





This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES PARENTS HAVE TOWARD THEIR  
CHILD'S ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF  
THOSE ATTITUDES TO RELIGIOUS CONVICTION, SOCIAL MO-  
BILITY AND SOCIAL CLASS.

presented by

Norman Page Nicolson

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

Ph.D. \_\_\_\_\_ degree in \_\_\_\_\_ Educational Administration  
K-12 Administration

Major professor

Date November 15, 1985



**RETURNING MATERIALS:**  
Place in book drop to  
remove this checkout from  
your record. FINES will  
be charged if book is  
returned after the date  
stamped below.

~~May 10 1993~~  
May 10 1993  
125

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES PARENTS HAVE TOWARD THEIR CHILD'S ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF THOSE ATTITUDES TO RELIGIOUS  
CONVICTION, SOCIAL MOBILITY AND SOCIAL CLASS

By

Norman Page Nicolson

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

1985



ABSTRACT  
A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES PARENTS HAVE TOWARD THEIR CHILD'S  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF THOSE ATTITUDES TO  
RELIGIOUS CONVICTION, SOCIAL MOBILITY, AND SOCIAL CLASS

By

N. Page Nicolson

This research investigates the attitudes parents of elementary school children have towards their child's educational environment in Ontario where two publicly funded but religiously separate (Public-Roman Catholic) elementary (K-8) systems exist. A questionnaire designed to elicit attitudes toward responsiveness of the school to parent wishes, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school, and desire for a traditional school was field tested and distributed to a random sample of 410 parents. Parents were divided into groups based on school support, social mobility, religiosity and social class. Using chi-square values and multiple regression analysis, the data from 314 usable questionnaires were examined to determine what significant ( $p < .05$ ) relationships existed between (1) type of school parents support and the four attitudes, (2) religiosity of the parents and the four attitudes, (3) social mobility of the parents and the four attitudes, (4) social class of the parents and the four attitudes, (5) religiosity

and type of school parents chose, (6) social mobility and type of school parents chose, and (7) social class and type of school parents chose.

Analysis of the data revealed that the parents in this sample believed their schools were effective and responsive to their concerns. When given a choice of school, parents desired a traditional type of school. Religiosity and social mobility were not related to the four attitudes.

Parents of the Separate (Catholic) school system rated their schools significantly higher on the discipline index than did the Public (Protestant) school parents. Separate school parents expressed concern over how the discipline level was maintained. Parents in the Separate School system also scored significantly higher on the index of religiosity.

The proportion of parents in the upper social class that desired a traditional school was significantly higher than the proportion of parents in the lower social class that desired a traditional school.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Appreciation is extended to the members of my committee - to Dr. Cusick for planting the seed that became the dissertation - to Dr. Lezotte for his unflagging interest that provided me with encouragement - to Dr. Ignatovich for his constant challenge for excellence - finally, to Dr. Marcus who nurtured me through the process with sound advice that resulted in an excellent learning experience and intellectual growth.

Thanks is extended to the Directors of the Public and the Separate School Board for allowing me to conduct this research into parents' attitudes about their schools.

Gratitude is extended to Bruce Brousseau for his assistance with the statistical component of this study.

Appreciation is also extended to Eunice McClary for her perserverance as a typist over the course of the dissertation.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Joyce, for without her support, understanding, and encouragement, I could not have succeeded.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page Number
<b>I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	Purpose.....	1
	Perspectives.....	2
	Historical Background.....	7
	Introduction.....	7
	Ontario to 1867.....	8
	Ontario 1867 to the Present.....	14
	Summary.....	18
	Attitudes.....	18
	Religion and Religiosity.....	20
	Summary.....	23
	Social Mobility.....	24
	Summary.....	29
	Attitudes and Schools.....	29
	Summary.....	33
	Exploratory Questions .....	33
	Hypotheses .....	35
	Method and Sample. ....	37
	Significance .....	38
	Endnotes.....	40
<b>II</b>	<b>A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE</b>	
	Introduction.....	1
	Schools and Philosophy.....	2
	Summary.....	6
	Ontario Schools.....	7
	Summary.....	10
	Voluntarism and School Support.....	10
	Summary.....	13
	Religion and Schools.....	13
	Summary.....	17
	Finances and Attitudes.....	18
	Summary.....	20
	Social Class.....	20
	Chapter Summary.....	22
	Endnotes.....	26

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page Number
<b>III</b>	<b>DESIGN OF THE STUDY</b>	
	Introduction.....	1
	Development of the Questionnaire.....	1
	Religion, Social Mobility and Social Class	1
	Attitude Indexes.....	9
	Summary.....	14
	Field Test.....	15
	Procedures.....	15
	Results.....	16
	Validity of the Indexes.....	21
	Summary.....	24
	Administration of the Questionnaire.....	25
	Sample.....	25
	Procedures.....	27
	Summary.....	31
	Index Development.....	32
	Testable Hypotheses.....	38
	Analysis.....	44
	Chapter Summary.....	47
	Endnotes.....	48
<b>IV</b>	<b>ANALYSIS</b>	
	Introduction.....	1
	Data Analysis.....	2
	School Choice.....	2
	Religiosity.....	6
	Social Mobility.....	10
	Social Class.....	15
	Regression Analysis.....	21
	Summary of Parents' Comments.....	22
	Chapter Summary.....	26
<b>V</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	
	Introduction.....	1
	Conclusions.....	4
	Discussion.....	10
	Summary.....	16
	Implications for Future Research.....	17

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **APPENDICES**

- Appendix A  
Field Test Questionnaire
- Appendix B  
Final Copy Questionnaire
- Appendix C  
Directors of Education Correspondence
- Appendix D  
Letters to Parents
- Appendix E  
Letters to Principals
- Appendix F  
Factor Analysis Statistics

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page Number
1.1	Per Pupil Revenue Cost.....	16
3.1	Adapted Religiosity Questions From Bishop's Task Force.....	2
3.2	Religiosity Questions.....	4
3.3	Social Mobility Questions.....	5
3.4	Social Class Questions.....	6
3.5	Technical Questions.....	7
3.6	Source of Attitude Questions and Revised Variable Title.....	10
3.7	Discipline Statements.....	11
3.8	Responsiveness Statements.....	11
3.9	School Effectiveness.....	12
3.10	Traditional - Non-Traditional Statements...	13
3.11	Number of Responses For Each Religiosity Question.....	19
3.12	Number of Responses For Each Social Status Question.....	19
3.13	Total Number of Responses For Each Variable-Part Two.....	20
3.14	Total Number of Responses For Traditional Orientation - Part III.....	21
3.15	Comparison of Criterion Persons on Field Test Questionnaire (Four Indexes).....	24

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page Number
3.16 Summary Characteristics of Parents.....	31
3.17 Source of Indexes.....	33
3.18 Factor Analysis of Variables - All Cases...	34
3.19 Reliability Alphas For Each Index.....	36
3.20 Discipline Index Score.....	38
4.1 A Comparison of the Attitudes of Public and Separate School Parents Toward the Respon- siveness of Their School.....	2
4.2 A Comparison of the Attitudes of Public and Separate School Parents Toward the Effec- tiveness of Their School.....	3
4.3 A Comparison of the Attitudes of Public and Separate School Parents Toward Discipline in Their School.....	4
4.4 A Comparison of the Attitudes of Public and Separate School Parents Toward a Traditional School.....	5
4.5 A Comparison of the Level of Religiosity of Parents With Type of School Chosen.....	7
4.6 A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Responsiveness Between Parents of High and Low Religiosity.....	7
4.7 A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Effectiveness Between Parents of High and Low Religiosity.....	8
4.8 A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Discipline Between Parents of High and Low Religiosity.....	9



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page Number
4.9	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward a Traditional School Between Parents of High and Low Religiosity.....	10
4.10	A Comparison of the Level of Social Mobility of Parents By the Type of School Chosen....	11
4.11	A Comparison of Social Mobility Levels (3) of Parents By the Type of School Chosen....	11
4.12	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Responsiveness Between Parents of High and Low Social Mobility.....	12
4.13	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Effectiveness Between Parents of High and Low Social Mobility.....	13
4.14	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Discipline Between Parents of High and Low Social Mobility.....	14
4.15	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward a Traditional School Between Parents of High and Low Social Mobility.....	14
4.16	A Comparison of the Level of Social Class of Parents With the Type of School Chosen..	16
4.17	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Responsiveness Among the Three Social Classes.....	17
4.18	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Effectiveness Among the Three Social Classes.....	17
4.19	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward School Discipline Among the Three Social Classes..	18

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page Number
4.20	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward a Traditional School Among the Three Social Classes.....	19
4.21	A Comparison of the Attitudes Toward a Traditional School Among the Three Social Classes.....	20
4.22	Summary of Stepwise Regression of Dependent Variables with Independent Variables.	22
4.23	Comment Differences Between Public and Separate School Parents.....	26
4.24	Summary of Results On Attitude Indexes With Type of School as the Independent Variable..	27
4.25	Summary of Results With Religiosity as the Independent Variable.....	28
4.26	Summary of Results With Social Mobility as the Independent Variable.....	28
4.27	Summary of Results With Social Class as the Independent Variable.....	29
4.28	Summary of Results With Type of School as the Dependent Variable.....	30
5.1	Types of Relationships Reported.....	3
5.2	Percentage of Parents by School System and Their Very High and Very Low Ratings on Each of the Dependent Variables.....	5
5.3	Enrolment Patterns as Related to Religiosity	6

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page Number
5.4	Percentage of Parents by Religiosity and Their Very High and Very Low Ratings on Each of the Dependent Variables.....	7
5.5	Enrolment Patterns as Related to Social Mobility.....	8
5.6	Percentage of Parents by Mobility Level and Their Very High and Very Low Ratings on Each of the Dependent Variables.....	8
5.7	Proportions of Parents in Each School System by Class.....	9
5.8	Percentage of Parents at Each Social Class Level Whose Scores are Very High or Very Low on Each of the Dependent Variables.....	10

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

**Purpose**

In broad terms, this research investigates the attitudes parents of elementary school children in Ontario have towards their children's educational environment. In more specific terms, the purpose can be broken into four sections:

- (i) School Choice
  - (a) to compare the attitudes of parents who support the two school systems. The comparison will focus on four attitudes--effectiveness of learning environment, responsiveness of the school to the parents' wishes, student discipline, and a desire for a traditional approach to teaching.
- (ii) Religiosity
  - (a) to examine the relationship between the variable religiosity of the parent and school choice.
  - (b) to examine the relationship between the variable religiosity of the parent and the four attitudes.
- (iii) Social Mobility
  - (a) to examine the relationship between the variable social mobility of the parent and school choice.
  - (b) to examine the relationship between the variable social mobility of the parent and the four attitudes.
- (iv) Social Class
  - (a) to examine the relationship between the variable social class of the parent and school choice.
  - (b) to examine the relationship between the variable social class of the parent and the four attitudes.

### Perspective

Probably the most talked about research in education in the past three years has been High School Achievement: Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared by James S. Coleman and his colleagues. The interpretation of his results, which seem to favor non-public schools, has been a subject of scholarly debate and has increased interest in the public-private school controversy.<sup>1</sup> The report has been an encouraging sign for those who sponsor various political initiatives (S.B. 150, Packwood Moynihan Bill, California Family Choice Initiative, Washington, D.C. Tax Credit Initiative) designed to gain financial support for private schools.

The Coleman report and political activity are regarded with interest in Canada, and in particular Ontario, where two publicly funded elementary (K-8) systems, Public and Separate, have been in existence for over 140 years. Since separation of church and state is an American, not a Canadian principle, the use of public money to support a denominational school is not an issue.

In Ontario, religion is the major distinguishing factor between the two school systems. The staff and a majority of the clients of the Separate system are Roman Catholic. Backed by a large degree of government funding, the Separate Schools spend almost as much per pupil as do the Public

schools (K-8). Complicated funding mechanisms and ambiguous ministry reporting practices make exact cost comparisons difficult but Carl J. Matthews S.J. estimated that elementary Separate schools were funded at a level slightly less than elementary Public schools.

My "guesstimate" would be \$2,438 for the Catholic junior high school students and \$1,810 for the elementary pupils the latter figure is only 92.6 per cent of the Public elementary figure of \$1,955.<sup>2</sup>

The Ontario School system provides an excellent opportunity to research many of the ideas about private schools and public schools without the confounding variable of tuition. Areas of study that are found in private and public school research are: discipline, religion, social mobility, social class, school effectiveness and responsiveness of the school to its clients. This research into the two school systems in Ontario will focus on comparing the attitudes parents have towards their respective school systems and will attempt to determine if the background variables of religiosity, social mobility or social class have a relationship to the parents' attitudes about their school system.

Investigations into the attitudes people have towards social institutions and in particular schools, has been the object of much research in North American society. A poll similar to the annual Gallup Poll of The Public's Attitudes

Towards The Public Schools in the United States was conducted in Canada by the Canadian Education Association in 1984.

Where it has been possible to directly compare the findings of the most recent U.S. and Canadian polls, however, we have found that public opinion in the two nations tends to be similar on many points.<sup>3</sup>

Like the Gallup Poll, this research seeks to discover parents' attitudes about education but the focus is more precise, for it will compare parents' attitudes about the two school systems in Ontario using a variety of background variables.

In addition to comparing parents' attitudes, this research will determine if there is a relationship between certain background characteristics of the parents and the attitudes they express about their schools. Since one of the school systems involved in the comparison is religiously based, the first background variable of interest is the religiosity of the respondent; the importance of religion in the parent's life. The significance of religion in a man's life is best indicated by Paul Tillich.

Religion is the substance, the ground, the depth of man's spiritual life. Religion, in the largest and most basic sense of the word, is the ultimate concern.<sup>4</sup>

People who are more religious should participate in and view the social organization of our world differently than people

who are less religious. Dr. Ruth Whitney, a professor of religion, expresses the importance of religion to people in this manner.

Religion is both the meaning of life and the activity to incarnate that meaning. Being religious is being struck by the transcendent quality of life and attempting to make it immanent in the world.<sup>5</sup>

Huber and Form noted the importance of religion in how people view the world in Income and Ideology. Religion was the main force behind Lenski's study in Detroit--The Religious Factor - A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics and Family Life. As Halevy and Halevy state, the fascination with religion can be traced to Weber.

The possible influence of religious affiliation on social conduct has attracted the interest of social scientists, especially since Weber drafted his thesis on the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.<sup>6</sup>

The second background variable to be investigated is that of social mobility - the change in social status from one's parents as measured by occupational status. Huber and Form found that mobility experiences were related to parable interpretation.

...mobility experiences, racial and income characteristics of those taking different positions on the camel story were clear.<sup>7</sup>

Social mobility, an ongoing phenomenon of North American life, has been researched since 1927 when Pitirim Sorokin



published Social Mobility where he noted that mobility had more deleterious effects on people than positive. Blau and Duncan used the patterns of mobility to help explain the stratification process in the United States. They wrote:

Processes of social mobility from one generation to the next and from career beginnings to occupational destination are considered to reflect the dynamics of the occupational structure. By analyzing the pattern of these occupational movements, the conditions that affect them and some of their consequences, we attempt to explain part of the dynamics of the stratification system in the United States.<sup>8</sup>

Social class provides the third point of focus for this research. Since people of similar social class tend to congregate in the same type of neighborhood, will they also have similar views about their school? Tumin believes that people who have similar class experiences also have similar attitudes. He wrote:

It is also quite obvious that there is an intimate relationship at all times between the general structural arrangements in society and the attitudes, values and interests of the persons who play out their roles in these structures.<sup>9</sup>

This research will contribute to a growing body of literature that seeks to compare and explain the similarities and differences between competing school systems. Not only will this study compare the attitudes of parents of elementary school children in Public Schools to the attitudes of parents of elementary school children in Separate

Schools on such traditional topics as discipline and effectiveness, it will also determine if a relationship exists between the background variables of social mobility, religiosity and social class and the attitudes expressed about their children's elementary school.

## **Historical Background**

### **Introduction**

Although the problems and purposes of education are similar in different nations, each has developed a unique system of education in response to the political, religious and social demands of its people. The school system is a reflection of the traditions, hopes and characteristics of the dominant founding groups. Kandel, a comparative education scholar, wrote:

Each national system of education is characteristic of the nation which has created it and expresses something peculiar to the group which constitutes that nation; to put it another way, each nation has the educational system that it desires or that it deserves.<sup>10</sup>

An appreciation of the historical background is necessary to understand the system of education that has developed in Ontario. The brief history of the development of the Ontario educational system will show how what was initially grudgingly granted as a privilege to Catholics came to be regarded as a right that the supporters extended through the judicial and political process.

Ontario to 1867

The development of a dual elementary system in Ontario, based on religion, is quite different from the school systems that developed in the United States. The Ontario education system, a reflection of the different historical backgrounds and philosophies of the respective founding peoples, is the political by-product of a temporary enforced union between two religiously distinct populations that sought solutions through committee and compromise.

After the conquest of Quebec in 1759 the British allowed the French to practise their culture and religion. This right was further legitimized in the Quebec Act (1774) and the Constitutional Act (1791). As English settlers established themselves in Quebec, the development of Protestant English schools was a necessity because the established schools were French Catholic. Thus, by the 1800's the existence of two separate denominational school systems was firmly entrenched in Quebec.

When Lower Canada (French-speaking Quebec) and Upper Canada (English-speaking Ontario) were united under one government in 1841, the issue of what type of elementary school system should be legitimized in Upper Canada was addressed by clerics and politicians of all hues. In the Throne Speech of the first Parliament after the Act of

Union the governor, Lord Sydenham, recognized the problems that education would cause when he said:

The establishment of an efficient system is a work of difficulty. If it should be found impossible to reconcile conflicting opinions, so as to obtain a measure which may meet the approbation of all, I trust that, at least, steps may be taken, by which an advance to a more perfect system may be made; and the difficulty under which the people of this Province now labour may be greatly diminished, subject to such improvements hereafter as time and experience may point out.<sup>11</sup>

It was Sydenham's hope that a basis for an educational system could be found so that the inter-religious quarrelling over schooling would cease. At that time in Upper Canada the conflicting opinions about education were addressed by the various religious groups with the most powerful being that of the Anglican Church, led by Bishop Strachan. Curriculum, use of the Bible, prayers, and how responsibility should be allocated for the schools were the major sources of conflict. Sydenham's instructions to the first Parliament were to establish an elementary school system that solved these problems and laid a basis for the future.

To determine the system of elementary education that was to be founded in Upper Canada, a committee of the Legislature was struck. Since dissentient<sup>12</sup> schools for Protestants existed in Lower Canada, it was only reasonable that dissentient schools be allowed in Upper Canada. In 1841, Day's Common School Act, which ensured the principle of Separate Schools, was passed.

The revisions to the Common School Act in the ensuing years attempted to clarify taxation and support difficulties, teacher certification rights and governance by the province. These rights, which were achieved through the political process of compromise, petition and backroom deals, were not welcomed by many leaders of the day. In reference to the Act of 1853, which was to give Separate School trustees the power to issue certificates to the teachers employed by them and the same power of levying taxes as that enjoyed by the trustees of Common Schools, Egerton Ryerson, the founder of the Ontario Education System, wrote the Attorney-General:

The effect of all this would be to destroy the system of Public Schools in cities and towns and ultimately perhaps in villages and townships; and to leave all the poorer portion of the population and that portion of it connected with minor religious persuasions without any adequate and certain means of education. I think the safest and most defensible ground to take is a firm refusal to sanction any measure to provide by law increased facilities for the multiplication and perpetuation of sectarian schools.<sup>13</sup>

Ryerson's fear was that the further extension of rights to Separate Schools would eventually cripple the Public system, particularly in the rural areas where small numbers necessitated one school.

Sir John A. MacDonald, who later became the first Prime Minister of Canada, while in agreement with Ryerson, realized that a decision to allow Separate Schools some power

was politically wise. MacDonald's biographer, Pope, indicated this attitude.

Mr. MacDonald said that he was as desirous as anyone of seeing all children going together to the Common School, and if he could have his own way there would be no Separate School. But we should respect the opinions of others who differed from us, and they had a right to refuse such schools as they could not conscientiously approve of.<sup>14</sup>

As nationhood approached, the Legislators of the Canadas struggled to draft resolutions for inclusion in the British North American (B.N.A.) Act, the founding document of Canada. Acrimonious debate about the education clauses and, in particular, over the rights of the religious minority (Protestant or Catholic) to have their own schools took place from 1863 to 1865. A compromise reached on the basis of maintaining the status quo was expressed in Resolution 43(6).

The Local Legislature shall have power to make laws respecting the following subjects....(6) Education, saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minorities in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools, at the time when the union goes into operation.<sup>15</sup>

This 1865 Resolution, it was believed, offered a permanent solution to what had been a difficult, time consuming problem. The permanence of the solution was expressed by John Sandfield Macdonald, who in the course of debating the bill stated:

We will not be in any worse position under the new system, and in one respect we will have a decided advantage, in that no further change can be made by the separate schools authorities.<sup>16</sup>

When the Legislators of the United Canadas submitted their resolutions about schools to London for inclusion in the B.N.A. Act, they believed they had solved the sectarian school issue for eternity. However, when the Act returned to Canada in 1867, changes, deletions and additions to the Resolution had changed the Legislators' intentions. The original Resolution had been changed to:

In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

- (1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any Right or Privilege with respect to Denominational Schools which any Class of Persons have by law in the Province at the Union.<sup>17</sup>

The inclusion of the word "prejudicially" dashed any hopes the politicians might have had for a permanent solution to the Separate School issue. The word "prejudicially" had been introduced to suggest that the existing privileges represented a minimum and not a maximum as well. Sissons, a Canadian historian, makes this point clear.

Roman Catholics, under the constitution are free to press for extension of privileges, to push forward along three salients as they are doing at present. And the state should be free through its legislative arm to decide whether these claims are just and

in the public interest, and to determine as well whether time has altered the correctness of the original settlement.<sup>18</sup>

By 1867, a distinctive school system, achieved through political compromise, was firmly in place and the opportunity to extend rights to the minority had a constitutional basis. The beginnings of a "more perfect system", as desired by Sydenham, had been completed.

The architect for this system had been Egerton Ryerson, the Superintendent of Schools in Canada West (Ontario) from 1846 to his retirement in 1876. Like Horace Mann and other educational leaders of the era, he believed the school was the instrument of social cohesion. Through the school, the populace could become bound together with one set of common values and beliefs.

Like his American counterparts, Ryerson looked on the school as a vehicle for inculcating loyalty and patriotism, fostering social cohesion and self-reliance, and ensuring domestic tranquility.<sup>19</sup>

Although Ryerson would have preferred one common school for all children, the unique historical background, public opinion and the forces of organized religion made it necessary to have a dual confessional system. As he stated in his report of 1847:

I was not prepared to condemn what had been unanimously sanctioned by two successive parliaments.<sup>20</sup>

Although he inherited a dual school system, he did not believe it would be a permanent part of the educational



scene. He believed that Separate Schools would

die out, not by force of legislative enactment, but under the influence of increasingly enlightened and enlarged view of Christian relations, rights and duties between different classes of the community.<sup>21</sup>

The foundation of the Ontario school system was built by a man who believed in a strong central authority over a common school where all could attend. Since Separate Schools existed, he believed in allowing Roman Catholics freedom of choice. His success in establishing an unique school system that was appropriate for the populace is attested to in the first official history of the Ontario Education System. The author states:

So complete is the system, so carefully is every contingency provided for that the observer....is apt to feel that its completeness is perhaps its greatest defect.<sup>22</sup>

#### Ontario 1867 to Present

The period from Confederation until the 1960's was notable for its lack of significant legislative actions with respect to elementary education in Ontario.<sup>23</sup> Most changes were brought about by departmental instructions or guidelines. The courts were the venue where disputes over taxes and jurisdiction were settled.<sup>24</sup>

Through Provincial Acts and the British North America Act, the Catholics were guaranteed a Separate School System in Ontario. The funding of the system was through local taxes and provincial grants. As the population of Ontario

grew and the province became industrialized, the majority of commercial and industrial municipal taxes was directed to the Public Schools. The Separate Schools had a right to exist but found it increasingly difficult because of limited financial resources.

In 1963, the Ontario Government announced the implementation of the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan. It was a bold step to provide each school board:

...with sufficient revenue for the adequate financing of the educational program that it considered essential and sufficient to meet the needs of its own community, while at the same time maintaining its responsibility to the ratepayers who elected it.<sup>25</sup>

This plan, together with subsequent modifications to the grant structure and tax structure, has led to almost equal funding on a per student basis in both systems as Table 1.1 demonstrates.

The figures in Table 1.1 are not directly comparable because the Separate School figures are based on a J.K. (Junior Kindergarten) to X system while the Public School figures are based on a J.K. to VIII system. Matthews estimates the elementary relationship of per pupil revenue cost in 1979 at 93.7%.<sup>26</sup> Through provincial funding, the minority system in numerical terms is able to spend almost the same per student as the public system yet tax its supporters at the same mill rate as the public school supporters.

TABLE 1.1  
PER PUPIL REVENUE COST<sup>27</sup>

	Public (P)	Separate (S)	Per Cent S of P
1959	\$ 291	\$ 186	64.0%
1960	309	200	64.7%
1961	328	217	66.2%
1962	342	234	68.4%
1963	371	260	70.2%
1964	386	301	78.1%
1965	409	329	80.3%
1966	456	327	82.7%
1967	484	427	88.2%
1968	574	506	88.2%
1969	641	577	90.0%
1970	719	663	92.2%
1971	766	730	95.3%
1972	837	797	95.2%
1973	885	857	96.8%
1974	997	968	97.1%
1975	1,219	1,213	99.1%
1976	1,437	1,422	99.0%
1977	1,604	1,576	98.2%
1978	1,772	1,750	98.7%
1979	1,955	1,924	98.4%

Separate school supporters in Sault Ste. Marie will be paying the same education taxes as public school supporters this year...<sup>28</sup>

Both systems are subject to the same rules and regulations, employ teachers trained in the same Teachers' Colleges, use the same textbooks and have locally elected trustees. The major difference between the two systems is in the teaching of religion. In the Separate Schools religious instruction and family life studies occur daily. In the Public Schools, formal religious instruction is conducted sporadically, usually by volunteers. The frequency of such instruction varies from a high of one-half hour per week through to a half hour every three weeks to virtually none. A compulsory family-life (Sex Education) course is in place.

Both systems are supported by local taxes and government grants. Only Roman Catholics have a choice as to which school system they wish to support with their municipal taxes. Non-Catholics, who send their children to a Separate School may be charged a fee by the Separate School Board or may be refused admission. Catholics who choose to support the Separate School System with their taxes, but send their children to a Public School, may also be charged a fee by the Public School Board. It should be emphasized that only Catholics have a choice as to which school system receives their local taxes.

### Summary

Over time, Ontario has developed two parallel elementary educational systems for the public to choose from. Whether or not it is the "more perfect system" desired by Sydenham is debatable but it is unique and still evolving.<sup>29</sup> Common curricula, guidelines and regulations; equalized funding but separate, local, political control for each system is in place. The single distinguishing factor between the two is that the Separate system emphasizes religion.

While it is possible for citizens to enrol their children in either school system, the crossing of religious boundaries is discouraged particularly by the Separate System. Consequently, the majority of Separate School supporters are Roman Catholic and the majority of Public School supporters are Non-Catholic.

### Attitudes

The use of attitudes in research has become commonplace in the social sciences. Nine reasons are given for the popularity and usefulness of attitudes by Oskamp in Attitudes and Opinions. Five are noted.

- (1) An attitude can be considered the 'cause' of a person's behavior toward another person or an object.
- (2) The concept of attitude helps to explain the 'consistency' of a person's behavior, since a single attitude may underlie many different actions. (In turn, Allport says, the consistency of individual behavior helps to explain the stability of society).

- (3) Attitudes are 'important' in their own right' regardless of their relation to a person's behavior. Your attitudes toward various individuals, institutions, and social issues (eg., a political party, the church, capital punishment, the President of the United States) reflect the way you perceive the world around you, and they are worth studying for their own sake.
- (4) The concept of attitude includes the idea of 'unconscious determinants' of behavior and the dynamic interplay of conflicting motives whose importance has been stressed by Freud and other psychoanalysts.
- (5) Within the field of sociology, some authors have viewed attitudes as the most central concept and 'basis of all social behavior', since they provide the mechanism by which cultural patterns influence individual behaviour.<sup>30</sup>

Thus, an investigation of attitudes of parents of elementary school children is important not only for 'their own sake' but for a better understanding of the behavior patterns of parents towards schools and the interplay between background variables and attitudes.

The term 'attitudes', which has several possible meanings, has been defined in a variety of ways by social scientists. In an attempt to arrive at a common meaning, Gordon Allport, former chairman of Harvard's psychology department, cited several definitions of attitudes before developing his own comprehensive definition of attitude which has been widely used. His definition is:

An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.<sup>31</sup>

According to Allport's definition, an attitude is a state of preparedness for behavior; it disposes people toward the manner in which they perceive the world. These attitudes are not inborn but rather learned and developed through experiences. Attitudes are not stagnant but have a motivational force. Hartley, Hartley and Hart noted the power of attitudes in mass communication when they wrote:

An attitude is a product of experience, but it enters into subsequent experience as a directive factor.<sup>32</sup>

The background experiences in this research are religiosity, social mobility and social class. The attitudes parents of elementary school children have towards their children's educational environment are the focus for this investigation.

### **Religion and Religiosity**

As the history of the education system in Ontario demonstrates, the role of religion was extremely important in its affect on the structure of the institution. Not only in Ontario, but worldwide, religion has been a strong force in the history of man for it has been at the root of revolution, reformation, and vast cultural changes. Religion determines beliefs, attitudes, philosophy and a way of life. Nicholas Hans, a comparative education scholar, wrote:

Among spiritual influences religion is the most powerful, because it appeals to the whole man and not only to his intellect. Religion penetrates the emotional depth of human nature, it conditions habitual reactions in daily life and it colours the reasoning ability of a creative mind.<sup>33</sup>

The significant role of religion in the lives of people was discussed by the German sociologist Max Weber in The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Religion was used by Weber to explain why the Catholics were not at the forefront of the capitalist movement.

Thus, the principal explanation of this difference must be sought in the permanent intrinsic character of their religious beliefs and not only in their temporary external historico-political situation.<sup>34</sup>

Religion is an important factor to be considered in explaining human behavior and attitudes; for it influences the actions and behaviors of its adherents and thus their institutions. In a study that investigates the attitudes of parents whose children are enrolled in Public and Separate Schools, the affect of the religious background of the parents is an important consideration.

The theories of Weber were crucial to a study, conducted by Gerhard Lenski, designed to "discover the impact of religion on secular institutions".<sup>35</sup> Results of his work indicated that religious organizations continued to be vigorous and influential in urban American life.

...from our evidence it is clear that religion in various ways is constantly influencing the daily lives of the masses of men and women in the modern American metropolis. More than that: through its impact on individuals, religion makes an impact on all other institutional systems of the community in which these individuals participate. Hence, the influence of religion operates at the social level as well as the personal level.<sup>36</sup>



In addition to finding a religious affect on secular institutions, Lenski found that the manner in which religion was viewed and practiced had an influence on attitudes and behavior patterns.

Not only is the behaviour of men influenced by the socio-religious groups to which they belong; our evidence also indicates it is influenced by their religious orientation.<sup>37</sup>

Varying religious orientations are related to varying patterns in daily life.

People have a variety of views of the church and its teachings and these views result in differing perceptions of the world and its organizations. The measure of the significance of religion in a person's life is frequently referred to as religiosity. At a personal level, religiosity should provide a point of view or reference point from which the world is interpreted. Lee and Clyde noted:

...religion fosters the internalization of norms, advocates particular guidelines for behavior, gives it adherents a firm notion that there are right and wrong ways.<sup>38</sup>

By implication, the more religious a person is, the more distinct their attitudes should be from a person who is less religious. The relationship of religiosity to various social and psychological areas of interest has been studied by social psychologists and researchers.<sup>39</sup>

Although the effect of a modern society is thought by some to have a moderating affect on religious influence,<sup>40</sup>

other sociologists consider religion and religiosity as important variables to be considered when assessing attitudes. Melvin Kohn, concerned with social class in his study Class and Conformity, recognized the importance of religion and practice.

Religious background and practice are potent variables, but independent of social class.<sup>41</sup>

In a reexamination of Kohn's thesis with up-to-date data, Wright and Wright, in their discussion of results, noted that when the assumption of minimal social class effect was in place, non-class variables such as ethnicity, region, and religion account for about three-fifths of the variance.<sup>42</sup>

The inclusion of religion and religiosity in this research into attitudes about schools is warranted by the results of previous researchers who have recognized the importance of religion and religious practices on attitudes and behaviors; and by the dominant role that religion had and continues to have in the Ontario Education System. The importance of religion in society is summarized by Yinger:

Religion is part of the complex of proscriptions and prescriptions that guides the interactions of men in all societies.<sup>43</sup>

#### Summary

The influence of religion on the orientation of its practitioners towards the institutions of society has been a topic of theory and research by psychologists and sociologists. Religion, it is believed, leads to an interpretation

of the world that is different from those who do not have a similar spiritual influence. Those who practise their religion will have different attitudes about secular institutions than those who don't. In a study of attitudes towards school systems where religion is significant, the inclusion of religiosity is an important variable. Religion and religiosity are seen as affecting how one makes sense out of the world. In "Dimensions of Religiosity in Modern Society", Drehsen maintains that religiosity is present in attitudes and action, the question is how much influence does it have.

Below the level of theoretical conceptualization, the question which above all remains open is that of to what extent religiosity is actually present in every action.<sup>44</sup>

### **Social Mobility**

As the previous sections have shown, the role of religion in education in Ontario is important and the role of religion as an influence on people's lives and their attitudes can be powerful. Different authors in the course of their discussions about religion consistently referred to different facets of socio-economic-status through the use of words such as class, socio-religious, historico-political and economics. The influence of class on how people view the world has been studied from a wide variety of perspectives, and is included in most social research. Kohn writes:

It is commonplace among social scientists that, no matter what the subject of study, we should always measure people's social class positions for class is nearly always significantly involved.<sup>45</sup>

In this section one aspect of class, mobility and its relationship to attitudes, will be reviewed.

Class can include education, family income, possessions, occupation, mobility, prestige and a range of other variables. The choice of which variables to use is dependent on the object of study and the inclination of the researcher. If class is defined in terms of money or income, and the assumption is made that most people have as their major source of income their job, then Blau and Duncan believe that occupation can be used as a major determiner of class.

Occupational position does not encompass all aspects of the concept of class, but it is probably the best single indicator of it.<sup>46</sup>

Interest in occupations and the changing of occupations between generations (mobility) has frequently been a subject of study by social science researchers. Their work with occupations was, in part, a reaction to the writings of Sorokin more than fifty years ago.

Within our societies, vertical circulation of individuals is going on permanently. But how is it taking place?.....what are the characteristics of this process of which very little is known? Individuals have been speculating too much and studying the facts too little. It is high time to abandon speculation for the somewhat saner method of collecting the facts and studying them patiently. 47

Investigations into the concept of mobility as a distinct variable was the focus of much of the early research. Concentration on, and explanations of mobility were not deemed sufficient by Blau and Duncan.

The tendency to conceive of mobility as a single variable and examine it largely without relating it to other variables has severely restricted the fruitfulness of mobility research.<sup>48</sup>

In spite of this concern about the single mindedness of mobility research, a number of studies have been conducted investigating the relationship between mobility and other variables. After investigating these studies, Melvin Tumin concluded that there was a relationship between mobility and the values, interests and attitudes of people.

The general trend of these findings is that the mobility experience in a status-minded society is likely to have some disruptive consequences, either because of the status orientation or anxiety of the mobile individual or because of his inability to adjust successfully to the new group into which he moves, whether it is up or down.<sup>49</sup>

Mobility studies have found relationships between mobility and: the achievement motive (Crockett); political orientation (Lopreato); interpersonal relations (Blau); mental disorder (Kleiner and Parker); marital stability (Chester) and other social phenomenon. The results of the studies in mobility have led to many interpretations and arguments wherein one finds little agreement. Germani, like Tumin, realizing that social mobility was a strong force, but its affect was unclear wrote:

Only one conclusion about the social consequences of mobility is likely to encounter general agreement; an enormous variety of social and individual consequences can be imputed to social mobility.<sup>50</sup>

Part of the difficulty in studying the effects of mobility was the lack of a clear definition of mobility and an understanding of the diverse nature of it. Like the notion of social class, social mobility has combined a number of ideas into one concept. As many as nineteen possible measures of social mobility were investigated by Wilensky.<sup>51</sup> After factor analyzing the results of 1,354 interviews with men, he stated:

Thus "much intergenerational occupational mobility" with a loading of .927 is the best clue to "intergenerational climbing of the couple" (occupation and education).<sup>52</sup>

His factor "much intergenerational occupational mobility" was composed of a five-point scale of much up to much down, based on a comparison of father's and son's occupation.<sup>53</sup> The term intergenerational mobility is the term used to refer to changes that occur from one generation to another with the occupations of father and son as the key variables.

Social mobility, as determined by occupational mobility between generations, and its relationship to school attitudes will be the second important focus for this research. As previous studies have shown, the relationship between social mobility and attitudes can be discerned. In a study of the social and psychological consequences of intergenerational mobility, Kessin concluded:

I believe this study permits us to assert the existence of demonstrable empirical consequences of mobility.<sup>54</sup>

The use of mobility, as an independent variable, is seen as important in a study of attitudes because of the significance of mobility in North American life. Kerckhoff wrote:

....is the fact that social mobility is both possible and highly valued in this society. That is, the American ideology rather clearly rejects the proposition that the son should necessarily take the place of his father in the stratification system. Not only should movement from one generation to the next be possible, but mechanisms to facilitate it should be made available. <sup>55</sup>

People who are socially mobile should have differing attitudes towards those mechanisms that help make mobility possible compared to those who are not socially mobile. One of those mechanisms is school. The generally increased affluence that has been present over the past several decades has allowed a socially mobile population to segregate itself into definite neighborhoods. Since students are enrolled on a neighborhood basis, schools have become somewhat uniform in terms of students and parents. Coleman makes this point when discussing the changes in the American public school system

....together with a general increase in affluence for all--and thus a greater range of economic options--made possible the separation of workplace from residence, and the development of large socially homogeneous residential areas served by socially homogeneous schools.<sup>56</sup>

### Summary

In addition to the influence of religion on attitudes, socio-economic-status has an important relationship to attitudes. One discrete part of socio-economic status is social mobility--the opportunity in society to change social position either up or down from that of one's parents. The effect of mobility on how a person views the world has been discussed and researched for over fifty years. The belief that mobility, both downward and upward, has an affect on interests, values, associations, and attitudes is consistent. In summarizing, studies carried out by sociologists, Tumin noted:

...virtually every study of any social phenomenon---whether it be of population fluctuations, divorce rates, family styles, or whatever---takes into account, often to considerable degree, the possibility that some one or several factors indicative of social and economic position and resources will exert significant influence on the behavior being studied.<sup>57</sup>

For this study a factor believed to "exert significant influence" on the attitudes being studied is social mobility.

### Attitudes and Schools

The previous sections have shown that religious values and social mobility may affect a person's attitudes. In this section, the importance of parental attitudes towards school and which attitudes will be used in the study will be discussed.



Just as religious values and social mobility are believed to affect peoples' attitudes, the type of social environment that a child is raised in may bear a relationship to success in school. In the home, the child is exposed to and learns a set of values that either help or hinder him in school. Exposure to a set of positive values about school would seem to augur for success in school more so than exposure to a set of negative values about schools. In a study of Ethnicity, Family Environment, School Attitudes and Academic Achievement the results indicated that:

...there are differential relations between family environments, attitudes, and children's academic achievement within the ethnic and social status groups.<sup>58</sup>

While the object of this research is not to become involved in the ability - environment - achievement controversy, most people believe that academic performance is a function of some combination of environment and ability. The attitudes that parents have towards schools are part of the environment that the child absorbs. Betty Miners of the Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory emphasized the importance of background values and learning.

Obviously, the child's assimilation of a set of values regarding education and successful performance, in part, determines his motivation to perform and, consequently, his actual performance.<sup>59</sup>

Thus a study of parents' attitudes towards schools is not only important for its own sake but such knowledge may be important in trying to explain differential student achievement.

Research that asks parents about schools or that compares schools is dominated by four topics. In general terms these topics are quality of classroom learning, student discipline, communication and basics.

Discipline in the schools has always been a major area of concern for parents. In the 1984 Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools, 68% of the public said discipline was either a "very serious" or "fairly serious" problem in the public schools.<sup>60</sup> Discipline has led the list of problems since the poll was begun in 1969. In Coleman's Public and Private Schools he found strong support for his premise that:

Private schools provide a safer, more disciplined, and more ordered environment than do public schools.<sup>61</sup>

A second common thread in the research that investigates what parents think of schools is that of student achievement levels or effectiveness of learning in the school. In Montgomery County, Maryland, public school parents who had transferred their children to a private school frequently mentioned a "perceived drop in the excellence of school programs" as their reason for leaving the public schools.<sup>62</sup> This perception of schools is also reflected in the 1984 Gallup Poll. Only four in ten parents gave Public Schools an A or B rating and that was the highest in the last decade.<sup>63</sup>

A third area of commonality among school studies is a concern for curriculum, basics, or a traditional education. In the 1984 Gallup Poll, "poor curriculum/poor standards" was third in a list of twenty-seven parent answers to a question about problems in public schools.<sup>64</sup> This concern for a traditional approach was voiced by parents in Montgomery County, Maryland when they were asked what public schools could do to achieve excellence. They responded:

Give more authority to teachers and less freedom to students; provide stronger administrative leadership; offer more challenging work in the curriculum; and assign more homework to students.<sup>65</sup>

A fourth area of attention in studies of schools is that of communication between the home and the school. In a comparison of Public Schools and Fundamental Schools, Weber et al. stated:

Because enrolment is voluntary, parents must endorse the rules and policies of the schools. Parental involvement in terms of school aims and volunteer work is expected.<sup>66</sup>

In the 1984 Gallup Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools thirty-one per cent of teachers indicated the biggest problem with public schools was "parent lack of interest/support".<sup>67</sup>

Communications between home and school is seen as very important in Fundamental Schools and poor parental support is seen as a problem by public school teachers. Both groups see contact with the home as important. Since this research

deals only with parents' attitudes, their perception of the responsiveness of the school to their requests will be probed. When parents do contact the school do they feel that the principal and staff are responsive to their requests?

In this research into parents' attitudes towards their child's school the focus will be on four areas: effectiveness - how effective is the learning environment in the child's school? discipline - how good is the student discipline in this school? responsiveness - how responsive is the school to their communication? traditional - how traditional a school would the parents like?

#### Summary

In educational research that asks parents their opinions about schools, or research that compares types of schools, common topics are found. These topics can be categorized into four general areas: school effectiveness, discipline, communication and basics. In this research the parents were asked questions that dealt with parts of each of these four topics - teacher effectiveness, student discipline, school responsiveness and parental desire for a traditional school.

#### Exploratory Questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes parents of elementary school children have towards their child's elementary school. As previous discussion has

shown, the attitudes people have are related not only to the object of discussion but are related to social mobility, social class, and religious views. Schools in Ontario offer an excellent focus for investigating the interplay of social and religious forces. While it is obvious that social mobility, social class, religion and education intersect in the schools, the nature of the relationships is not clear. The exploratory questions are based on the fact that two publicly funded systems exist in Ontario, and that religious views, social mobility and social class may have an effect on people's attitudes.

- (i) Is there a relationship between the type of school the child attends and his parents' attitude towards it?
- (ii) Is there a relationship between the parents' religious views and their attitude towards their child's school?
- (iii) Is there a relationship between the parents' social mobility and their attitudes toward their child's school?
- (iv) Is there a relationship between the parents' social class and their attitudes towards their child's school.

These four general questions will focus on four areas of interest in schools. These areas are: school effectiveness, school discipline, school responsiveness to parents, and a desire for a traditional school by parents.

### HYPOTHESES

In view of the purposes of this study, the exploratory questions that have been outlined and the limitations imposed by the Ontario School structure, the following hypotheses will be tested. The hypotheses are listed under the four themes of school choice, religiosity, social mobility and social class.

(i) School Choice

- (a) Parents who view their child's school as responsive, effective, and with good student discipline will be discriminated from parents who view their child's school as unresponsive, ineffective and with poor student discipline by school choice.
- (b) Parents who desire a traditional approach to education will be discriminated from those parents who desire a more liberal approach to education by school choice.

(ii) Religiosity

- (a) Parents who desire a Public school will be discriminated from those parents who desire a Separate school by religiosity.
- (b) Parents who view their child's school as effective, responsive and with good student discipline will be discriminated

from parents who view their schools as ineffective, unresponsive and with poor student discipline by religiosity.

- (c) Parents who desire a traditional approach to education, will be discriminated from those parents who desire a more liberal approach to education by religiosity.

(iii) Social Mobility

- (a) Parents who desire a Public school will be discriminated from those who desire a Separate school by direction of social mobility.
- (b) Parents who view their child's school as responsive, effective and with good student discipline will be discriminated from parents who view their child's school as unresponsive, ineffective and with poor discipline by direction of social mobility.
- (c) Parents who desire a traditional approach to education will be discriminated from those parents who desire a more liberal approach to education by direction of social mobility.

(iv) Social Class

- (a) Parents who desire a Public school will be discriminated from those parents who desire a Separate school by social class.
- (b) Parents who view their child's school as responsive, effective and with good student discipline will be discriminated from parents who view their child's school as unresponsive, ineffective and with poor student discipline by social class.
- (c) Parents who desire a traditional approach to education will be discriminated from those parents who desire a more liberal approach to education by social class.

**Method and Sample**

The investigation into parents' attitudes was conducted via a questionnaire composed of researcher designed questions and questions drawn from previous studies. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: background information, attitudes towards their school, and type of school desired. After field testing and revisions, the questionnaire was distributed to parents via the schools. Anonymity for schools and respondents was assured. Results were analyzed with respect to the hypotheses stated.

A random sample of parents was drawn from all parents with children in English speaking regular classrooms in



elementary (K-VIII) schools in a medium sized Ontario city served by a Public Board of Education and a Separate Board of Education. In each system, approximately two hundred questionnaires were distributed on a proportionate basis to each school. Principals were instructed how to randomly distribute the questionnaires within their school. By this method representation from each school in the area was assured.

### Significance

It is important to conduct this study for four reasons. First, it is important to determine if parents whose children attend two different but publicly funded schools see their schools differently. This information will be of value to Americans who are studying public and private schools, to advocates of state funding for private schools, and to Ontario educators who must respond to critics in and out of the system. Second, it is important to evaluate the effect of religious values on attitudes towards schools. In a dual system where one system emphasizes its religious values, it is important to determine if the religious values of the clients are related to their attitudes towards schools. Such information will be of value to those who study schools, particularly religious schools, and to those who are interested in the relationship between religion and attitudes. Third, it is important to evaluate the effect of social mobility on attitudes towards schools. Since North

American society is socially mobile, the effects of mobility on attitudes towards schools is important both for those who study schools and those who work in them. Fourth, it is important for Americans to learn of a foreign system of education for it enables them to better understand their own system and to be sensitive to the possible long term effects of change within their own system. The importance of learning from another system of education was emphasized by I.L. Kandel in his book Comparative Education where he wrote:

The study of foreign systems of education means a critical approach and a challenge to one's own philosophy and, therefore, a clearer analysis of the background and basis underlying the educational system of one's own nation. It means, further, the development of a new attitude and a new point of view which may be derived from a knowledge of the reasons for establishing systems of education and of the methods of conducting them.<sup>68</sup>

ENDNOTES      CHAPTER I

<sup>1</sup>Three of the critics of Coleman's study are:

Michael W. West, "The Rationale for Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (November 1981), pp. 164-165.

Andy C. Porter, "Some Comments on Public and Private School" (paper presented at the N.I.E. sponsored conference on Methodological Considerations Affecting The Credibility of Conclusions: The Instance of Three Conflicting Studies on Public and Private Schools. National Institute of Education, Washington D.C., July 21,22, 1981).

Douglas Willms, "Achievement Outcomes in Public and Private Schools: A Closer Look at the 'High School and Beyond' Data" (Occasional Paper. Stanford, California: Stanford Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance 1982).

<sup>2</sup>Carl J. Matthews, "Trends in Separate School Enrolment," C.T. Reporter (November, 1981), p. 19.

<sup>3</sup>G.E. Malcolm MacLeod, "Voices From The Attic: Canadian Public Opinion on Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (January, 1985),p. 348.

<sup>4</sup>Paul Tillich, Theology of Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. 7-8.

<sup>5</sup>Ruth Whitney, "Religion and the Secular: Creative and Destructive," Religion In Life, 48 (Summer, 1979), p. 239.

<sup>6</sup>Zvi Halevy and Eva Etzioni Halevy, "The 'Religious Factor' and Achievement in Education," Comparative Education,10 (October, 1974), p. 193.

<sup>7</sup>Joan Huber and William H. Form, Income and Ideology An Analysis of the American Political Formula (New York: The Free Press, 1973), p. 114.

<sup>8</sup>Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, The American Occupational Structure (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967), p. 1.

<sup>9</sup>Melvin L. Tumin, Social Stratification The Forms and Functions of Inequality (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 94.

<sup>10</sup>I.L. Kandel, Comparative Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Riverside Press, 1933), p. XXIV.

<sup>11</sup>J.G. Hodgins, ed., Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada (Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1894-1910), Vol. IV, p.4.

<sup>12</sup>Dissentient was the term used to describe those schools that dissented from the majority of schools in place at the time. Thus, in Lower Canada (Quebec), dissentient schools were Protestant and Upper Canada (Ontario) dissentient schools were Catholic.

<sup>13</sup>Harold Putman, Egerton Ryerson and Education in Upper Canada (Toronto: William Briggs, 1912), p. 186.

<sup>14</sup>Joseph Pope, Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John Alexander MacDonald G.C.B. (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1930), p. 138.

<sup>15</sup>C.B. Sissons, Church and State in Canadian Education An Educational Study (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959), p. 56.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

<sup>17</sup>E.A. Driedger, A Consolidation of the British North American Act 1867-1952 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1956), p. 28.

<sup>18</sup>C.B. Sissons, op. cit., p. 112.

<sup>19</sup>Brian E. Titley and Peter J. Miller, Education In Canada: An Interpretation (Calgary, Alberta: Detselig Enterprises, 1982), p. 62.

<sup>20</sup>Hodgins, Documentary History, VII, p. 178.

<sup>21</sup>Sissons, op. cit., p. 20.

<sup>22</sup>H.T.J. Coleman, Public Education in Upper Canada (New York: Brandon Printing Company, 1907), p. 105.

<sup>23</sup>In 1886, 1913 and 1936 different laws were passed in an attempt to have corporations pay taxes to the school system in proportion to the religion of their shareholders. The courts did not uphold the laws. In fact, the 1936 attempt was so poorly worded, it was repealed in 1937.

<sup>24</sup>Prior to Confederation (1867), the Separate Schools of Ontario were able to operate schools to the end of Grade X. In 1928, the Trustees of Tiny Township argued that the lack of government grants to operate a Grade XI, XII, XIII program was unconstitutional. The Privy Council, the final appeal body, turned down their request.

<sup>25</sup>W. G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society II, The Administrative Structure (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 245.

<sup>26</sup>Carl J. Matthews, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>27</sup>Carl J. Matthews, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>28</sup>Sault Star, (April, 1982), p. B2.

<sup>29</sup>On Tuesday, June 12, 1984, the Premier of Ontario announced that he was extending full funding for the Separate Schools through to Grade XIII, beginning in September 1985.

<sup>30</sup>Stuart Oskamp, Attitudes and Opinions (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977), p. 5.

<sup>31</sup>Gordon W. Allport, "Attitudes," in Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement, ed. by Martin Fishbein (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 8.

<sup>32</sup>E.L. Hartley, R.E. Hartley, and Clyde Hart, "Attitudes and Opinions" in The Process and Effects of Mass Communication, ed. by W. Schramm (University of Illinois Press, 1961), p. 219.

<sup>33</sup>Nicholas Hans, Comparative Education (London, England: Unwin Bothers Limited, 1982), p. 85.

<sup>34</sup>Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism, trans. by Talcott Parsons (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 40.

<sup>35</sup>Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1961), p. 1.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 289.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 291.

<sup>38</sup>Gary R. Lee, and Robert W. Clyde, "Religion, Socio-economic Status and Anomie," Journal For The Scientific Study of Religion, 13 (1974), pp. 36-37.

<sup>39</sup>Some examples of the diverse range of topics that have been studied in relation to religiosity are: Anomie (Carr and Hauser, 1976), Abortion (McIntosh et al., 1979), Community Orientation (Martinson et al., 1982), Self-Esteem (Bahr and Martin, 1983), Politics (Miller and Wattenburg, 1984), Educational Expectations (Rhodes and Nam, 1970).

<sup>40</sup>W.C. Roof, "Traditional Religion in Contemporary Society," American Sociological Review, 41 (1976), p. 195-208.

<sup>41</sup>Melvin L. Kohn, Class and Conformity (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1969), p. 61.

<sup>42</sup>James D. Wright and Sonia R. Wright, "Social Class and Parental Values For Children: A Partial Replication and Extension of the Kohn Thesis," American Sociological Review, 41 (June, 1976), p. 536.

<sup>43</sup>M. Yinger, The Scientific Study of Religion (New York: Macmillan, 1970), p. 203.

<sup>44</sup>Volker Drehsen, "Dimensions of Religiosity in Modern Society," Social Compass, 27 (1980/1), p. 52.

<sup>45</sup>Melvin L. Kohn, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>46</sup>Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, op. cit., p. 6.

<sup>47</sup>Pitirim Sorokin, Social Mobility (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1927), p. 414.

<sup>48</sup>Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, op. cit., p. 6.

<sup>49</sup>Melvin M. Tumin, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>50</sup>Gino Germani, "Social and Political Consequences of Mobility," in Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development, ed. by Neil J. Smelser and Seymour Martin Lipset (Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1966), p. 364.

<sup>51</sup>Harold L. Wilensky, "Measures and Effects of Social Mobility," in Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development, ed. by Neil J. Smelser and Seymour Martin Lipset (Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1966), pp. 98-135.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 107.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 108.

<sup>54</sup>Kenneth Kessin, "Social and Psychological Consequences of Intergenerational Occupational Mobility," American Journal of Sociology, 77 (July, 1971), p. 16.

<sup>55</sup>Alan C. Kerckhoff, Socialization and Social Class (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 3-4.

<sup>56</sup>James S. Coleman, "Rawls, Nozick, and Educational Equality," The Public Interest, 43 (Spring 1976), p. 124.

<sup>57</sup>Melvin Tumin, op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>58</sup>Kevin Marjoribanks, "Ethnicity, Family Environment, School Attitudes and Academic Achievement," The Australian Journal of Education, 22 (October, 1978), p. 249.

<sup>59</sup>Betty Miner, "Sociological Background Variables Affecting School Achievement," The Journal of Educational Research, 61 (April, 1968), p. 372.

<sup>60</sup>George H. Gallup, "The 16th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (September, 1984), p. 37.

<sup>61</sup>James Coleman, Thomas Hoffer and Sally Kilgore, Public and Private Schools, Report to the National Center for Education Statistics, (March, 1981), p. XXII.

<sup>62</sup>Joy Frechtling, "Why Parents Put Kids in Private Schools," American School Board Journal, 170 (January, 1983), p. 18.

<sup>63</sup>George H. Gallup, op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>64</sup>George H. Gallup, op. cit., p. 36.

<sup>65</sup>Joy Frechtling, op. cit., p. 18.

<sup>66</sup>Larry Weber, Janice McBee and Joseph H. Lyles, "An Evaluation of Fundamental Schools," Evaluation Review 8 (October, 1984), p. 596.

<sup>67</sup>Alec Gallup, "The Gallup Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (October, 1984), p. 105.

<sup>68</sup>I. L. Kandel, op. cit., p. XX.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This study investigates the attitudes parents of elementary school age children in Ontario have towards their children's educational environment. The previous chapter has shown that attitudes may bear a relationship to religious values, social mobility and social class. In this chapter, the philosophy behind schools will show how North American schools, in spite of democratic intentions, have developed into selective institutions rather than egalitarian. The growth of selective schools based on neighborhood enrolment is related to the concept of social mobility and class.

Ontario's dual school system, with a limited degree of school choice for parents, leads to the investigation of the affect of voluntarism on attitudes. Voluntarism, it is believed, will be related to greater satisfaction with an organization than would ordinarily be expected under compulsory assignment.

The third topic of discussion is religion and its affect on attitude towards the school. People of similar religious background who are drawn together in one organization may not only have similar views about the organization,



but their participation within the organization will reinforce their views. Since the schools are divided on a religious basis, the influence of religion on attitudes is investigated.

Fourth, a study in British Columbia, where public and private schools were compared before and after the receipt of tax money by the private schools, is reviewed. The results and the applicability of the results to Ontario schools are discussed.

Lastly, the role of social class in people's attitudes towards schools will be investigated. The pervasive affect of social class on a wide range of social behavior has been noted by many social scientists. Since this research, in general terms, is a study of how a society views its schools, the study of the relationship of social class to attitudes towards schools is important.

### **Schools and Philosophy**

Schools are considered to be the vehicle by which a society is preserved and improved. In school children are introduced to the community as a whole. Language, cultural mores, values, moral rectitude as well as what are considered by some the practical subjects such as arithmetic, are transmitted to the child. While most agree that education is indeed a vital ingredient for a successful society, no consensus exists as to what type of school best serves the country. Injustice, inequality and a diminution of

liberty are some of the concerns expressed about a common school system with compulsory attendance.

John Stuart Mill, a strong believer in liberty, maintained that individual liberty was important both for the society and the individual. A reduction of individual liberty as threatened by the idea of a government supported school was treated contemptuously. Mill wrote:

A general state education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another: and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominate power in the government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation; in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body.<sup>1</sup>

The concerns of John Stuart Mill about government establishing a "despotism over the mind" have been partially allayed by the existence of two school systems in Ontario from which parents may choose without severe financial penalty. The Ontario system allows for a larger degree of liberty on the part of parents than in the usual public-private system. Limited degree of choice may result in parents who view their respective schools as equally effective places of learning.

For where a choice is involved, people are generally more supportive of their choice than they would be had they been coerced into a single situation. The affect of liberty,

choice or voluntarism on attitudes is discussed in a later section.

Justice, not liberty, is the concern of John Rawls, a moral philosopher, who addresses the question of what is a just allotment in society where inequalities do exist.<sup>2</sup> His philosophic position is that the central authority has the right to redistribute the resources to the population. As applied to education, the government imposes equality through a public system, but individual liberty is diminished. Most governments have chosen to establish a publicly funded educational system with compulsory attendance. Private schools are tolerated but not well supported, if at all. The dual Ontario system, which redistributes the wealth through equal funding to two systems, does permit a small amount of liberty in school choice.<sup>3</sup>

Justice is also the topic in Anarchy State and Utopia where Robert Nozick argues that a just society is one that ensures neither an equality nor an inequality that would benefit the least advantaged, as Rawls espouses, but one where the full rights accrue to each person from what he has justly acquired. Only the individual has the right to the rewards of his own work and the right to the application and disposal of them. Each person has the right to the products of his labor until such times as he chooses to trade or transfer some part of his output to another person or to government.

The general outlines of the theory of justice in holdings are that the holdings of a person are just if he is entitled to them by the principles of justice in acquisition and transfer.....<sup>4</sup>

By applying Nozick's ideas to education, all education must be private; for each child is entitled to the benefits of his family's labors; at least that part which they are willing to transfer to a school. By adopting this position of individual liberty, birthright and the material resources of one's family are the important determinants of success.

Based on the existing school system, it would seem that North American governments have adopted the Rawlsian position towards education. Through financial means, an attempt has been made to make schools equal. To compensate for inequitable schooling opportunities, various levels of government in North America have instituted several types of equalization oriented programs (Head Start) and have developed formulas for educational grants on the basis of need and ability to pay. Concomitantly, with this dominant Rawlsian approach, the Ontario system has demonstrated a concern for liberty, in that it allows its patrons a choice of school systems. Combined with this liberty, an increasingly mobile population has resulted in people segregating themselves into economically homogeneous neighborhoods which, in turn, provide the student population for the neighborhood school. In Nozick's sense, the child is attending the

school that his parents can afford by virtue of their ability to pay for the housing near the school.

The Ontario School system represents a mixture of philosophical ideas. Will this hybrid school system cause parents to view their chosen schools similarly irrespective of their religiosity, social class, or social mobility? To put the question another way, will government efforts to provide an equitable school system prove effective in overpowering the influence of background variables?

#### Summary

A philosophic discussion about what types of schools will best serve the society focuses on the author's conception of liberty, equality and justice. For Mill, individual liberty is supreme and the private school is the way to maintain a strong society. For Rawls, justice, in the sense the government redistributes the wealth of the nation, leads to a government sponsored school system. For Nozick, justice means that with what each person earns and acquires in a just manner, he has the right to dispose of as he sees fit. --Nozick supports the idea of a private school.

The Ontario school system is viewed as a compromise among these various positions. Although religiously separated, the school system does allow for some intermingling. This action does give parents some liberty as to which school to select and support with its resources--money and children. However, through provincial guidelines, funding,

curricula, and regulation, the government does try to maintain an equitable set of systems.

### Ontario Schools

While a Rawlsian solution to education may have been pursued, the result has not been what was intended. Economics, a mobile population, and growing urban centres have destroyed the egalitarian common school. The type of school children attend is determined by the parents' ability to afford the type of housing available adjacent to the school. Neighborhood schools have become socially and economically uniform. James Coleman, the author of Public and Private Schools, says:

The residential basis of school assignment, in an ironic twist, has proved to be segregative and exclusionary, separating economic levels...<sup>5</sup>

In Nozick's sense of a just society, the existence of the neighborhood schools is a natural right.

Parents in a particular neighborhood consider it their right to have their children educated with their economic and social peers. According to Coleman, when this right was violated in America through mandated busing, the middle class opposed it. This group had succeeded economically and wanted a similar or better life for their children. This desire would be partially fulfilled by sending their children to a school where discipline was good, and the school reflected those values and beliefs the parents believed to be responsible for their own success.

Perhaps the development of a socially mobile population and their desire for their children to be educated with their peers (Coleman's hypotheses) in a "traditional mode" can help explain the growth of the Separate System in Ontario. Growth of the Ontario Separate School System has followed a similar pattern to that of the private or independent school.<sup>6</sup> In 1955, the Separate Schools enroled 20.8% of the elementary age (JK-8) population; by 1980, the Separate School System enroled 32.2% (JK-8) of the elementary population.<sup>7</sup> Part of the growth can be explained by the equalization of the grant structure from 1963 forward.

Perhaps the upward mobility experience causes people to be desirous of schools that traditionally have been perceived as having good discipline, as well as a large religious component in their curriculum. The 16th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward The Public Schools indicated that public school parents believed "lack of discipline" was the biggest problem facing public schools.<sup>8</sup> In the same poll, 73% of public school parents favored the U.S. Amendment that would allow prayer in public schools.<sup>9</sup>

In Canada, a 1984 national poll of religious feeling reported

two-thirds of Canadians want religion taught in schools either as doctrine or as an academic subject.<sup>10</sup>

Results of these surveys indicate the concern parents have about discipline in schools and the belief of parents that religion has a role in education.

A logical choice for people who are concerned about behaviour standards for their children and desire religious teaching in the school, is a school that espouses these ideals that they feel are significant. The school the parents seek to provide an education for their children, be it either Public, Private or Separate, should in tone, emphasis and curriculum reflect the values that the parents believe to be educationally significant. If discipline is a major concern of parents, as the Gallup Poll consistently indicates, then parents should choose a school that is reputed to have strong discipline. If a religiously based mode of instruction is desired by the parents, then they will select a school that portrays itself as having a strong religious component in its curriculum.

In a decision based on a desire for good discipline, parents are not necessarily restricted to one stream of education, for, as Coleman found, a strong disciplinary climate and well-behaved students were not the exclusive characteristics of any particular sector of education. The parents who are socially mobile and who expect their children to attend university, should, where a school choice is available, view their school as being responsive to their needs, having good disciplinary practices, and providing an



effective learning environment in a mode that could be best described as traditional.

In the matter of school selection, parents in Ontario often have a choice (with little or no financial penalty) as to whether to enrol their children in a secular Public School or a Roman Catholic Separate School. Not only is the basis on which the school is selected debatable, but the relationship between social mobility, social class and the support that parents express for their school, may be dissimilar.

#### Summary

In spite of the desire of governments for a set of common schools where all classes of children attend, the result, especially in the last thirty years, has been a set of individual schools with students from similar socio-economic backgrounds. Those parents, who are socially-mobile, may desire for their child a school that in reputation reflects the idea of traditional schooling. These parents will select the school known for discipline where their children are taught the basics with their peers.

#### **Voluntarism and School Support**

The attitude one has toward an organization, according to Nault and Bidwell, is dependent on the method of affiliation, the suitability of the organization's goals with the individual's and the feeling that the organization is distinct from others purporting to serve a similar function.

The means of affiliation, whether voluntary or compulsory, with an organization is thought to determine the degree of trust, commitment, and participation the client exhibits toward the organization. Richard Nault wrote:

Major conceptualizations of the topic of client-organization affiliation suggest persons who voluntarily affiliate with an organization are likely to demonstrate greater commitment toward their subsequent participation in the organization than persons who are compelled against their wishes to initiate organizational membership.<sup>11</sup>

Bidwell also studied the problems of organizations winning and keeping client-member trust. In most elementary schools the voluntary self-selection that is representative of most professional arrangements is non-existent. He argued that it is self selection that builds trust and commitment.

Bidwell referred to the students and parents as "typically involuntary clientele"<sup>12</sup> In Ontario's elementary schools, Bidwell's statement represents only a partial truth. The Catholic population does, indeed, have a choice as to school tax support and school selection, while the Protestants may enrol their children in a Separate School for a small fee with permission from the Separate School authorities.

The sense of voluntarism, tempered by religion, that is experienced by Separate School supporters and the sense of voluntarism, although it is slight, experienced by the

Public School supporter should assist in creating a supportive clientele. The effect of voluntarism should be especially strong among those that have crossed over traditional lines--ie. Roman Catholics who support a Public School and Non-Catholics who support a Separate School. Voluntarism should cause parents to choose a school that more closely satisfies their ideas of what a school should be. Bidwell noted:

By choosing the school, one's parents have chosen what it stands for---in academic program, religious training, or social standing---and the faculty by doing what it thinks is best for its students, also does what the parents presumably want.<sup>13</sup>

The two Ontario School systems have distinct positions with regard to an educational experience. The Separate School has a Roman Catholic religious ethos permeating its entire program. The Public System uses an universal set of beliefs in its approach to the learning of its interdenominational students.

That is, in the religious context, each system purports to provide distinctive learning environments; however, both boards of education respond to subject area guidelines and curriculum practices outlined by the Ontario Ministry of Education.<sup>14</sup>

When parents select a school, they hold the school responsible for learning irrespective of the child's background. In a study by Vernberg and Medway, where parents and teachers disagreed over the cause of school related

problems, the parents tended to hold the teachers primarily responsible, while the teachers assigned most responsibility for the problems to parent-home factors.<sup>15</sup> Parents who voluntarily select a school may be more supportive of the organization but this does not appear to release the organization from being accountable for its action.

#### Summary

The means by which one affiliates with an organization in some measure, determines the strength of one's attitudes towards it. Those people who voluntarily choose to support a particular school should be more supportive of its programs than parents who were compelled to enrol their children. In Ontario this factor should increase the level of support of those people who have truly volunteered to support a school that is different from that of their declared religion. Voluntarism might also affect the level of support by Roman Catholics for the Separate system since they, more so than Protestants, have a choice of schools.

#### Religion and Schools

When parents select a school for their children, in addition to their belief as to its effectiveness and disciplinary climate; they must often consider the type of spiritual wrapping that is purported to overlay the curriculum and instruction. Religion, or the lack of it, in the school structure, appears to be a powerful force for many parents. Its influence in non-public school choice and support has

been cited by several researchers.<sup>16</sup> Gerald Grant emphasized that the particular tradition the parents are seeking in private schools must be clearly displayed. Grant wrote:

A primary function of private schools is to make visible an otherwise invisible collectivity to draw together a public that shares similar preferences.<sup>17</sup>

The distinctiveness of the two school systems was demonstrated in a newspaper feature discussing the role of the computer in schools and the changes that it might cause in the schools by the year 2000. The director of the Separate School system said:

In the whole process of change, we must not forget the human and spiritual needs of our people, how to live with all this. Values and principles will require more and more attention and I see our catholic education more vital as a result.<sup>18</sup>

The director of the Public School system said:

In the long run, reason will prevail. If you look back at the history of education, there has always been change. It's always evolved. People adjust.

There will be controls on how things will be used. There will likely be controls in how long a child can sit in front of the machine.<sup>19</sup>

At every opportunity spokesmen for the Separate system make references to their "catholic" education. They work very hard at making themselves, in Grant's word, "visible". Spokesmen for the Public system cannot address their comments to a specific group in society because they are speaking on behalf of a school system that is open to all

segments of society and, must be, as well as seem to be, public.

Since the first major contact outside the home for many children is the school, and by extension the teacher, it is important to have the teacher be a reflection of those values held by the parents and their community. The significance of the teacher cannot be underestimated. Emile Durkheim wrote:

The teacher is society's agent, the critical link in cultural transmission. It is his task to create a social moral vein. Through the teacher, society creates man in its image.<sup>20</sup>

The Separate Schools are staffed entirely by lay teachers and a few nuns whose professed faith is Roman Catholic. Separate School supporters can be assured of a Roman Catholic point of view expressed by Roman Catholic teachers.

In the Public School, the religion or lack of religion of the teacher is not a concern of the Board. Public School supporters can be assured of a more secular approach expressed by teachers with a variety of religious backgrounds.

Homogeneity, based on religion in the Separate Schools, may lead to greater uniformity in what parents desire from a school, particularly in terms of moral standards and their view of the schools as an extension of their beliefs. Toennies spoke of the common bond of people of the same religious community.

For it is its very essence that men who pray to, and conceive of, the same God feel bound to each other by a common consciousness.<sup>21</sup>

The religious heterogeneity of the Public Schools may be just as strong a force for the Public Schools as religious homogeneity is for the Separate Schools. Public School supporters may be very supportive of the universalistic secular approach of their chosen school.

Schools, as part of society cannot be totally immune to the effect of religion on its clients. Religious feeling or religiosity is increasing in Canada. Two of the major results from a nation wide poll in 1984 were:

1. Nearly 40 per cent of Canadians surveyed sometimes absorb religion electronically from radio or television with 15 per cent watching regularly.
2. Two-thirds of Canadians want religion taught in schools, either as doctrine or as an academic subject. Only one in five wants no religious teaching of any sort.<sup>22</sup>

Schools have a role beyond the teaching of academics and that role is recognized by the Ministry of Education. One of thirteen goals of education is helping each student develop:

values related to personal, ethical or religious beliefs and to the common welfare of society.<sup>23</sup>

Popular writers in the field of education also refer to the broader goals of education. Charles Silberman wrote:

Education should prepare people not just to earn a living, but live a life.....a creative human and sensitive life.<sup>24</sup>

The role of religion, morals and values is an important facet of public education for the Ministry, parents, and authors. The method of fulfilling this need by the two school systems is different. The Separate School system uses a particularistic religious philosophy to meet what it sees as the requirements of the Ministry's goals. The Public School system uses a universal set of values to meet what it sees as the requirements of the Ministry's goals.

#### Summary

The role of religion in an education system can be a powerful force. A homogeneous staff, student body and parent group allow for more uniformity in goal setting and action. Homogeneity allows them to speak with one voice. While discussing the reasons for prayer in Separate Schools, a consultant for religious education said:

The whole underlying reason for the prayers is that parents want their children to have some prayer life during the day. Usually, the children come from homes where they reinforce what is going on in schools.<sup>25</sup>

The role that religion has in a Public system must of necessity be of a very general nature. A heterogeneous staff, student body, and parent group allow for more diversity in discussion and goal setting. This appeal to the broad spectrum was made clear in comments about the teaching of moral values made by a Public School Superintendent of Curriculum.



... "very careful" not to isolate any child as students are of all denominations, backgrounds and moral values.  
... the greater attention that we pay to the importance of interaction and relationships between human beings in today's society.<sup>26</sup>

Although religion, values and morals are present in both systems, the focus varies from narrow to broad. Because of the uniform religion in terms of clientele, staff and purpose in a Separate School, they may as a group, be more supportive of their schools.

#### **Finances and Attitudes**

It is an old adage 'that you only appreciate what you pay for'. With respect to attitudes towards schools, those parents who pay tuition beyond the normal tax assessment, would indicate greater support for a school than those who paid no tuition. In Ontario, where tuition is not a factor, and tax assessment is basically equal, the influence of money on attitudes should not be significant. The role of finances on attitudes towards schools was investigated by Erickson in Western Canada and in British Columbia in particular.

The topic of Private and Public Schools has been extensively studied by D.A. Erickson (1979, 1980, 1981, 1982). On the basis of interviews with parents, teachers and administrators, the great majority of whom had experience only in Catholic Schools, Erickson developed a model of the Private School that he called "The Gemeinschaft Model". This

model asserted that voluntarism, tuition, selective admissions, and unorthodox personnel policies would lead to superior achievement.<sup>27</sup>

For Public Schools, he developed "The Professionalism Model". This model asserted that a well trained, well paid, carefully selected professional teaching staff would result in parent satisfaction and student motivation, all of which would lead to superior goal achievement.<sup>28</sup>

With his models as a guide Erickson surveyed teachers, students and parents of public and independent schools in British Columbia in 1978, just prior to the receipt of public money by the independent schools. The study revealed a significant difference in the areas of jeopardy (financial worry), social cohesion, schools' responsiveness to parents, schools' need of parental help, school effectiveness and teacher commitment between public and independent schools.<sup>29</sup>

For Erickson the distinctiveness of the private school was caused by jeopardy.

...the fundamental dynamic reflected in these differences between publicly and privately supported schools is jeopardy, the condition produced by significant threats real or imagined to a school's success or failure.<sup>30</sup>

The uncertain financing led to a sense of jeopardy about the school, which in turn caused all those associated with the entity to work harder. The sense of jeopardy brought about by uncertain financing was the glue that held the model together.

Two years after the infusion of public money into the private schools, another survey of parents, teachers and students was conducted. As hypothesized by Erickson, the large differences between public and private schools declined.

Parents indicated that:

- .....they had a diminished sense of being needed at the school
- .....social cohesion had diminished at the school
- .....teacher commitment had diminished
- .....the independent schools were less responsive to parents
- .....levels of relative student achievement had diminished.<sup>31</sup>

If Erickson's assumptions are correct, then supporters of the two school systems in Ontario should exhibit similar levels of support for their child's elementary school.

#### Summary

Erickson's research in British Columbia into private and public schools systems, before and after funding of the private sector, led him to conclude that the lack of money was the essential ingredient to the success of the private schools. In Erickson's opinion, the feeling that the private school needed all the moral and financial support it could muster, caused all who were associated with it to pull together.

#### Social Class

The role of social class in the attitudes of people has been a subject of intense study by sociologists and others

who are concerned with human behavior. Social class has been found to be related to academic achievement, arithmetic scores, mental abilities, home learning environment and a wide variety of other areas related to education. Social class is believed to be related to almost every area of human behavior and thus is commonly used in studies of the relationship between people and their institutions. Kohn wrote:

It is commonplace among social scientists that no matter what the subject, we should always measure people's social class positions, for class, is nearly always significantly involved.<sup>32</sup>

It is commonly hypothesized that people of different levels in society view the world differently. The assumption is that social class is a composite of educational background, cultural background and a wide variety of other correlated variables that in combination, cause people in different classes to have different values, behaviors and attitudes. Their conceptions of social reality lead to different hopes and views of what is and what is desirable. Wright and Wright noted:

Parents in different strata develop value systems (mobility orientations, social and cultural values, political ideologies and so on) which rationalize or are otherwise consistent with social life in the stratum.<sup>33</sup>

Thus, in a study of parents' attitudes towards schools, social class cannot be overlooked in light of previous work in the social sciences that shows its relationship to peoples' attitudes. Tumin emphasized the same point.

Indeed, an analysis of the influence of socioeconomic factors has become a "must" in most sociological studies, no matter what the behaviour under consideration.<sup>34</sup>

### Chapter Summary

A review of the philosophical positions with respect to elementary schools revealed a concern for liberty and justice. For Rawls, the only manner to organize a system is through the government which, in effect, redistributes the wealth of society. Most societies have a state education system with required attendance, standardized curricula, and a state supported system of teacher education. Ontario has two state-supported school systems for the public to choose from although complete freedom to choose is still a political issue, and unlikely at this time.

For Mill, government control of schools was anathema for it allowed the government undue influence over the education of children. His position seemed to favor the development of private schools where people could select the type of education they desired for their children. This ability to select a school led to an investigation of the influence of voluntarism on the attitude people express towards an organization. For the degree of support parents express for a school may be related to the manner in which they become associated with that school. The research of Bidwell and Nault indicated that if the association were voluntary, support would tend to be higher than if association were felt to be coercive.

Support for the idea of more than one system of education was also found in the ideas of Nozick who believed that justice demands that people obtain what they can financially afford providing their earnings have been obtained in a just manner. Although governments generally have not accepted Nozick's ideas and applied them to education, economic events have caused the development of school systems which resemble a number of private schools rather than the truly common public school for all. According to Coleman, the egalitarian common school that was established one hundred and forty years ago has slowly become a socially uniform school where economic peers are educated together. The socially mobile gravitate to the same neighborhood and send their children to the same schools. These parents may expect to have their children effectively educated in a school where academics and discipline are strong.

Superimposed over these philosophical and sociological concerns is the historic role of religion in the Ontario school system where religion has often been cited as a reason for people to associate with a school. The uniform religious background of the Separate School supporters may act as a rallying point for all to support their school and its particularistic philosophy. The disparate religious background of the Public School supporters may also be a rallying point for all to support their school and its universalistic philosophy. An increase in the religiosity of a

large number of adults, as indicated in a Canada-wide survey, may result in strong support for or a desire for schools that are seen as traditional.

Investigations into the similarities and differences that parents believe exist between school systems have been conducted in Western Canada by Don Erickson who focussed on school effectiveness, student discipline, social cohesion, and school responsiveness to parents. Erickson believes the major distinguishing factor that explains the different levels of support for private and public schools is money. As levels of fiscal support become equal, the levels of parental support for the school may become similar.

If Erickson's premise is wrong and the level of parental support for the two Ontario systems is different then the underlying factor could not be jeopardy. The distinguishing factor in Ontario could be the strong emphasis on religion, morals and values in the Separate School system. This emphasis, combined with a religiously homogeneous population, could be a strong enough factor to compensate for the loss of jeopardy. A further explanation for any difference in parental opinion about schools could also be found in the concept of mobility.

Investigations in the social sciences that focus on peoples' attitudes towards social institutions nearly always find a relationship between attitudes and social class. Social class is believed to exert an affect on peoples'

attitudes because it represents the combined affects of a number of variables.



**ENDNOTES      CHAPTER II**

<sup>1</sup>J.S. Mill, On Liberty in Utilitarianism, Liberty and Representative Government (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1964), p. 161.

<sup>2</sup>John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (Cambridge, Mass: Beknap Press, 1971).

<sup>3</sup>After a newspaper report that 200 non-catholic students had been refused admission to Toronto Separate Schools, the Minister of Education said tht with public funds committed for the entire system "equitability of access" is desirable. (The Sault Star: September 13, 1984), p. A1-A2.

<sup>4</sup>Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia (New York: Basic Books, 1974), p. 153.

<sup>5</sup>James S. Coleman, "Quality and Equality in American Education: Public and Catholic Schools," Phil Delta Kappan, 63 (November, 1981), p. 161.

<sup>6</sup>In Ontario there has been an increase in private school enrolment for each year over the past eleven years. "Private Schools Popular," Sault Star, (November 12, 1981), p. A4.

<sup>7</sup>Ontario Ministry of Education, Education Statistics Ontario, 1980 (Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1981), pp. 46-48.

<sup>8</sup>George H. Gallup, "The 16th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools", Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (September, 1984), p. 36.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

<sup>10</sup>"Poll Finds Traditional Church Reviving in Canada," The Sault Star, (September 6, 1984), p. A2.

<sup>11</sup>Richard Nault, "Voluntary and Involuntary Student Participation in Non-Public School Settings: Consequences for Students and Schools," Notre Dame Journal of Education, 6 (Winter, 75), p. 312.

<sup>12</sup>Charles E. Bidwell, "Students and Schools: Observations on Client Serving Organizations," in Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service, ed. by W.R. Rosegren and M. Lefton (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970), p. 48.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

<sup>14</sup>Bruce Cassie, John Stunt, and Alan Unwin, The Joint Occupancy and Sharing of School Facilities: An Experiment Between the Lincoln County Board of Education and The Lincoln County Roman Catholic Separate School Board (Toronto: OISE Press, 1980), p. 2.

<sup>15</sup>Eric M. Vernberg and Frederic J. Medway, "Teacher and Parent Causal Perceptions of School Problems," American Educational Research Journal, 18 (Spring 1981), pp. 29-37.

<sup>16</sup>William Lloyd Turner, "Reasons for Enrollment in Religious Schools: A Case Study of Three Recently Established Fundamentalist Schools in Kentucky and Wisconsin," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1979).

Also, see Fay, 1973, Frechtling et al., 1981 as listed in Bibliography.

<sup>17</sup>Gerald Grant, "The Character of Education and the Education of Character." Daedalus Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 110 (Summer, 1981), p. 144.

<sup>18</sup>"Futureschool: Can Education Cope with the Computer?", The Sault Star - Starlight, April 3, 1982, p. 15.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Emile Durkheim, Moral Education, ed. by E.K. Wilson (New York: Free Press, 1961), p. XI.

<sup>21</sup>Ferdinand Toennies, On Sociology: Pure Applied and Empirical, edited by Werner J. Cahnman and Rudolf Heberle (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1971), p. 68.

<sup>22</sup>"Poll Finds Traditional Church Reviving in Canada," The Sault Star, September 6, 1984, p. A.2.

This poll was a telephone survey in July 1984 of 1,011 adult Canadians conducted by the Carleton University School of Journalism.

<sup>23</sup>Ontario Ministry of Education, Issues and Directions: The Response to the Final Report of the Commission on Declining School Enrolments in Ontario (Toronto, 1980), p. 7.

<sup>24</sup>Charles Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 114.

<sup>25</sup>"Prayer Retains Role in Both Sault School Systems," The Sault Star, March 27, 1982, p. B.1.

<sup>26</sup>"Planning New Strategies for Morals Education," The Sault Star - Starlight, April 3, 1982, p. 15.

<sup>27</sup>Donald A. Erickson, et al., Characteristics and Relationships in Public and Independent Schools (San Francisco: Center for Research on Private Education, 1979), p. 42.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., pp. 47-48.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 164-169.

<sup>30</sup>Donald A. Erickson and Richard L. Nault, Effects of Public Money on Catholic Schools in Western Canada: Exploratory Interviews (A final report to the Spencer Foundation, San Francisco, 1980), p. 4.

<sup>31</sup>Donald A. Erickson, "Effects of Public School Money on School Climates in Private Schools: A Preliminary Report," (paper presented at the 1981 Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 16, 1981), p. 29.

<sup>32</sup>Melvin L. Kohn, Class and Conformity (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1969), p. 3.

<sup>33</sup>James D. Wright, and R. Sonia Wright, "Social Class and Parental Values For Children: A Partial Replication and Extension of the Kohn Thesis," American Sociological Review, 41 (June, 1976), p. 527.

<sup>34</sup>Melvin L. Tumin, Social Stratification The Forms and Functions of Inequality (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 11.

CHAPTER III  
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

**Introduction**

This chapter contains a description of the procedures used in developing this study. The sources of the questionnaire, the field testing and the administration of the questionnaire to assess parents' attitudes toward their selected schools are described. The selection procedures of 410 parents to complete the questionnaire are detailed. Method of coding the results and procedures used for analysis of the data are described.

**Development of the Questionnaire**

**Religion, Social Mobility, and Social Class**

As the previous two chapters have established, a relationship may exist between the religiosity of a person and his attitudes towards schools. An excellent source of questions in the area of religiosity was found in the background section of a survey used by the Diocese of Cleveland with parents of children in Catholic Schools. The questions had been refined by the Bishop's Task Force using focussed group interviews to help them design a survey questionnaire that would stimulate reliable and valid responses from their target group.<sup>1</sup>

One of the four areas of focus for the survey was

the study of the attitudes of lay Catholics toward Catholic education.<sup>2</sup>

The Diocese relied on the University of Notre Dame, Centre For the Study of Man in Contemporary Society to provide technical assistance to the project.<sup>3</sup>

From their survey, six questions were selected as being suited to the purposes of establishing religiosity. The wording of the questions was adjusted so that they could be answered by people of all denominations, not only Roman Catholics. Words such as parish and mass were replaced with more universal words such as church and religious services. The final wordings of the questions after field testing and the question number are shown in Table 3.1. The field tested questionnaire and final questionnaire are found in Appendices A and B respectively.

**TABLE 3.1**  
**ADAPTED RELIGIOSITY QUESTIONS FROM BISHOP'S TASK FORCE**

=====		
5. How often do you attend religious services?		
Once a week or more		1
1-3 times a month		2
Several times a year		3
Almost never		4
Not applicable		5
6. How long have you been practising your religion?		
Less than 1 year		1
1-2 years		2
3-5 years		3
5 or more years		4
Not applicable		5

**TABLE 3.1 (Cont'd)**  
**ADAPTED RELIGIOSITY QUESTIONS FROM BISHOP'S TASK FORCE**

---

12. Think of five close friends. How many of them are members of your church?	
None	1
One	2
Two	3
Three	4
Four	5
Five	6
13. How would you rate your participation in church activities?	
Very active	1
Active	2
Help when I can	3
Occasionally participate	4
Seldom participate	5
Never participate	6
14. Considering your income, do you feel your contributions to the church are:	
A considerable amount	1
A moderate amount	2
A little	3
A meager amount	4
16. As a general rule, how important do you think it is for young people to marry a member of their own religion?	
Very important	1
Fairly important	2
Not important at all	3

---

The source of question two (Table 3.2) requesting information on religious preference was adapted from a similar one in the 1980 OISE survey which used the Gallup Standard Backup Questions<sup>4</sup>. The Jewish category was removed because of the miniscule Jewish population in the survey area. The remaining question on religion, number three, was researcher

designed. It was asked because the respondent may not have a declared religion but the spouse may have. A declared family religion was necessary to discover those people who were enroled in a system different from that of their religion.

**TABLE 3.2**  
**RELIGIOSITY QUESTIONS**

---

2. What is your religious preference?

Protestant	1
Roman Catholic	2
Other _____	3
(Specify)	
No religious preference	4

3. What is your husband's/wife's religious preference?

Protestant	1
Roman Catholic	2
Other _____	3
(Specify)	
No religious preference	4
Not applicable	5

---

Like the religiosity questions, those questions seeking to measure social mobility were from a number of sources (Table 3.3). Questions seven through eleven were a fusion of ideas from the Cleveland survey, from the researcher, and from a consultation with the Director of The Social Science Research Bureau at Michigan State University.<sup>5</sup> The relationship between the respondent's job and his father's job were used to establish a level of social mobility. Occupation is an important tool for determining social mobility. Oppenheim wrote:

Since a man's occupation is, in Westernized societies, the most important single determinant of his social status, social-research workers often use it as an index of social class or prestige level.<sup>6</sup>

**TABLE 3.3**  
**SOCIAL MOBILITY QUESTIONS**

- 
- 
7. What do you do? (Be specific about your job, i.e., salesperson in a department store, but do not give the name of the company).

---

---

---

8. What did your father do when you were in High School? (Again, be specific. If father deceased or not in home, write in his usual occupation before he left home).

---

---

---

9. Does your husband/wife work outside the home?

Yes	1
No	2
Not applicable	3

(If No or Not applicable go to Question #12)

10. What does he/she do? (Again, be specific)

---

---

---

11. What did your husband's/wife's father do when he/she was in high school? (Again, be specific)

---

---

---

---

Due to the significance of social class in studies of this type, as outlined in Chapter two, five questions were used to establish social class (Table 3.4). Number eighteen, which established the respondent's education level,



and number seventeen, a question about perceived status, are based on questions from the Gallup Standard Background Questions<sup>7</sup> which were part of the OISE survey. As income is related to one's self-perception of his social status, question nineteen probed relative socio-economic status.

Number twenty was a modification of a question from the Cleveland survey. Number twenty-one, relating to the importance of a university education for success, was designed because of social science research that indicates that educational aspirations show a positive correlation to social status. Sewell et al. wrote:

...the present tests lend support to the sociological claim that values specific to different status positions are important influences on levels of educational and occupational aspiration.<sup>8</sup>

One of these values associated with middle and upper classes is the importance of a university education.

**TABLE 3.4**  
**SOCIAL CLASS QUESTIONS**

=====		
17.	If you were asked to use one of the following names for your social class, which would you say you belonged to?	
	Lower class	1
	Working class	2
	Lower middle class	3
	Middle class	4
	Upper middle class	5
	Upper class	6
18.	Which of these was the last school you graduated from?	
	No formal schooling	1
	Public/Grade School	2
	Secondary School	3
	Community College	4
	University	5
	Other	6
	_____ (specify)	

**TABLE 3.4 (Cont'd)**  
**SOCIAL CLASS QUESTIONS**

---

---

19.	In comparison to other people your age, how do you feel you are doing economically and socially?	
	Very much better	1
	Better	2
	Same	3
	Worse	4
	Very much worse	5
20.	Thinking generally about your neighborhood, how satisfied are you with it?	
	Very satisfied	1
	Satisfied	2
	Somewhat satisfied	3
	Dissatisfied	4
	Very dissatisfied	5
21.	As a general rule, how important do you think it is for your children to have a university education to be successful?	
	Great Importance	1
	Very important	2
	Somewhat important	3
	Slightly important	4
	Not important at all	5

---

The last group of questions (Table 3.5) were of a technical nature. They were used to establish school support and length of time the children had been in attendance at the school.

**TABLE 3.5**  
**TECHNICAL QUESTIONS**

---

---

1.	What type of elementary (k-8) school do your children attend?	
	Public	1
	Separate	2
	Children in both systems	3

---

**TABLE 3.5 (Cont'd)**  
**TECHNICAL QUESTIONS**

---

4. To which school system do you direct your municipal tax support?

Public	1
Separate	2
Don't Know	3

22. How long has your child (children) attended this school? (i.e. 1 month, 4 years, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

---

Question number fifteen was the only question in the background section of the questionnaire that did not relate to the respondent's background.

15. Students are often given the grades A, B, C, D and Fail to denote the quality of their work. Suppose that the school your children attend now was graded in the same way. What grade would you give your child's elementary school?

A	1
B	2
C	3
D	4
Fail	5

Its different format necessitated its inclusion in Part I rather than Part II with the other school effectiveness questions. This question was from the Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Towards the Public Schools.<sup>9</sup>

The twenty-one background questions were designed and selected so that the respondents could be differentiated in terms of five variables. They were: school support, religiosity, social mobility, social class and length of time the child was in school.

Attitudes Indexes

Parts II and III of the questionnaire were designed to measure attitudes toward the school and to determine what type of school the respondent would like. These questions were in large measure drawn from the parent questionnaire employed by Erickson to establish what public and independent schools were "like" in the Spring of 1978 before the first public dollars began to flow into independent schools in British Columbia.<sup>10</sup> These questions were developed from the works of George Maudaus of Boston College, Andrew Greeley of the National Opinion Research Centre and the Rand Corporation's evaluation of a "Voucher" experiment in California.<sup>11</sup>

After the results were compiled, Erickson stated

...that we used techniques known as factor analysis and cluster analysis to identify sets of items which respondents answered with notable consistency, and we examined the items to ensure that their content, too, was consistent.<sup>12</sup>

Not all of Erickson's parent questionnaire was used because parts of it were inappropriate. Where necessary, the wording or format of the original questions were modified to fit the overall design of this questionnaire. The grouping of the questions into categories has undergone some modification when compared to the original design of Erickson. (Table 3.6).

**TABLE 3.6**  
**SOURCE OF ATTITUDE QUESTIONS AND REVISED VARIABLE TITLE**

ERICKSON CATEGORY	QUESTIONNAIRE VARIABLE	QUESTION NUMBER		TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS
		PART II	PART III	
Responsiveness to Parents	Responsiveness	2,3,4,5,6		5
School Effectiveness (Researcher Designed)	Discipline	9 1,13		3
School Effectiveness Teacher Commitment	Effectiveness	7,8 10,11,12		5
Traditional Academic Orientation	Traditional		1,2	7
Desire for Control by Parents			3,4,5,6,7	

For the discipline, effectiveness, and responsiveness statements, in the final questionnaire, a six part response pattern was established: 0-no basis for opinion, 1-strongly disagree, 2-tend to disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree (neutral), 4-tend to agree and 5-strongly agree. Since a number of statements involved comparisons between schools, (eg #9) or were situational (eg #5), the option of 0-no basis for opinion-was included.

Three statements were designed to measure the parent's attitude towards the disciplinary climate in their child's school (Table 3.7). In an attempt to ensure that statements

were read, and as a check for response consistency, the statements were distributed throughout the thirteen statements rather than listed together.

**TABLE 3.7**  
**DISCIPLINE STATEMENTS**

- 
1. The students seem to have a lot of respect for the teachers in this school.
  9. It seems to me that student discipline is better in this school than in most other schools.
  13. The following of rules and regulations by students is important in this school.
- 

Five statements were designed to measure the responsiveness of the school and staff to the wishes and desires of the parents (Table 3.8). These statements were all negatively worded in order to serve as a check on the respondent's answer pattern. By negatively wording this set of statements a respondent could not logically circle one number for all thirteen statements in Part II.

**TABLE 3.8**  
**RESPONSIVENESS STATEMENTS**

- 
2. The school this child attends is trying to do too many things all at once, rather than doing a few things well.
  3. This school does a lot of things that I wish it would not do.
  4. When the school does things I do not like, I feel powerless to do anything about it.
  5. Getting ahead depends on who you know more than how well you do something.
  6. The Principal and teachers in this school don't pay much attention to what parents think.
-

The last set of statements in Part II was directed toward the concept of school effectiveness (Table 3.9). These statements, in combination with number fifteen from Part I, were designed to determine how effective the parents believe their child's school is. These statements in Part II represent a union of two groups "School Effectiveness" and "Teacher Commitment" from Erickson's work. If parents believe that teachers are committed and doing a good job it was reasoned that they must be part of the effectiveness component of a school.

**TABLE 3.9**  
**SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS**

- 
7. The rate of student learning is above average in this school, in comparison with most other schools.
  8. In my opinion, this school is making good use of the money it gets.
  10. This child's teacher seems to try very hard to do a good job.
  11. When I see how dedicated many teachers are in this school, I feel I must do my best to help out.
  12. Almost all teachers at this school seem very well trained for the jobs they do.
- 

Part III of the survey instrument was designed to determine what type of schools parents would like. Through underlining and capitalizing, the instructions emphasized that this portion was not related to the school the children attended, but rather applied to the type of school parents would like. Parents were asked to indicate which of the two statements about schools they agreed with or were inclined

towards. The seven pairs of statements, with a traditional versus a non traditional statement, are shown in Table 3.10. With modifications the statements were adapted from two of Erickson's categories. "Traditional Academic Orientation" and "Desire For Control by Parents". The amalgamated set of statements has been given the term Traditional.

**TABLE 3.10**  
**TRADITIONAL - NON TRADITIONAL STATEMENTS**

=====					
1.	Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?				
	A school where students learn practical things they can use when they get out of school (like Wood-working and Cooking).	OR	A school where students study academic subjects most of the time (like Mathematics and English).		
	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?				
	A school where students generally learn at an easy rate.	OR	A school where students are constantly pushed and challenged to learn rapidly.		
	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?				
	A "strict school" where students were tightly disciplined.	OR	A "free school" where students could act naturally.		
	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?				
	A school where students took only the most basic academic subjects until they really learned them.	OR	A school where students took a wide variety of subjects, even before they mastered any of them.		
	1	2	3	4	5



**TABLE 3.10 (Cont'd)**  
**TRADITIONAL - NON TRADITIONAL**

---

5.	Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?				
	A school where the teacher decided what the students would learn most of the time.	OR	A school where the students could choose what they wanted to learn most of the time.		
	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?				
	A school where a wide range of behaviour is considered morally acceptable.	OR	A school where a clearly defined position is taken on what is moral.		
	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?				
	A school where teachers and administrators are pretty free to "do their own thing".	OR	A school where a definite set of goals and methods is pursued by everyone.		
	1	2	3	4	5

---

#### Summary

The questionnaire, (Appendix B) a conglomerate formed from five sources, required a total of forty-two responses. The questions or statements have been modified and categorized to suit the locale and the purposes of the study. The background portion of the questionnaire, Part I, sought to establish the social mobility, the religiosity, and the social class of the respondent. Part II was aimed at eliciting the respondent's attitudes about his child's school in three areas, responsiveness, effectiveness and discipline. The final section was designed to determine which type of school

the respondent desired, given a choice between a more traditional type school and one that is less traditional.

### **Field Test**

#### **Procedures**

The research proposal was orally explained to each Director of Education (Public and Separate School Board) and a copy of the questionnaire was given to each. An offer to make the presentation to the Board was deemed unnecessary. After reading the questionnaire, each Director granted permission for the distribution of the questionnaires to parents via the schools. (Appendix C). The Director of Education for the Public System wanted more emphasis put on the confidentiality of individual results in the covering letter. This request was complied with by highlighting the parts of the letter dealing with confidentiality.

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was then field tested in a neighborhood that provided students to both Boards. The first eight people from each system who answered the door and agreed to co-operate, comprised the field test sample. After introductions, an explanation outlining what they were to do and the purpose of their actions took place. The parents were asked to pretend the questionnaire had been brought home from school by their child. It was emphasized that they were a test group and their recommendations and criticisms were to be used to clarify or change the questionnaire. Confidentiality was not possible at this stage

since discussion was to take place with each respondent later.

The first sixteen people contacted agreed to co-operate. All but one was interviewed a few days after the questionnaire was delivered.

Although the discussions were wide ranging, the following questions were asked of all fifteen field test subjects.

1. Why didn't you answer number \_\_\_\_\_? (if applicable).
2. Which questions did you have trouble understanding?
3. Did you have any difficulty following the instructions?
4. Did you realize there was a difference between Parts II and III? What was it?
5. Why did you answer Part I number 15 the way you did? (Part II number 6, Part III number 1?)
6. Do you have any comments on any of the questions?
7. If the respondent had circled the number 1 (no basis for opinion) frequently in Part II he was asked why.

A week after the discussions with the field test subjects, a thank-you note was sent to each.

### Results

The subjects answered all the questions. Numbers thirteen and fourteen (Part I) caused some minor difficulty to a subject whose father was dead at the time in question, and to another subject who didn't realize these questions were a continuation of a pattern from the previous page. The field test subjects noted certain questions where they

had minor difficulty because of the wording or the scale. One person was curious as to why there were a number of questions on religion.

Other than the preceeding, no one expressed any great difficulty understanding the questions or instructions but they did admit to difficulty in deciding what to answer in Part III. The extreme examples were "thought-provoking" indicated one subject. All of the subjects interviewed could give specific reasons as to why they had answered a question in a particular manner. Most had a number of suggestions as to what the school could do to change their opinion or further confirm it. Those who had "no basis for opinion" in Part II, generally had children who had only been in the school a short time. (Parents of kindergarten students).

As a result of the discussions with the field test subjects, a number of minor changes were made in the instrument. The social mobility questions relating to subject's job and father's job were allocated to one page so that the sequence would not be interrupted when the page was turned. A qualifying note was added to account for a father who was not present when the respondent was in high school. Number five was altered from "church" to "religious services" to become more generic. Number six was changed to "practising your religion" from "member of your current church". The original seemed to penalize people who had recently moved into the area and changed parishes, or people who had

changed churches of their own volition.

A summary of the parents' comments and the spread sheets of the results (Tables 3.11; 3.12) from the sixteen questionnaires were a topic of discussion with a statistical analyst in the Computer Laboratory and the Director of Social Science Research Bureau at Michigan State University.<sup>13</sup> The purpose of these consultations was to have people with wide experience in statistics and questionnaire construction check the results of the field test and offer their observations before the final questionnaire was determined and distributed.

As a result of the discussions, minor changes to the scales of some questions in the social status area were undertaken. In order to force the sample to make a choice as to their social class, "can't say" and "deny there are classes" were removed and "middle class" added to question seventeen. The lack of range in the scores for the social class questions, nineteen through twenty-one was believed to be due to the uniform nature of the neighborhood sampled. Numbers twenty and twenty-one were converted to five point scales, the same as number nineteen.

**TABLE 3.11**  
**NUMBER OF RESPONSES FOR EACH RELIGIOSITY QUESTION**

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TOPIC	NUMBER OF RESPONSES OF EACH LEVEL					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
5	Church Attendance	2	10	1	2	1	n/a
6	Member Time	10	1	1	3	1	n/a
7	Number of Friends	2	0	4	1	1	8
8	Church Participation	1	1	3	2	5	4
9	Amount of Contribution	1	8	3	4	n/a	n/a
16	Marriage & Religion	3	7	6	n/a	n/a	n/a

**TABLE 3.12**  
**NUMBER OF RESPONSES FOR EACH SOCIAL STATUS QUESTION**

QUESTION NUMBER	QUESTION TOPIC	NUMBER OF RESPONSES OF EACH LEVEL						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	Social Class	0	5	7	2	0	1	1
18	Education Level	1	10	0	4	0	1	n/a
19	SES Comparison	2	5	9	0	0	n/a	n/a
20	Neighborhood Satisfaction	11	5	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
21	University Importance	9	7	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a

The results from Part II (Table 3.13), with the responses to the negative questions reversed, indicated a range of answers. The underuse of the disagreement section, except for the negative questions, could be explained by the uniform nature of the sample and the schools they were reporting on. As an aid to interpretation, the scale for Part II was adjusted so that strong agreement was a high number and strong disagreement a low number.

**TABLE 3.13**  
**TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES FOR EACH VARIABLE - PART TWO**

VARIABLE	RESPONSE CHOICE					
	NO BASIS FOR OPINION 1	STRONGLY AGREE 2	TEND TO AGREE 3	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE 4	TEND TO DISAGREE 5	STRONGLY DISAGREE 6
Responsiveness (5 questions)	5	38	28	3	4	2
Discipline (3 questions)	3	24	20	1	0	0
Effectiveness (5 questions)	12	25	32	4	7	0

As the raw scores in Table 3.14 indicate, the whole scale was used in Part III. The corrected scores indicated again the uniformity of the field study sample.

The covering letter was rewritten to emphasize the importance of the study to the school system and by extension to respondent. The references to the "three" part questionnaire were omitted. Both of these measures were designed to increase the likelihood of a high return rate.

**TABLE 3.14**  
**TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES FOR TRADITIONAL ORIENTATION-PART III**

VARIABLE	RESPONSE CHOICE				
	NON TRADITIONAL 1	2	3	4	TRADITIONAL 5
Traditional (7 questions)	6	5	32	29	40
Traditional (raw scores)	28	18	32	16	18

### Validity of the Indexes

The notion of validity in indexes is to determine if the scores on the index represent true variations in the attitudes of those who answered the questions. Cronbach said:

A test is valid to the degree that we know what it measures or predicts.<sup>14</sup>

Validity of an index is measured in what Cronbach called "empirical validity" whereby an index is compared with another known variable that measures the same criterion.<sup>15</sup> Since attitudes are interpreted from written responses and are not observable in the strictest sense, validity of attitude indexes can only be inferred. In an attempt to validate his attitude scales, Adorno used two people as criterion referents for the validation of his several scales in The Authoritarian Personality.<sup>16</sup>



If the indexes in this survey have empirical validity, they should differentiate between those persons whose attitudes and/or behavior patterns were known to differ in definite ways. To determine if the indexes discriminated between people with different beliefs about the attitudes in question, the scores of pairs of field test volunteers, whose known behavior or statements during the interview displayed very clearly differing attitudes toward the index in question, were compared.

The religiosity scores of one volunteer who attended church weekly and whose family was actively involved in the church throughout the week were compared with the scores of another family who did not appear to take part in any organized religious activity. The "religious" volunteer scored twenty-seven (27) out of a possible twenty-nine (29), the other volunteer a seven (7) out of a possible low score of six (6) (Table 3.15). The scores from the religiosity questions were arranged in the predicted fashion and appeared to constitute a measure of validity.

A similar method was followed with the indexes of school effectiveness, school discipline and school responsiveness. The scores of two volunteers, one who praised the school and one who criticized the school, were compared. The results of all these comparisons of criterion persons are shown in Table 3.15. As expected, the scores on school effectiveness, discipline and school responsiveness were

quite different in the predicted fashion. The volunteer who was quite effusive in her praise for the school gave the school very high marks in the three indexes. The other volunteer, who was just as effusive in her criticism of the school, gave the school quite low marks in the three indexes. The index scores on effectiveness, discipline and responsiveness were arranged in the manner predicted and appear to constitute a measure of validity.

While no prediction was attempted to link parent satisfaction with their school to a desire for a traditional school, a definite difference was noted between the scores of the two volunteers. Since field test subjects were not asked about their views on "traditional" schools it was not possible to select two "criterion" persons for comparison. The difference in scores between the two selected field test subjects, the range of scores as shown in Table 3.15 and the fact these questions were based on Erickson's work, which in turn was based on work from previous sources of relevant research (See earlier section on Attitude Indexes), all led the researcher to conclude that the questions were in fact as valid as the other questions relating to schools.

**TABLE 3.15**  
**COMPARISON OF CRITERION PERSONS ON FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE (FOUR INDEXES)**

	POSSIBLE HIGH SCORE	NEIGHBOR #1	NEIGHBOR #2	POSSIBLE LOW SCORE
Religiosity	29	27	7	6
School Effectiveness	35	27*	17	11
School Discipline	18	18	8	6
School Responsiveness	30	27	17	10
Traditional	35	35	25	7

\*one question was unanswered, i.e no basis for opinion.

High numbers represent a large measure of the variable.

#### Summary

Once official permission was received to conduct the study, a field test of the questionnaire was proceeded with. Sixteen questionnaires were completed with equal representation from each school system. After focussed interviews with the subjects, analysis of the results, and discussions with advisors, a number of changes were made to the questionnaire.

Changes included the rewording of the religious questions to a more generic language, the rearranging of questions to facilitate comprehension and the adjustment of scales to ease interpretation. A check on the validity of the indexes was also undertaken.

## Administration of the Questionnaire

### Sample

The sample was drawn from the parents of elementary school children in the English Public and Separate schools of a medium sized Ontario city of less than 100,000. The kindergarten to Grade VIII population, exclusive of special classes, for the Public system in September numbered 7,002; for the Separate system 5,744. These figures do not include students of specialized schools such as those for the Mentally Retarded or for French Instruction.

Distribution of 200 questionnaires to each school system was planned. Due to rounding, 206 were sent to the Public Schools; 204 to the Separate Schools. That yielded a sampling ratio of one out of every thirty-four parents (.030) in the Public system and one of every 28 (.036) in the Separate system. In a survey conducted in Bavaria, Germany, in which the results were verified with a concurrent population census, Kellerer reported satisfactory results using a .01 sampling ratio.<sup>17</sup> As explained later, only parents of children in Grades III and VIII were sampled. The assumption was made that they were representative of the population under study.

The lack of an overall school list of parents, and the necessity of selecting parents whose children had been at the school for a long period of time necessitated the use of class lists for a random assignment of questionnaires. Only

parents whose children had been in the school for a year or longer were to be sampled. Based on the comments from parents in the field study interviews, it was felt that a period of adjustment was necessary for parents before any opinions were formed about a school. The parents also believed that the Kindergarten experience was not a sufficient base on which to form an opinion.

A second reason for the one year limit was the closing of two Separate Schools and the reallocation of 280 pupils in September 1984. An attempt was made to avoid contaminating the sample with parents who were unhappy over the recent Board decision.

The parents of students in Grades III and VIII were the target of the survey. Grade III was selected because it is the end of the primary division. The parents of these children would have had sufficient contact with the school over the previous three years to have formed an opinion with respect to their school. The parents of Grade VIII students were selected because they would have had the longest contact with the school. It is in Grade VIII that students and their parents decide what "stream" or "level" the child will take in Secondary School. While deciding the future course of their children, it is assumed that the parents will have given some thought to the type of education their children have received in the previous nine years.

In August, a list of anticipated enrolments for each grade in each school was obtained from the school boards. Due to the variety of enrolments that ranged from a low of three per class to a high of fifty-four in another class, a minimum number of two questionnaires per class was established to ensure representation from every school.

Each school was assigned a number of questionnaires based on what proportion of the system's Grade III and Grade VIII population they had enrolled. In order to determine which parents from the class should receive a questionnaire, random numbers, equal to the number of questionnaires for that class, were selected to be applied to the alphabetical list. In applying this information to class lists, principals were asked to avoid new arrivals and duplicates (twins, siblings). Avoidance was to be achieved by moving to the next name on the list.

#### Procedures

The overall plan was to contact principals about the nature of the survey and enlist their co-operation. Their co-operation entailed selecting the parents according to a given random process, addressing three pieces of mail per parent chosen, distributing, collecting and forwarding the questionnaires. Each parent was to be sent a notification letter on yellow paper (Appendix D) September fourteenth, the questionnaire, (Appendix B) September twentieth, and a follow-up thank you reminder note on blue paper (Appendix D)

September twenty-fourth, 1984. The principals were asked to forward the returned questionnaires in the brown envelope provided to the Board Office in the September twenty-sixth courier. Late questionnaires were also to be forwarded to the Board Office. This process took slightly different forms in each system.

A package was prepared that contained the following in sufficient numbers for each school

1. Parent notification letters - folded and stapled, yellow sheets. (Appendix D)
2. Peel and stick address labels
3. Parent follow-up letters - folded and stapled, blue sheets. (Appendix D)
4. Instruction sheet for principals - glued to package (Appendix E)
5. Questionnaires and addressed return envelopes -- sealed in individual envelopes. (Appendix B)
6. Large addressed envelope for returning questionnaires to Board Office.

In the first courier service to each school in September, a notification letter (Appendix E) informed the principals of the nature of the research and asked for their co-operation over the next few weeks. On September sixth, at the Public School Principals' meeting, their co-operation was asked for in the process of distributing and collecting the questionnaires. The motion to co-operate with the re-

searcher was passed unanimously. On Monday, September tenth, the packages of materials were delivered by courier to each Public School.

Because the Separate School Principals' meeting was not held until later in the month, questionnaires were personally delivered to each school and the distribution process explained to each principal. Co-operation with the project was promised in each case.

In an effort to keep the Directors of Education informed of the progress of the study, a short note was sent to each informing them of the progress of the study along with copies of the introduction and instruction letters to principals. (Appendix C)

On September twentieth, the day the questionnaires were to be sent home, a brief presentation was made at the Separate School Principals' meeting reminding them that it was questionnaire day.

That night four parents, representing both systems, telephoned the researcher reporting that they had not received questionnaires as promised in the notification letter. On Friday, these schools were phoned and reminded to distribute the questionnaires. All remaining Public Schools were also phoned.

On Friday, September twenty-first, the Director of the Public system telephoned the researcher with a concern that the process of distributing the questionnaires seemed to be



putting pressure on children whose parents didn't wish to complete the questionnaire. After a meeting requested by the Director on Friday afternoon, it seemed advisable to ask Public School Principals to refrain from distributing the follow-up letters. The Director sent a letter to those parents involved in the research explaining that completion and return of the questionnaire was entirely voluntary. (Appendix C). Follow-up letters were not recalled from the Separate Schools.

Questionnaires were picked up from the respective Board Offices until October tenth, a date two weeks after the deadline given to principals. The overall return rate was 84%. Of 206 questionnaires sent to Public school parents 156 usable questionnaires were returned. Of 204 questionnaires sent to Separate school parents 158 usable questionnaires were returned. The usable return rate was 77% (314/410). Although the procedures for distribution and collection were different in each system, the return rate was similar. The high return rate indicates that parents, as a group, found the questionnaire interesting and inoffensive.

An overview of the respondents (Table 3.16) shows the majority of the respondents as female (68%). As expected, parents generally send their children to a school that mirrors their religion in broad terms---Catholic - non Catholic.

**TABLE 3.16**  
**SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF PARENTS**

Sex of Respondent <sup>a</sup>		
SEX	RAW SCORE	PERCENTAGE
Male	96	31
Female	213	68
Missing Cases	5	1

Religion and School Choice					
School	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Other	No Religious Preference	Total
Public	114	19	2	19	154
Separate	12	142	1	1	156 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> As the question about sex of the respondent was not on the questionnaire, it was inferred from the responses to questions concerning occupation and the comment section. In only five cases was it unclear what the sex was.

<sup>b</sup> The total number of cases dropped to 310 because four respondents had children in both school systems.

Separate Schools have 91% of their parents as Catholic; Public Schools have 88% of their parents who claim to be non-Catholic.

#### Summary

In order to analyse and compare the attitudes toward school of Public school and Separate school parents, a questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of parents of Grade III and Grade VIII students in both systems. A three

part process consisting of notification letter, questionnaire and follow-up letter was followed with both principals and parents. Although the procedure was not identical in each system due to technical problems, the usable return rates were almost identical--Public School 76%, Separate School 77%.

### **Index Development**

This research is designed to investigate the attitudes parents of elementary school children have towards their children's educational environment and to determine if attitudes toward schools bear any relationship to social class, social mobility, or religiosity. The data were gathered by means of a forty-two question survey directed toward over 200 parents in each school system.

The dependent variables; school effectiveness, school discipline, school responsiveness, and desire for a traditional school are examined in relationship to the independent variables divided into levels as follows.

1. Type of school supported, with two levels, Public and Separate.
  2. Religiosity, with two levels, High and Low.
  3. Social Mobility, with two levels, High and Low.
  4. Social Class, with three levels, High, Medium and Low.
- The distribution of the questions among these seven concepts is shown on Table 3.17.

To ensure that the questions to be used for constructing the indexes were in fact related to one another and measuring the same phenomenon they were subjected to factor analysis. Kim and Mueller noted:

Factor analysis assumes that the observed (measured) variables are linear combinations of some underlying source variables (or factors). That is it assumes the existence of a system of underlying factors and a system of observed variables.<sup>18</sup>

Using the SPSS program, the variables were run in groups of two to determine if the questions would fall into two discrete groups as planned. The results of these runs

**TABLE 3.17**  
**SOURCE OF INDEXES**

CONCEPT	QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION	QUESTION NUMBER
Religiosity	1(A)	5,6,12,13,14,16
Social Mobility	1(A)	7,8,9,10,11
Social Class	1(A)	17,18,19,20,21
Discipline	2(B)	1,9,13
Responsiveness	2(B)	2,3,4,5,6
Effectiveness	1(A) 2(B)	15 7,8,10,11,12
Traditional	3(C)	1,2,3,4,5,6,7

are indicated in Appendix F. The variables did separate themselves out into groups as planned. Since the strength of the relationships between certain variables was not as

**TABLE 3.18**  
**FACTOR ANALYSIS OF VARIABLES**  
**ALL CASES**

Number	Statement	r	$\bar{X}$	S <sub>d</sub>
Religion				
A5	attendance at religious services	.89	3.5	1.3
A6	years active religiously	.43	4.4	1.4
A12	number of religious friends	.53	2.9	1.9
A13	participation in church activities	.67	2.8	1.5
A14	monetary contributions	.66	2.3	.9
A16	importance of one religion in marriage	.63	1.9	.8
Social Class				
A17	social class level	.53	3.4	1.0
A18	highest education level	.53	3.3	1.0
A19	economic comparison	.11	3.3	.7
A20	neighborhood satisfaction	.16	4.0	.9
A21	importance of university education	.22	3.9	1.1
School Effectiveness				
A15	school report card grade	.44	4.0	.8
B7	student learning	.13	2.1	1.6
B8	school use of money	.38	3.3	1.6
B10	teacher hard work	.44	3.8	1.3
B11	teacher dedication	.68	3.7	1.3
B12	teacher training	.63	3.6	1.4
School Discipline				
B1	student respect for teachers	.64	3.7	1.2
B9	student discipline	.45	2.8	1.6
B13	school rules important	.57	4.2	.9
School Responsiveness				
B2	school does a few activities well	.50	3.4	1.6
B3	school does what I like	.72	3.8	1.4
B4	have power in school decisions	.60	3.5	1.6
B5	success dependent on ability	.57	3.3	1.5
B6	staff listens to ideas	.64	3.8	1.5
Desire for Traditional School				
C1	desired academics	.24	3.7	1.3
C2	desired challenging pace	.14	2.9	1.3
C3	desired "tight" discipline	.55	3.6	1.2
C4	desired "core" curriculum	.19	3.6	1.3
C5	desired teacher centred	.53	4.0	1.0
C6	desired clear moral stand	.48	4.2	1.1
C7	desired common goals	.31	4.4	.8

strong as desired, the number of questions was reduced in Social Class, Desire For a Traditional School and School Effectiveness (Table 3.18). In the Social Class questions, numbers nineteen through twenty-one were eliminated because of their low covariance or weightings. For the same reason, numbers one, two and four were eliminated from Desire For a Traditional School and number seven from School Effectiveness.

The reduction of the number of questions is one of the functions of Factor Analysis. Kim and Mueller wrote:

Therefore factor analysis may be used as an expedient way of ascertaining the minimum number of hypothetical factors that can account for the observed covariation, and as a means of exploring the data for possible data reduction. This form of use is exploratory with probably the majority of the applications in the social sciences belonging to this category.<sup>19</sup>

With this new set of variables representing each of the concepts, indexes were established for each.

In recent years factor analysis has been extensively used by sociologists as a research tool. It has primarily been used in the area of index construction in exploratory studies in which the researcher is interested in determining the amount of linear dependence among a set of items or variables which presumably measure the same general domain of content.<sup>20</sup>

Each index was to be the sum of the scores divided by the number of variables. Weighting the scores was not done because it has not been found to be profitable. Wang and Stanley wrote:

Although differential weighting theoretically promises to provide substantial gains in predictive or construct validity, in practice these gains are often so slight that they do not seem to justify the labor involved in deriving the weights and scoring with them.<sup>21</sup>

These indexes were used to establish reliability coefficients.

Reliability alphas are reported in Table 3.19 with the question numbers included. In order to improve the

**TABLE 3.19**  
**RELIABILITY ALPHAS FOR EACH INDEX**

INDEX	QUESTION NUMBERS INCLUDED	ALPHAS
Religion	A5,A12,A13,A14,A16	.75
Social Class	A17,A18	.40
Effectiveness	A15,B8,B10,B11,B12	.67
Responsiveness	B2,B3,B4,B5,B6	.76
Discipline	B1,B9,B13	.54
Traditional	C3,C5,C6,C7	.50

reliability from .7 to .75 on the religion index, question six was removed from the index. The low alphas on the indexes of social class, discipline and traditional concepts must be considered when these indexes are used to determine differences between groups. If there is a significant difference between the groups, the index underestimates the differences. However, if no significant difference is found, no significant difference may in fact exist or the measure is too insensitive, as indicated by its low

reliability, to find any difference.

A social mobility index was established by use of responses to questions seven through eleven. Based on the description of their job and their father's job, each answer was given a number according to O.D. Duncan's Socioeconomic Index.

Of the five, the standard Duncan Socioeconomic Index is being most widely used and is generally considered to be superior for most survey and large-sample situations. It takes into account income, education and occupational prestige.<sup>22</sup>

The chief "bread-winner" for each family was determined. For example, if both parents were working only the husband's score was used. If it was a single parent family then the score of that parent was used. The social mobility score was determined by subtracting the father's job score from the respondent's job score.

Once each index was created, an index score was run to determine the mean and the range of the index. Each index score was divided as nearly as possible at the median and the effectiveness, discipline, responsiveness and traditional indexes as nearly as possible into five equal segments, each representing approximately 20% of the scores. Table 3.20 indicates how this was done with the Discipline Index. A similar procedure was followed with the indexes of effectiveness, responsiveness and desire for a traditional school. Division into five parts was necessary in order to establish 2x5 and 3x5 tables used in the analysis.



**TABLE 3.20**  
**DISCIPLINE INDEX SCORE**  
(B1 + B9 + B13/3)

Score	Frequency Raw Count	Cumulative Frequency	% of Cases in Category
1.00	2	.8	21.9
1.67	2	1.7	
2.00	3	2.9	
2.33	5	5.0	
2.67	8	8.3	
3.00	12	13.2	
3.33	21	21.9	
3.67	47	41.3	19.4
4.00	52	62.8	21.5
4.33	49	83.1	20.2
4.67	28	94.6	17.0
5.00	13	100.0	

### Testable Hypotheses

The dependent variable is divided into levels. The objective is to determine if the observed differences in levels between the samples are outside the range to be expected from sampling variation if there are no differences in the population,  $p. < .05$ .

The hypotheses tested for the independent variable type of school are:

1.  $H_0 : P_R = S_R$

The proportion of Public school parents who view their schools as responsive to their needs is the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who view their schools as responsive to their needs.

against:

$$H_1: P_R \neq S_R$$

The proportion of Public school parents who view their schools as responsive to their needs is not the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who view their schools as responsive to their needs.

2.  $H_0: P_E = S_E$

The proportion of Public school parents who view their schools as effective is the same as the proportion of Separate School parents who view their schools as effective.

against:

$$H_1: P_E \neq S_E$$

The proportion of Public school parents who view their schools as effective is not the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who view their schools as effective.

3.  $H_0: P_D = S_D$

The proportion of Public school parents who believe their schools have strong discipline is the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who believe their schools have strong discipline.

against:

$$H_1: P_D \neq S_D$$

The proportion of Public school parents who believe their schools have strong discipline is not the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who believe their schools have strong discipline.

4.  $H_0: P_T = S_T$

The proportion of Public school parents who desire a traditional school is the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who desire a traditional school.

against:

$$H_1 : P_T \neq S_T$$

The proportion of Public school parents who desire a traditional school is not the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who desire a traditional school.

The hypotheses for the independent variable religiosity are:

1.  $H_0 : R_{Hp} = R_{Hs}$

There are no differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores in terms of school chosen.

against:

$$H_1 : R_{Hp} \neq R_{Hs}$$

There are differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores in terms of school chosen.

2.  $H_0 : R_{Hr} = R_{Lr}$

There are no differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the index of responsiveness.

against:

$$H_1 : R_{Hr} \neq R_{Lr}$$

There are differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the index of responsiveness.

3.  $H_0 : R_{He} = R_{Le}$

There are no differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the index of effectiveness.

against:

$$H_1 : R_{He} \neq R_{Le}$$

There are differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the index of effectiveness.

4.  $H_0 : R_{H_d} = R_{L_d}$

There are no differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the index of discipline.

against:

$$H_1: R_{H_d} \neq R_{L_d}$$

There are differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the index of discipline.

5.  $H_0 : R_{H_t} = R_{L_t}$

There are no differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the traditional index.

against:

$$H_1: R_{H_t} \neq R_{L_t}$$

There are differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the traditional index.

The hypotheses for the independent variable social mobility are:

1.  $H_0: SM_{H_p} = SM_{L_s}$

There are no differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility in terms of school system chosen.

against:

$$H_1: SM_{H_p} \neq SM_{L_s}$$

There are differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility in terms of school system chosen.

2.  $H_0 : SM_{H_r} = SM_{L_r}$

There are no differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the responsiveness index.

against:

$$H_1: SM_{H_r} \neq SM_{L_r}$$

There are differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the responsiveness index.

3.  $H_0 : SM_{H_e} = SM_{L_e}$

There are no differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the effectiveness index.

against:

$$H_1: SM_{H_e} \neq SM_{L_e}$$

There are differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the effectiveness index.

4.  $H_0 : SM_{H_d} = SM_{L_d}$

There are no differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the discipline index.

against:

$$H_1: SM_{H_d} \neq SM_{L_d}$$

There are differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the discipline index.

5.  $H_0 : SM_{H_t} = SM_{L_t}$

There are no differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the traditional index.

against:

$$H_1: SM_{H_t} \neq SM_{L_t}$$

There are differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility on the traditional index.

The hypotheses tested for the independent variable social class are:

1.  $H_0 : SC_{Hp} = SC_{Hs}$   
 $H_0 : SC_{Mp} = SC_{Ms}$   
 $H_0 : SC_{Lp} = SC_{Ls}$

The proportion of parents from each of the social classes (low, middle and high) that enrol their children in Public and Separate schools is the same.

against:

- $$H_1 : SC_{Hp} \neq SC_{Hs}$$
- $$H_1 : SC_{Mp} \neq SC_{Ms}$$
- $$H_1 : SC_{Lp} \neq SC_{Ls}$$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) that enrol their children in Public and Separate schools is not the same.

2.  $H_0 : SC_{Hr} = SC_{Mr} = SC_{Lr}$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who view their schools as responsive is the same.

against:

- $$H_1 : SC_{Hr} \neq SC_{Mr} \neq SC_{Lr}$$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who view their schools as responsive is not the same.

3.  $H_0 : SC_{He} = SC_{Me} = SC_{Le}$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who view their schools as effective is the same.

against:

$$H1 : SC_{He} \neq SC_{Me} \neq SC_{Le}$$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who view their schools as effective is not the same.

4. 
$$H0 : SC_{Hd} = SC_{Md} = SC_{Ld}$$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who believe their school has strong discipline is the same.

against:

$$H1 : SC_{Hd} \neq SC_{Md} \neq SC_{Ld}$$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who believe their school has strong discipline is not the same.

5. 
$$H0 : SC_{Ht} = SC_{Mt} = SC_{Lt}$$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who desire a traditional school is the same.

against

$$H1 : SC_{Ht} \neq SC_{Mt} \neq SC_{Lt}$$

The proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who desire a traditional school is not the same.

### Analysis

The analysis of the data is designed to determine if significant differences do exist between groups of parents who are subdivided on the basis of school support, religiosity, social mobility and social class on the variables school responsiveness, school effectiveness, school discipline and desire for a traditional school. If significant

differences are found the strength of the relationship will be noted by statistical measures of relationship.

In each case where the dependent variables school effectiveness, school responsiveness, school discipline and desire for a traditional school were used, they were divided into five categories (very low to very high) based on the total index score as described previously. For schools, the two levels were Public and Separate. For religiosity, the index score was divided as nearly as possible in half (49% were in the high category) to give two levels, high and low. For social mobility, the index was divided at the .5 level: those whose social mobility score was a negative number or zero were defined as non-mobile (non-mobility scores were 39% of the total). For social class, the scores were divided into three levels - low 23%, middle 49%, upper 28%.

Depending upon the hypothesis being tested the chi-square test of statistical significance was used to establish 2 x 2 tables (eg. school choice and religiosity), 2 x 5 (eg. school choice and discipline), and 3 x 5 (eg. social class and discipline). The chi-square statistic indicates if observations differ from an expected level of probability. Ideally, in a 2 x 5 table, 20% of the cases should fall in each cell for each of the two levels, since the overall set of index scores was divided at approximately 20% intervals.



Chi-square is a test of statistical significance. It helps us determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two variables.<sup>23</sup>

The significance level chosen was  $<.05$ .

The chi-square tells us only if a relationship exists between two variables.

By itself, chi-square helps us only decide whether our variables are independent or related.<sup>24</sup>

If the chi-square statistic indicates that a significant relationship exists between the two variables, two different measures of association will be used to determine the strength of the relationship. For the hypotheses that deal with two bi-level variables, thus resulting in a two by two tables, the measure of association used will be phi.

For a 2 x 2 table, the phi statistic is a suitable measure of association.<sup>25</sup>

For the other tables, two by five, and three by five, the statistic used to determine the strength of the relationship where significant differences are found will be tau C.

In a rectangular table (one in which the number of rows differs from the number of columns) tau C is appropriate.<sup>26</sup>

In addition to the use of the chi-square statistic and measures of association described, a further procedure, multiple regression is used. Multiple regression is a procedure whereby it is possible to examine the relationship between dependent and independent variables.

The most important uses of the technique as a descriptive tool are: (1) to find the

best linear prediction equation and evaluate its prediction accuracy; (2) to control for other confounding factors in order to evaluate the contribution of a specific variable or set of variables; and (3) to find structural relations for seemingly multivariate relationships, such as is done in path analysis.<sup>27</sup>

Based on the results of regression analysis it may be possible to show the "dependence of a variable on a set of other variables."<sup>28</sup>

### Chapter Summary

A forty-two question survey, an amalgamation of questions from five sources, was field tested on parents of elementary school children in a city neighborhood in Ontario. The results of the field test were reviewed by personnel at Michigan State University. The religiosity, responsiveness, discipline and effectiveness questions were checked for validity.

The survey was distributed on a random basis to 204 parents in the Separate School system, and 206 parents in the Public School system in a medium sized Ontario city. A usable return rate of 77% was achieved.

Using factor analysis data and reliability tests, indexes for religiosity, social class, responsiveness, effectiveness, discipline and traditional were checked and refined. The analysis plan for the data using the chi-square statistic, phi, tau C and regression analysis was described.

ENDNOTES      CHAPTER III

<sup>1</sup>Sally Riede and William Hoffman co-chairperson, Bishop's Task Force on Secondary Education (Cleveland, Ohio, Diocese of Cleveland, 1980), p. 60.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Overall supervision for the study was Dr. David C. Leege, Director of Centre for the Study of Man in Contemporary Society. His co-investigators were Dr. C. Lincoln Johnson and Dr. R. Robert Huckfeldt.

<sup>4</sup>D. W. Livingstone and D. J. Hart, Public Attitudes Toward Education in Ontario 1980 (Toronto, Ontario: OISE Press, 1981), p. 54.

<sup>5</sup>Meetings with Dr. Marcus, Director of Social Science Research Bureau, Michigan State University, October 1983.

<sup>6</sup>A. N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement (New York: Basic Books, 1966), p. 263.

<sup>7</sup>D.W. Livingstone and D.J. Hart, op. cit., pp. 53-54.

<sup>8</sup>William H. Sewell, et al., "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), p. 73.

<sup>9</sup>George Gallup, "The 14th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (September, 1982), p. 39.

<sup>10</sup>Donald A. Erickson, et al. Characteristics and Relationships in Public and Independent Schools (San Francisco: Center For Research on Private Education, 1979) p. 1.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 107.

<sup>13</sup>Meetings with Dr. Houang, Statistical Analyst, and Dr. Marcus, Sociologist, August 1984.

<sup>14</sup>Lee J. Cronbach, Essentials of Psychological Testing (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), p. 48.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>T.W. Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Row, 1950), p. 31.

<sup>17</sup>H. Kellner in Tore Dalenius, Sampling in Sweden: Contribution to the Methods and Theories of Sample Survey Practice (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1957), p. 216.

<sup>18</sup>Jae On Kim, and Charles W. Mueller, Introduction To Factor Analyses What It Is and How To Do It (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1978), p. 8.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>20</sup>Duane F. Alwin, "The Use of Factor Analyses in the Construction of Linear Composites in Social Research," Sociological Methods and Research, 2 (November, 1973), p. 191.

<sup>21</sup>Marilyn W. Wang and Julian C. Stanley, "Differential Weighting: A Review of Methods and Empirical Studies." Review of Educational Research, 40 (No. 5), p. 664.

<sup>22</sup>Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research and Design (New York: David MacKay, 1977), p. 211.

<sup>23</sup>C. Hadlai Hull and Norman H. Nie, SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw Hill, 1981), p. 223.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 224.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p.228.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p.321.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS

#### **Introduction**

In this chapter each of the four independent variables: school choice, religiosity, social mobility and social class will be analyzed in terms of the four dependent variables: responsiveness, effectiveness, discipline and desire for a traditional school. Using the chi-square statistic, levels of the different dependent variables will be compared in 2x5 or 3x5 tables. Tau C will be used to determine the strength of the relationship.

As independent variables, religiosity, social mobility, and social class will be analyzed with type of school as the dependent variable. Using the chi-square statistic, levels of the dependent variable will be compared in a 2x2 table. Phi will be used to determine the strength of the relationship.

Regression analysis will be used to examine relationships between dependent and independent variables. Relationships found, and significance levels will be reported. Unintended effects if any, will be identified.

## Data Analysis

### School Choice

This independent two level variable (Public, Separate) was used to determine if parents of the two school systems expressed any significant differences on the four dependent variables: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school and desire for a traditional school. Only those cases that had responded to all the questions on the index being tested were used in the analysis. That is, those cases that had left an answer blank or had circled - no basis for opinion - were eliminated from the analysis of that index.

On the responsiveness index, the number of valid cases was 238 - 50% Public, 50% Separate. A comparison between

**TABLE 4.1**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOL PARENTS TOWARD THE RESPONSIVENESS OF THEIR SCHOOL**

Type of School Parents Support	Responsiveness of School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Public	18	19	25	19	19	118
Separate	23	12	22	26	17	120

Public school parents and Separate school parents on the responsiveness of the school index resulted in a chi-square value of 4.9 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .29 (Table 4.1). Tau C statistic for the

relationship was .005. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that the proportion of Public school parents who view their schools as responsive to their needs is the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who view their schools as responsive to their needs was retained.

The second dependent variable tested was school effectiveness. The nature of these questions, in that they involved a judgement on school effectiveness or a comparison of the parent's school to another school, caused an unusually high number of "0's" -no basis for opinion - or questions left blank. Consequently, the number of usable cases on the index was 225 - 47% Public, 53% Separate. (Table 4.2)

**TABLE 4.2**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOL PARENTS TOWARD THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THEIR SCHOOLS**

Type of School Parents Support	Effectiveness of The School (% of n)					n of cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Public	20	23	29	13	15	106
Separate	17	16	28	23	16	119

A comparison between Public school parents and Separate school parents on the school effectiveness index resulted in a chi-square value of 4.9 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .30. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .11. Although a slight tendency was observed for Separate school parents to view their schools as more

effective, the results were not significant at the .05 level. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that the proportion of Public school parents who view their school as effective is the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who view their schools as effective was retained.

The third dependent variable tested was discipline. The total number of usable cases was 242- 48% Public, 52% Separate. (Table 4.3). A comparison between Public school parents and Separate school parents on the index of school discipline resulted in a chi-square value of 20.7 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .00. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .23. Since the

**TABLE 4.3**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOL PARENTS TOWARD DISCIPLINE IN THEIR SCHOOL**

Type of School Parents Support	Discipline In The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Public	34	19	15	16	16	115
Separate	11	20	28	23	18	127

reliability coefficient for the discipline index of .54 would cause an underestimation of the significant differences, the parents of the two systems did see their schools as having significantly different standards of discipline. Since  $p < .05$ , the null hypothesis that the



proportion of Public school parents who believe their schools have strong discipline is the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who believe their schools have strong discipline was rejected.

The fourth variable tested was the desire for a traditional school. The response rate on the index was the highest of all four; 300 cases, equally divided between Public and Separate. The results are indicated in Table 4.4.

**TABLE 4.4**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOL PARENTS TOWARD A TRADITIONAL SCHOOL**

Type of School Parents Support	Desire for Traditional School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Public	17	18	21	27	17	150
Separate	13	19	20	23	25	150

A comparison between Public school parents and Separate school parents on the desire for a traditional school index resulted in a chi-square value of 3.7 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .45. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .08. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that the proportion of Public school parents who desire a traditional school is the same as the proportion of Separate school parents who desire a traditional school was retained.

With type of school the parents support as the independent variable (summarized in Table 4.24), one statistically significant difference was revealed. Parents, whose children were enrolled in a Separate elementary school rated their child's school significantly higher on the discipline index than did parents of children in Public elementary schools. Parents of the two school systems did not rate their respective schools significantly different on the responsive and effectiveness index. Both Public and Separate school supporters desired a traditional type of school environment.

#### Religiosity

This index was designed to measure the degree of religious conviction of the respondents. The index was divided at the median with 51% of the cases deemed to be of low religiosity and 49% of the cases deemed to be of high religiosity.

The first variable tested was type of school chosen. Of 285 valid cases, 47% were Public school supporters, and 53% were Separate school supporters (Table 4.5). A comparison between Public school parents and Separate school parents on the index of religiosity resulted in a corrected chi-square value of 16.9 with one degree of freedom and a significance level of .00. The phi statistic for this relationship was .25. Since  $p < .05$ , the null hypothesis that there were no differences between people with high religiosity scores and those with low religiosity scores in terms of school selected was rejected.

**TABLE 4.5**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE LEVEL OF RELIGIOSITY OF PARENTS**  
**WITH THE TYPE OF SCHOOL CHOSEN**

Type of School Parents Support	Level of Religiosity (% of n)		n of Cases
	Low	High	
Public	64	36	134
Separate	39	61	151

The second variable tested was school responsiveness. The 218 valid cases were divided into 50% with low religiosity and 50% with high religiosity (Table 4.6). A comparison between parents with high religiosity scores and parents with low religiosity scores on the index of responsiveness of the school resulted in a chi-square value of .92 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .92. Tau C statistic for this relationship was -.01. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that no difference would exist

**TABLE 4.6**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL RESPONSIVENESS**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW RELIGIOSITY**

Level of Religiosity of Parents	Responsiveness of School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	18	16	27	21	18	110
High	21	14	24	24	17	108

between people with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the index of responsiveness of the school was retained.

The third variable tested was school effectiveness. Of 207 valid cases, 49% were in the low religiosity category and 51% in the high religiosity category. (Table 4.7). A comparison between parents with high religiosity scores and parents with low religiosity scores on the index of school effectiveness resulted in a chi-square value of 4.4 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .36. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .04. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that no difference would exist between people with high religiosity and low religiosity scores on the effectiveness of the school index was retained.

**TABLE 4.7**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARDS SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW RELIGIOSITY**

Level of Religiosity of Parents	Effectiveness of The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	19	18	32	14	17	102
High	16	18	27	25	14	105

The fourth variable tested was discipline. The 219 cases were divided evenly between high religiosity (50%) and low religiosity (50%). (Table 4.8). A comparison between parents with high religiosity scores and parents with low

religiosity scores on the index of school discipline resulted in a chi-square value of 5.0 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .29. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .0. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that no difference would exist between people with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the school discipline index was retained.

**TABLE 4.8**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL DISCIPLINE**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW RELIGIOSITY**

Level of Religiosity of Parents	Discipline in The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	25	16	18	21	20	110
High	16	23	24	23	14	111

The fifth variable tested was the desire of parents for a traditional school. The 276 valid cases were divided into 51% with low religiosity and 49% with high religiosity. (Table 4.9). A comparison between parents with high religiosity scores and parents with low religiosity scores on the index of desire for a traditional school resulted in a chi-square value of 4.4 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .35. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .01. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that no difference would exist between people with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores on the desire for a traditional school index was retained.

**TABLE 4.9**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD A TRADITIONAL SCHOOL**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW RELIGIOSITY**

Level of Religiosity of Parents	Desire for Traditional School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	17	17	18	29	19	140
High	15	20	21	20	24	136

With religiosity as the independent variable, (summarized in Table 4.25) no statistically significant differences were found using the dependent variables responsiveness, effectiveness, discipline and desire for a traditional school. People with high religiosity scores were more likely to be enrolled in a Separate school than in a Public School.

#### Social Mobility

The social mobility index was constructed by subtracting the father's job score as determined by Duncan's Socio-economic Index from the respondent's job score. In the case of working couples, the male's job score was used. If the difference was a positive number, the respondent was defined as socially mobile (high); if the difference was 0 or a negative number, the respondent was defined as non-mobile (low). Of the 314 cases, 39% were non-mobile (low) or downwardly mobile and 61% were mobile (high) or upwardly mobile.

The first variable tested was type of school chosen. Of 297 valid cases, 49% were Public school supporters, 51% were Separate school supporters (Table 4.10). A comparison between Public school parents and Separate school parents on the social mobility index resulted in a corrected chi-square

**TABLE 4.10**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL MOBILITY OF PARENTS BY**  
**THE TYPE OF SCHOOL CHOSEN**

Type of School Parents Support	Social Mobility Level (% of n)		n of Cases
	Low	High	
Public	45	55	145
Separate	34	66	152

value of 3.5 with one degree of freedom and a significance level of .06. The phi statistic for this relationship was .12. Since the significance level was very close to the cut-off point of .05 the social mobility scores were divided approximately into thirds and a 2x3 table was established (Table 4.11).

**TABLE 4.11**  
**A COMPARISON OF SOCIAL MOBILITY LEVELS (3) OF PARENTS BY**  
**THE TYPE OF SCHOOL CHOSEN**

Type of School Parents Support	Social Mobility Level (% of n)			n of Cases
	Low	Middle	High	
Public	36	32	32	145
Separate	25	40	35	152

Using this method of comparison, a chi-square value of 4.8 with two degrees of freedom and a significance level of .09 resulted. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .10. Since  $p > .05$  in both comparisons, and the strength of the relationship is weak, the null hypothesis that there are no differences between parents with a high level of social mobility and parents with a low level of social mobility in terms of school chosen was retained.

The second variable tested was responsiveness of the school. The 230 valid cases for this index were divided into 38% low mobility and 62% high mobility. (Table 4.12). A comparison between parents with high social mobility and parents with low social mobility on the index of responsiveness of the school resulted in a chi-square value

**TABLE 4.12**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL RESPONSIVENESS**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW SOCIAL MOBILITY**

Mobility Level of Parents	Responsiveness Of The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	22	19	24	19	16	88
High	19	14	23	25	19	142

of 2.1 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .72. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .09. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that there are no differences between parents with a high level of social mobility and parents with a low level of social mobility on the



index of responsiveness was retained.

The third variable tested was effectiveness of the school. The 216 valid cases were divided into 36% low mobility and 64% high mobility. (Table 4.13). A comparison between parents with high social mobility and parents with low social mobility on the index of school effectiveness resulted in a chi-square value of 3.6 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .46. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .02. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that no difference would exist between parents with a high social mobility and parents with a low social mobility score on the index of school effectiveness was retained.

**TABLE 4.13**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW SOCIAL MOBILITY**

Mobility Level of Parents	Effectiveness of The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	17	25	23	19	16	77
High	19	15.1	31	19	16	139

The fourth variable tested was school discipline. Of 233 valid cases, 35% were in the low mobility category and 65% were in the high mobility category (Table 4.14). A comparison between parents of high social mobility and parents of low social mobility on the index of school discipline resulted in a chi-square value of 4.5 with four

**TABLE 4.14**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL DISCIPLINE**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW SOCIAL MOBILITY**

Level of Mobility of Parents	Discipline in The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	26	21	22	13	18	82
High	20	17	22	25	16	151

degrees of freedom and a significance level of .34. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .08. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that there are no differences between parents with high social mobility and parents with low social mobility on the school discipline index was retained.

The fifth variable tested was desire for a traditional school. Of 287 valid cases, 38% were in the low social mobility category and 62% in the high social mobility category. (Table 4.15). A comparison between parents of high

**TABLE 4.15**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD A TRADITIONAL SCHOOL**  
**BETWEEN PARENTS OF HIGH AND LOW SOCIAL MOBILITY**

Level of Mobility Mobility	Desire for Traditional School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	19	19	23	20	19	109
High	11	18	20	28	23	178

social mobility and low social mobility on the index of desire for a traditional school resulted in a chi-square value of 6.3 with four degrees of freedom and a significance level of .18. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .14. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that no difference would exist between parents with a high level of social mobility and parents with a low level of social mobility on the desire for a traditional school index was retained.

With social mobility as the independent variable, (summarized in Table 4.26) no statistically significant differences were found using the dependent variables responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, school discipline and desire for a traditional school. Enrolment patterns in the two systems were not statistically related to social mobility.

#### Social Class

Interpretation of the statistics using the social class index must of necessity be tentative because of the low reliability coefficient of .40 on this index. No significant differences may indicate either that no differences do in fact exist or that the index is too insensitive to measure differences. Any significant differences that are found will likely be underestimated.

The social class index was divided into three parts such that lower class was 23%, middle class was 49% and upper class was 28% of the valid cases.

The first variable tested was type of school. Of the 297 valid cases 49% were Public school supporters, 51% were Separate school supporters. (Table 4.16). A comparison between Public school parents and Separate school parents on the social class index resulted in a chi-square value of .35 with two degrees of freedom and a significance level of .84.

**TABLE 4.16**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL CLASS OF PARENTS WITH**  
**THE TYPE OF SCHOOL CHOSEN**

Type of School Parents Support	Social Class Level (% of n)			n of Cases
	Low	Middle	High	
Public	22	51	27	146
Separate	24	48	28	151

Tau C statistic for this relationship was .02. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that the proportion of parents from each of the social classes (low, middle, high) that enrol their children in Public and Separate schools is the same was retained.

The second variable tested was responsiveness of the school. Of 229 valid cases, 24% were lower class, 50% were middle class and 26% were upper class. (Table 4.17). A comparison of parents' attitudes among the three social classes on the index of responsiveness of the school resulted in a chi-square value of 2.4 with eight degrees of

**TABLE 4.17**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL RESPONSIVENESS**  
**AMONG THE THREE SOCIAL CLASSES**

Social Class Level of Parents	Responsiveness Of The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	20	18	26	18	18	55
Middle	22	16	22	25	15	115
High	20	14	29	20	17	59

freedom and a significance level of .97. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .01. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that the proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who view their schools as responsive is the same was retained.

The third variable tested was school effectiveness. The 215 valid cases were divided into three levels 21% lower class, 53% middle class and 26% upper class (Table 4.18).

**TABLE 4.18**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS**  
**AMONG THE THREE SOCIAL CLASSES**

Social Class Level of Parents	Effectiveness Of The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	18	14	29	25	14	44
Middle	16	20	27	20	17	114
High	25	19	32	12	12	57

A comparison of parents' attitudes among the three social classes on the index of school effectiveness resulted in a chi-square value of 5.4 with eight degrees of freedom and a significance level of .71. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .09. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that the proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who view their schools as effective is the same was retained.

The fourth variable tested was school discipline. The 233 valid cases were divided into 21% lower class, 52% middle class and 27% upper class (Table 4.19). A comparison of parents' attitudes among the three social classes on the index of school discipline resulted in a chi-square value of 12.7 with eight degrees of freedom and a significance level of .12. Tau C statistic for this relationship was -.09. Since  $p > .05$ , the null hypothesis that the proportion of

**TABLE 4.19**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL DISCIPLINE**  
**AMONG THE THREE SOCIAL CLASSES**

Social Class Level of Parents	Discipline In The School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	29	12	22	16	21	49
Middle	16	20	22	21	21	121
High	30	24	16	22	8	63

parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who believe their school has strong discipline is the same was retained.

The fifth variable tested was desire for a traditional school. The 294 valid cases were divided into three levels -- 23% lower class, 47% middle class and 30% upper class (Table 4.20). A comparison of parents' attitudes among the three social classes on the desire for a traditional school index resulted in a chi-square value of 15.3 with eight degrees of freedom and a significance level of .05. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .05, which indicates a weak relationship. Since the reliability of the social class index was low, it is likely that differences

**TABLE 4.20**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD A TRADITIONAL SCHOOL**  
**AMONG THE THREE SOCIAL CLASSES**

Social Class Level of Parents	Desire for Traditional School (% of n)					n of Cases
	Very Low	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	3	19	11	37	30	67
Middle	4	11	17	35	33	140
High	1	8	28	24	39	87

are underestimated. In order to gain a clearer understanding of the differences among the classes on the desire for a traditional school index, it was broken into four equal parts. (Table 4.21). In this comparison among the classes, the chi-square value was 14.4 with six degrees of freedom

**TABLE 4.21**  
**A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD A TRADITIONAL SCHOOL**  
**AMONG THE THREE SOCIAL CLASSES**

Social Class Level of Parents	Desire for Traditional School (% of n)				n of Cases
	Low	Middle	High	Very High	
Low	23	10	37	30	67
Middle	15	17	35	33	140
High	9	28	24	39	87

and a significance level of .03. Tau C statistic for this relationship was .05.

Among social classes a similar percentage of each class strongly desires a traditional school. As desire for a traditional school decreases differences among classes become more apparent. The tendency exists for the higher social class to be more strongly in favor of a traditional school.

The constant significance level in the tables and the low reliability of the social class index results in the rejection of the null hypothesis that the proportion of parents in each of the social classes (low, middle, high) who desire a traditional school is the same. Based on the statistics generated from the two indexes, social class and traditional, a weak relationship exists between social class and desire for a traditional school.

With social class as the independent variable (summarized in Table 4.27) no statistically significant differences were found using the dependent variables school



choice, responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school and school discipline. A weak relationship was found between social class and desire for a traditional school - the higher the social class the stronger the desire for a traditional school.

### Regression Analysis

In the regression analysis, cases that had left answers blank, used 0-no basis for opinion -, or had not specified a level of education in question 18 part 1 (necessary for social class index) were eliminated from this analysis. The number of valid cases was 137.

The dependent measures responsiveness of the school, school discipline, effectiveness of the school, and desire for a traditional school were each used in a stepwise regression with the independent variables religiosity, social class, social mobility and type of school. One statistically significant relationship ( $p < .05$ ) was found. (Table 4.22). Eight per cent (8%) of the variance on the discipline index was explained by the four independent variables. Of the four, type of school made the most independent and statistically significant contribution.

These results support the analysis of the school discipline index with type of school as the independent variable where Separate school parents rated their schools significantly higher than did Public school parents. The weak relationship found between social class and desire for a

**TABLE 4.22**  
**SUMMARY OF STEPWISE REGRESSION OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES WITH**  
**INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**

Dependent Variable	Step Variable	Beta	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>	Overall F	Sig.
Responsiveness	Religion	-.16	.08	.03	2.2	.07
	Class	-.15	.09	.04		
	School	-.04	.63	.04		
	Mobility	.14	.10	.06		
Effectiveness	Religion	.06	.54	.01	.80	.53
	Class	.07	.41	.01		
	School	.07	.44	.02		
	Mobility	.09	.34	.02		
Discipline	Religion	-.18	.05	.03	2.7	.03
	Class	-.10	.24	.04		
	School	.18	.04	.07		
	Mobility	-.09	.33	.08		
Traditional	Religion	-.10	.27	.00	.85	.50
	Class	.06	.50	.01		
	School	.10	.27	.02		
	Mobility	.08	.36	.03		

traditional school is not supported in the stepwise regression analysis.

#### **Summary of Parents' Comments**

At the conclusion of the survey instrument, parents were invited to write any comments they might have. The invitation read:

Thank you for your time. If any important issues or topics have been missed, please note them in the space provided. Use the back of the page if necessary.

Twenty-nine per cent (29%) of Public school parents and twenty-two (22%) of Separate school parents commented on a wide variety of topics. To bring some order to the diverse comments, four general categories were devised; Curriculum and Learning, Staff and School, Discipline and Questionnaire.

The comments of all the parents will be noted first, followed by a discussion of any differences in the comment pattern between the Public and Separate school parents.

The general thrust in the Curriculum and Learning area could be designated as a desire for a traditional or basic mode of education. Parents wrote of a need for study habits, homework and a stress on morals and respect.

The Staff and School comments centred on two general areas. Parents would like more communication with the school through notes, letters and Home and School Associations. Related to communication, is the difficulty parents have understanding the rules governing staff (eg. tenure) and the differing expectations (discipline, curriculum and learning) of staff.

Discipline was felt by some parents to be unfairly and inconsistently applied. They want fair, non-discriminatory, consistent discipline within the classroom and within the school.

The nature of the survey evoked responses ranging from "Thank You" to strong criticism of educational surveys in

general. Within this range were specific comments about certain questions, and questions by six (6) parents as to why questions about religion were part of the survey.

Similarities between Public school parents and Separate school parents in the comment section were more dominant than differences. However, on four specific topics there were differences between the two groups of parents.

In the Curriculum and Learning area six (6) Public school parents requested French in all grades rather than in Grades VI-VIII. In the fall of 1984 the Separate School Board had extended French instruction to Grade 1 in their system. In the spring of 1985 the Public School Board did the same. Four Separate school parents wrote on standards for achievement or promotion (two pro, two con). Related to the standards issue were two more comments requesting a recognition of individual's needs (educational and emotional) in the classroom.

The Discipline area revealed considerable disparity between the two sets of parents. Four Public school parents; eleven Separate school parents wrote about discipline. Separate school parents (5) showed concern over methods of discipline and two parents asked outright "if teachers had any respect for students?" While Separate school parents believe their schools have strong discipline, they appear to have reservations about how the level of discipline is attained. Although Public school parents rated their schools

lower on the discipline index than did Separate school parents, the Public school parents commented only about "if teachers had fairness and consistency" and wrote nothing about particular methods.

The last area of difference between parents was in that of survey design. Questions about religion caused five Public school parents to respond while only one Separate school parent responded. This response pattern seems to reflect the nature of the two systems--public, religious. Public school supporters take exception to being asked about their religion, and religiosity on an educational survey and cannot see any relationship between education and religion.

One caveat that cannot be ignored in this section is that only a very small percentage of respondents is being discussed. For example, the five (5) Separate school parents who disagreed with the methods of discipline represent only 5/158 or 3% of those who returned surveys. That the parents took time to write a comment indicates that it must be of some significance to them. If an issue is raised more than twice in the comment section, it may be assumed to have wider support in the general population being sampled.

The comment section revealed more similarities than differences between parents from the two school systems. They want traditional schools where the basics are taught and learned; they want better communication between the home

and the school in order to understand the curriculum (eg. Sex Education), and the value of professional development and contractual obligations between the Board and its employees.

The areas of difference between Public school and Separate school parents are reported in Table 4.23.

**TABLE 4.23**  
**COMMENT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUBLIC AND SEPARATE SCHOOL PARENTS**

=====	
PUBLIC PARENTS	SEPARATE PARENTS
no mention of academic standards	a state of confusion over the role of minimum standards
no mention of methods of discipline	concern over methods of discipline
question value of inquiries on survey into religiosity	one person mentioned the religiosity questions
desire for French instruction in grades 1-VIII	no mention of French instruction

Interpretations of the comment section must be tempered with care because of the small overall number of respondents for each particular topic.

### **Chapter Summary**

In this chapter each of the four dependent variables: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school and desire for a traditional school were presented and analyzed in terms of the independent variables: type of school, religiosity, social mobility and

social class. The type of school chosen by parents (Public or Separate) was also presented and analyzed in terms of religiosity, social mobility and social class.

For the independent variable, the type of school parents support, the null hypothesis of equal proportions of Public and Separate school parents among the levels of the dependent variables: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school and desire for a traditional school were retained. The null hypothesis for the dependent variable discipline was rejected. The results are summarized in Table 4.24.

**TABLE 4.24**  
**SUMMARY OF RESULTS ON ATTITUDE INDEXES WITH TYPE OF SCHOOL**  
**AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE**

Dependent Variable	Hypotheses	Significance Level	<u>Retain</u> <u>Reject</u>
Responsiveness	$H_0: P_R = S_R$	.29	Retain
Effectiveness	$H_0: P_E = S_E$	.30	Retain
Discipline	$H_0: P_D = S_D$	.004	Reject
Traditional	$H_0: P_T = S_T$	.45	Retain

For the independent variable religious conviction or religiosity, the null hypothesis of equal proportions of parents of high and low religiosity among the levels of the dependent variable responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school and desire for a traditional school were retained. The results are summarized in Table 4.25.

**TABLE 4.25**  
**SUMMARY OF RESULTS WITH RELIGIOSITY AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE**

Dependent Variable	Hypotheses	Significance Level	Retain Reject
Responsiveness	$H_0: R_{H_r} = R_{L_r}$	.92	Retain
Effectiveness	$H_0: R_{H_e} = R_{L_e}$	.36	Retain
Discipline	$H_0: R_{H_d} = R_{L_d}$	.29	Retain
Traditional	$H_0: R_{H_t} = R_{L_t}$	.35	Retain

For the independent variable social mobility, the null hypothesis of equal proportions of mobile and non-mobile parents among the levels of the dependent variables: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school and desire for a traditional school were retained. The results are summarized in Table 4.26.

**TABLE 4.26**  
**SUMMARY OF RESULTS WITH SOCIAL MOBILITY AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE**

Dependent Variable	Hypotheses	Significance Level	Retain Reject
Responsiveness	$H_0: SM_{H_r} = SM_{L_r}$	.72	Retain
Effectiveness	$H_0: SM_{H_e} = SM_{L_e}$	.46	Retain
Discipline	$H_0: SM_{H_d} = SM_{L_d}$	.34	Retain
Traditional	$H_0: SM_{H_t} = SM_{L_t}$	.18	Retain



For the independent variable social class, the null hypothesis of equal proportions of each class among the levels of the dependent variables, responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school and discipline in the school were retained. The null hypothesis for the dependent variable desire for a traditional school was rejected. The results are summarized in Table 4.27.

**TABLE 4.27**  
**SUMMARY OF RESULTS WITH SOCIAL CLASS AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE**

Dependent Variable	Hypotheses	Significance Level	Retain Reject
Responsiveness	$H_0: SC_{H_r} = SC_{M_r} = SC_{L_r}$	.97	Retain
Effectiveness	$H_0: SC_{H_e} = SC_{M_e} = SC_{L_e}$	.71	Retain
Discipline	$H_0: SC_{H_d} = SC_{M_d} = SC_{L_d}$	.12	Retain
Traditional	$H_0: SC_{H_t} = SC_{M_t} = SC_{L_t}$	.05	Reject

For the independent variable religiosity, the null hypothesis of no differences between parents with high religiosity scores and low religiosity scores in terms of school system chosen was rejected. For the independent variable social mobility, the null hypothesis of no differences between parents with high social mobility and low social mobility in terms of school system chosen was retained. For the independent variable social class, the null hypothesis that the proportion of parents from each of the social classes (low, middle and high) that enrol their children in Public

and Separate schools is the same was retained. These results are summarized in Table 4.28.

The results of multiple regression analysis where the independent variables were analyzed in a stepwise regression with each of the dependent variables revealed one significant relationship. On the discipline index, the type of school the parent supports was the most important factor in explaining the discipline scores.

**TABLE 4.28**  
**SUMMARY OF RESULTS WITH TYPE OF SCHOOL AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE**

Independent Variable	Hypotheses	Significance Level	Retain Reject
Religiosity	$H_0: R_{H_p} = R_{H_s}$	.00	Reject
Social Mobility	$H_0: SM_{H_p} = SM_{H_s}$	.09	Retain
Social Class	$H_0: SC_{H_p} = SC_{H_s}$	.84	Retain
	$H_0: SC_{M_p} = SC_{M_s}$	.84	Retain
	$H_0: SC_{L_p} = SC_{L_s}$	.84	Retain

The sample, as a whole, viewed their schools in a similar manner except in discipline. Although the parents from the two school systems were separated on the religiosity index, religiosity bore no significant relationship to attitudes towards a school.

Neither the degree of social mobility nor the level of social class bore any relationship to attitudes towards the child's school. The only significant relationship in the

social class levels was a significant desire for a traditional school by upper class parents.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes that parents of elementary school children have toward their children's educational environment.

A forty-two statement questionnaire, designed to elicit attitudes toward responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school, and desire for a traditional school was developed, field tested, and delivered via two school systems to 410 parents. The purpose of the questionnaire was to systematically collect a set of data that could be used to describe parents' attitudes toward their school and to divide the parents into groups based on school support, social mobility, religiosity and social class.

The data from the questionnaires were used to determine if any significant relationships existed between: (1) type of school parents support and the four attitudes, (2) religiosity of the parents and the four attitudes, (3) social mobility of the parents and the four attitudes, (4) social class of the parents and the four attitudes. In addition,

the data were used to determine if there were any significant relationships between: (1) religiosity and type of school parents chose, (2) social mobility and type of school parents chose and (3) social class and type of school parents chose. Three hundred fourteen (77%) usable questionnaires were returned.

To measure attitudes toward school, indexes for each of the four dependent variables: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school, and desire for a traditional school were constructed from groups of questions believed to measure the same phenomenon. In a similar manner, religiosity and social class indexes were also constructed. For the social mobility index, the difference between the principal worker's job score (as determined by Duncan's Socioeconomic Index) and his father's job score was used to establish an index of social mobility.

Using the indexes and the type of school the parents enrolled their children in, the sample was divided in each of four different ways: (1) by school support--Public or Separate, (2) by religiosity--high or low, (3) by social mobility--high or low, (4) by social class--high, middle or low. The indexes for the dependent variables: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school, and desire for a traditional school were divided into five approximately equal levels ranging from very low to very high. Using these sets of indexes, comparisons of

the parents' attitudes toward schools were possible using the four independent variables. The relationships between type of school the children attend and (1) religiosity, (2) social mobility and (3) social class of the parents were also analyzed. The comparisons are given in Table 5.1.

**TABLE 5.1**  
**TYPES OF RELATIONSHIPS REPORTED**

Independent Variable		Dependent Variable	Degrees of Freedom	Number of Tables
School Choice	by	Responsiveness, Effectiveness, Discipline, Traditional	4	4
Religiosity	by	Responsiveness, Effectiveness, Discipline, Traditional	4	4
Social Mobility	by	Responsiveness, Effectiveness, Discipline, Traditional	4	4
Social Class	by	Responsiveness, Effectiveness, Discipline, Traditional	8,6	5
Religiosity	by	Type of School	1	1
Social Mobility	by	Type of School	1	1
Social Class	by	Type of School	2	1

For each of the tables the null hypothesis that equal proportions of parents would be divided among the levels of the dependent variables was tested. The chi-square value was used with a significance level set at .05.

## **Conclusions**

### **(1)**

This section of conclusions is related to the first group of hypotheses that dealt with school choice and the four attitudes towards school.

On the responsiveness index, which summarized the responses to five questions with a response pattern ranging from one through five with three being neutral, the mean score was 3.9, the mode 4.4. Parents rated their schools very highly on this index. A comparison of the responses between Public and Separate school parents on the responsiveness index revealed no significant differences at the .05 level.

The effectiveness index, which summarized the responses to five questions with a response pattern ranging from one through five with three being neutral, had a mean of 4.0, a mode of 4.0. A comparison of the responses between Public and Separate school parents on the effectiveness index revealed no significant differences at the .05 level.

On the discipline index, which summarized the responses to three questions with a response pattern of one through five with three being neutral, the mean was 3.9, the mode 4.0. A comparison of the responses between Public and Separate school parents on the discipline index revealed a significant difference at the .05 level. Separate school parents rated their schools higher on the discipline index

than did Public school parents.

The desire for a traditional school index, which summarized the responses to four questions with a response pattern ranging from one through five with three being neutral had a mean of 4.1, a mode of 4.0. A comparison of the responses between Public and Separate school parents revealed no significant differences at the .05 level.

A summary of the percentage of parents whose index scores were at the extreme ends (Very high, Very low) of the five point indexes is shown in Table 5.2. Significant differences at the .05 level are indicated.

**TABLE 5.2**  
**PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS BY SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THEIR VERY HIGH AND VERY LOW RATINGS ON EACH OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

Dependent Variable	Level	School System (% of n)		Significant Difference
		Public	Separate	
Responsiveness	Low	18	23	No
	High	19	17	
Effectiveness	Low	20	17	No
	High	15	16	
Discipline	Low	34	11	Yes
	High	16	18	
Traditional	Low	17	13	No
	High	17	25	

(2)

This section of the conclusions is related to the second group of hypotheses that dealt with religiosity, school choice, and the four attitudes towards school.



The religiosity index summarized the responses from five questions. Those whose scores fell in the bottom half (51%) were deemed to have low religiosity, those whose scores were in the top half (49.1%) were deemed to have high religiosity. On this index the mean was 2.75 and the mode 3.2.

Supporters of the Separate school system scored significantly higher on the religiosity index than did supporters of the Public school system. Sixty-one per cent (61%) of the Separate school parents fell into the high religiosity category as opposed to thirty-six per cent (36%) of the Public school parents. (Table 5.3).

**TABLE 5.3**  
**ENROLMENT PATTERNS AS RELATED TO RELIGIOSITY**

Type of School	Level of Religiosity (% of n)		n of Cases	Significant Difference
	Low	High		
Public	64	36	134	Yes
Separate	39	61	151	

For each of the attitudes towards schools, comparisons between parents of high and low religiosity revealed no significant differences at the .05 level. A summary of the percentage of parents whose index scores were at the extreme ends (Very high, Very low) of the five point indexes is shown in Table 5.4.

**TABLE 5.4**  
**PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS BY RELIGIOSITY AND THEIR VERY HIGH AND**  
**VERY LOW RATINGS ON EACH OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

Dependent Variable	Level	Religiosity (% of n)		Significant Difference
		Low	High	
Responsiveness	Very Low	18	21	No
	Very High	18	17	
Effectiveness	Very Low	19	16	No
	Very High	17	14	
Discipline	Very Low	25	16	No
	Very High	20	14	
Traditional	Very Low	17	15	No
	Very High	19	24	

Based on these results, degree of religiosity does not have any relationship to the attitudes a person has toward his child's school.

(3)

This section of conclusions is related to the third group of hypotheses that dealt with social mobility, school choice and the four attitudes towards school.

A social mobility index was established by using Duncan's Socioeconomic Index. From the principal wage earner's job score was subtracted the father's job score. The differences ranged from -68 to +87. Those parents whose mobility score was 0 or less (39%) were defined as non-mobile (low), those whose score was +1 or greater (61%), were defined as socially mobile (high). The mean score on the index was 11.1

People who are socially mobile (upward) tend to enrol their children in Separate schools. Fifty-six per cent (56%) of the mobile parents were Separate school supporters. Fifty-six per cent (56%) of the non-mobile parents were Public school supporters. These observations had a significance level of .06. The results are shown in Table 5.5.

**TABLE 5.5**  
**ENROLMENT PATTERNS AS RELATED TO SOCIAL MOBILITY**

Level of Mobility	Type of School (% of n)		n of Cases	Significant Difference
	Public	Separate		
Low	56	44	116	No
High	44	56	181	

On each of the four attitudes towards schools, comparisons between parents of high and low social mobility

**TABLE 5.6**  
**PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS BY MOBILITY LEVEL AND THEIR VERY HIGH AND VERY LOW RATINGS ON EACH OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

Dependent Variable	Level	Mobility Level (% of n)		Significant Difference
		Low	High	
Responsiveness	Very Low Very High	22 16	19 19	No
Effectiveness	Very Low Very High	17 16	19 16	No
Discipline	Very Low Very High	26 18	20 16	No
Traditional	Very Low Very High	19 19	11 23	No

revealed no significant differences at the .05 level.

A summary of the percentage of parents in each mobility level whose index scores were at the extreme ends (Very high, Very low) of the five point indexes is shown in Table 5.6. A tendency for the socially mobile to desire a traditional school exists but the significance level is .18.

(4)

This section of conclusions is related to the fourth group of hypotheses that dealt with social class, school choice and the four attitudes towards school.

A social class index was established by combining the results of two questions, - one, a self evaluation of class position, the other, the highest level of formal education attained. The index was divided into three parts - lower class 23%, middle class 49% and upper class 28%.

Parents enroled their children in the two school systems in almost exactly the same proportion as the classes were divided. (Table 5.7.)

**TABLE 5.7**  
**PROPORTIONS OF PARENTS IN EACH SCHOOL SYSTEM BY CLASS**

Type of School	Social Class Level (% of n)			n of Cases	Significant Difference
	Low	Middle	High		
Public	22	51	27	146	No
Separate	24	48	28	151	

Comparisons between parents of different classes revealed no significant differences on the responsiveness, effectiveness and discipline indexes at the .05 level. The higher the social class of the parents, the greater was the desire for a traditional school. The desire for a traditional school was statistically significant at the .05 level. A summary of the percentage of parents at each social class level whose index scores were at the extreme ends (Very high, Very low) of the five point indexes is shown in Table 5.8.

**TABLE 5.8**  
**PERCENTAGE OF PARENTS AT EACH SOCIAL CLASS LEVEL WHOSE**  
**SCORES ARE VERY HIGH OR VERY LOW ON EACH OF THE DEPENDENT**  
**VARIABLES**

Dependent Variable	Level	Social Class Level (% of n)			Significant Difference
		Low	Middle	High	
Responsiveness	Very Low Very High	20 18	22 15	20 17	No
Effectiveness	Very Low Very High	18 14	16 17	25 12	No
Discipline	Very Low Very High	29 21	16 21	30 8	No
Traditional	Very Low Very High	3 30	4 33	1 39	Yes

### Discussion

The purpose of this research was to investigate the attitudes parents of elementary school children have toward their children's educational environment. This study was to determine if attitudes towards schools bore any relationship

to type of school chosen, religiosity, social mobility or social class. The four attitudes measured were: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school, discipline in the school, and the desire for a traditional school. The study was also to determine if there was any relationship between the type of school chosen and the three variables religiosity, social mobility and social class.

On two of the three attitudes that were related to the child's school, parents from the two school systems viewed their schools in a very similar manner. Parents saw the schools as being responsive to their educational wishes. When a problem existed between home and school, parents believed they received a fair hearing. Schools are effectively educating their children. Parents viewed the teachers as being well trained for the job, doing an effective job of teaching, and being dedicated to their work.

This finding on the effectiveness index is similar to the conclusion reached by Alexander and Pallas after a re-examination of the data from High School Achievement Public Catholic and Private Schools Compared by Coleman et al. Their conclusion was contradictory to Coleman's finding. They stated:

We stand by our original conclusion: there is little reason to think Catholic schools are superior to public schools in promoting high levels of cognitive performance.<sup>1</sup>

A traditional school with tight discipline, clearly defined standards, teacher centred and a common set of goals for all was strongly desired by all parents. If these characteristics can be described as educational values, then the results of this investigation indicate that the majority of parents in the sample share the same set of educational values. A shared commitment to educational values by Catholic school supporters has been used to explain the success of Catholic schools in America.<sup>2</sup> The results of this study in Ontario indicate that a desire for a "traditional school" and the "importance of standards" is not exclusive to the supporters of one system.

The only point of difference between Public school and Separate school parents was in the area of discipline. Separate school parents rated their schools significantly ( $p < .05$ ) higher on the discipline index than did Public school parents. Respect for teachers, the following of rules and general level of student discipline were all rated higher by Separate school parents than by Public school parents.

These results create somewhat of an anomaly. Public school parents believed their schools offered effective teaching but gave their schools less than top grades in discipline in comparison with Separate school parents. The comment section of the questionnaire revealed a concern by Separate school parents about the method of discipline used

by the teachers. Based on this sample, it may be said that Separate school parents believe their schools have strong discipline but have some reservations about the methods used to maintain the level of discipline and that Public school parents believe their schools have good discipline and are satisfied with the means used to maintain the discipline level.

The difference found between Separate school and Public school supporters on the discipline index was consistent with Coleman's finding in American secondary schools where his research indicated that Catholic schools had stricter discipline standards than public schools. Like Coleman's other findings, these results did not go unchallenged. Rossi and Wright noted:

...there are remarkably few measurements of discipline, consisting of a handful of items asking students for example, to describe their views of discipline in their schools as "effective" or "ineffective."<sup>3</sup>

The comparisons between Public and Separate school supporters on the attitude indexes tend to confirm the belief of Erickson that a loss of jeopardy (financial worry) would result in parents rating their respective schools in a similar manner. Perhaps more than a strongly emphasized religious instructional tone is necessary to convince Separate school parents that "their" children's school is more effective and responsive than a public school.



The religious community evident in the Separate system and the effect of voluntarism on its supporters has frequently led to the assumption that supporters of the Separate school system would see their schools as highly responsive and effective. The results from this research indicated that they did see their schools as responsive and effective but not at a significantly different level than Public school supporters saw their schools.

The similarity of attitudes is intriguing considering the advantages of the Separate system in terms of clientele. Alexander and Pallas in discussing the results of High School Achievement were also intrigued by the lack of significant differences between Public and Catholic high schools. They wrote:

Rather than persist in the elusive quest for substantial Catholic school effects on cognitive performance, a more constructive agenda for the future might be to ponder why Catholic schools do not outpace public schools by the sort of margin that their many advantages seem to anticipate.<sup>4</sup>

Separate school supporters (predominantly Roman Catholic) are more religious than Public school supporters. Degree of religiosity did not bear any relationship to the attitudes parents had toward their respective schools. Religiosity may bear a relationship to other social attitudes, but in this sample it did not bear a relationship to the attitudes parents have toward their child's elementary school.

One of the major criticisms of Coleman et al. in High School Achievement has been their failure to include the background variables of religion and religiosity. Rossi and Wright wrote:

....they (Catholic schools) may also represent a positive choice for religiously suffused education. Should not religiosity and religious values of parents and children also be measured?<sup>5</sup>

The results of this study indicate that the omission of religiosity by Coleman et al. may not have been as serious as some critics believe.

Social mobility, like religiosity, may bear a relationship to other social attitudes but in this sample it did not bear a relationship toward the attitudes parents have towards their child's elementary school.

Level of social class did not differentiate parents on three attitudes: responsiveness of the school, effectiveness of the school and discipline in the school. On the fourth attitude measured, desire for a traditional school, the higher the social class the greater the desire for a traditional school. The traditional school is defined as one that is teacher centred, with strict discipline and clearly defined and agreed upon goals and standards. The desire of the higher social classes for a more traditional school, while it is statistically significant, should be regarded as tentative only. The low reliability of both indexes in the relationship and the non support of the

"desire" in the regression analysis considerably reduce the level of certainty associated with this finding.

#### Summary

In an environment where two school systems are subject to the same governmental rules for their curriculum, whose teachers are subject to the same licensing rules, whose salary schedules are comparable, where tuition fees are minimal or non-existent but where the major difference is the religious basis for instruction, this sample indicates that parents will express similar attitudes toward their schools. The parents see their schools as being responsive to their concerns, effective in their role, and as having good discipline. Supporters of the Separate school system rate their schools higher on discipline than Public school supporters rate their schools. It could be argued that this represents an opinion that was prevalent when the nuns were present in large numbers in the Separate schools. While the Separate schools rate their schools high on the discipline index, they appear to have concerns about the methods of discipline used.

Effectiveness of a school system does not seem to be related to discipline. Public school supporters rate their schools as effective as Separate school supporters but give their schools lower ratings on the discipline index.

Religiosity and social mobility bore no relationship to the attitudes parents had toward schools.

Social class bore no relationship to the attitude parents had toward their child's school but, the higher the social class the greater the desire for a traditional type of school environment.

### **Implications For Future Research**

Future research in this environment may investigate the matter of discipline in the two school systems. This research could be directed at parents, teachers, principals and ministry personnel who have access to both school systems. Attitudes and impressions about, and the use of: corporal punishment, isolation practices, suspensions, behavior modification and other forms of discipline could form the focus for such an investigation.

A second area of research could be in the effectiveness of the school. Since the Separate schools devote one-half hour per day to religious studies (837 hours in the elementary school life of a child), what discernible affect does this have on students, and on other areas of the curriculum? Comparative investigations into student attitudes, moral concepts and achievement levels at the Grade VIII level could be the basis for this research.

A third area of investigation could be the refinement of the questionnaire and its reuse with another sample. The low reliability of the social class, discipline and traditional indexes indicate that these measures must be improved before the questionnaire is reused. In its present form it

can be described as a test model that needs to be reworked in certain areas.

A fourth area of investigation could be the use of the improved questionnaire with parents of Private school, Public school, and Separate school children. A comparison of attitudes could then be undertaken. Interest in Private schools has increased as their growth has become associated with declines in Public school enrolment. In Ontario, Private schools have increased 49% in the period 1972-3 to 1982-3, Public schools have declined 15% over the same period.

ENDNOTES      CHAPTER V

<sup>1</sup>Karl L. Alexander and Aaron Pallas, "In Defense of 'Private Schools and Public Policy': Reply to Kilgore," Sociology of Education, 57 (January, 1984), p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>Chester E. Finn Jr., "Why Public and Private Schools Matter," Harvard Educational Review, 51 (1981), pp. 510-18.

<sup>3</sup>Peter H. Rossi and James D. Wright, "Best Schools - Better Discipline or Better Students? A Review of High School Achievement," American Journal of Education, 91 (November, 1982), p. 82.

<sup>4</sup>Karl L. Alexander and Aaron M. Pallas, "School Sector and Cognitive Performance: When Is Little a Little?" Sociology of Education, 58 (April, 1985), p. 127.

<sup>5</sup>Peter H. Rossi and James D. Wright, op. cit., p. 86.

## **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A

### Field Test Questionnaire

Appendix A contains a copy of the field test questionnaire which was used in July of 1984.



**Parents' Attitudes About Their Elementary School**

Dear Parents:

I am presently engaged in a research project to determine what parents think of their elementary school and schools in general. Permission to distribute this questionnaire through the schools has been received from the Director of Education. I recognize that questionnaires require time to complete. I hope you will find this questionnaire **about yourself (Part I) your child's school (Part II) and schools in general (Part III)** interesting. I anticipate it will provide information of value to our understanding of schools and what parents think of them. Because of the personal nature of some of the questions, individual responses will **NOT** be reported. Confidentiality is assured.

Please do not put any distinguishing marks on this questionnaire. **You, as an individual will not be identified.** Neither you, nor your school will be identified in reporting the results of this study.

This study is based on a carefully selected random sample of schools such as yours. The return of the questionnaire is, therefore, essential for this study.

Following this is a three-part questionnaire. Each part is preceded with specific directions.

Please return the questionnaire, **SEALED** in the enclosed envelope to the school.

Sincerely

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 2

### Part I

It is important to have background information on the people who are responding to the questionnaire.

**PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOU.**

1. What type of elementary (k-8) school do your children attend?

Public	1
Separate	2
Children in both systems	3

2. What is your religious preference?

Protestant	1
Roman Catholic	2
Other _____	3
(Specify)	
No religious preference	4

3. What is your husband's/wife's religious preference?

Protestant	1
Roman Catholic	2
Other _____	3
(Specify)	
No religious preference	4
Not applicable	5

4. To which school system do you direct your municipal tax support?

Public	1
Separate	2
Don't Know	3

5. How often do you attend religious services?

Once a week or more	1
1-3 times a month	2
Several times a year	3
Almost never	4
Not applicable	5

6. How long have you been practising your religion?

Less than 1 year	1
1-2 years	2
3-5 years	3
5 or more years	4
Not applicable	5

7. Think of five close friends. How many of them are members of your church?

None	1
One	2
Two	3
Three	4
Four	5
Five	6

8. How would you rate your participation in church activities?

Very active	1
Active	2
Help when I can	3
Occasionally participate	4
Seldom participate	5
Never participate	6

9. Considering your income, do you feel your contributions to the church are:

A considerable amount	1
A moderate amount	2
A little	3
A meager amount	4

10. What do you ? (Be specific about your job, ie., salesperson in a department store, but do not give the name of the company).

---



---



---

11. What did your father do when you were in High School? (Again, be specific).

---



---



---

12. Does your husband/wife work outside the home?

Yes	1
No	2
Not applicable	3

13. What does he/she do? (Again, be specific)

---



---



---

14. What did your husband's/wife's father do when he/she was in high school? (Again, be specific)

---



---



---

15. Students are often given the grades A, B, C, D and Fail to denote the quality of their work. Suppose that the school your children attend now was graded in the same way. What grade would you give your child's elementary school?

A	1
B	2
C	3
D	4
Fail	5

16. As a general rule, how important do you think it is for young people to marry a member of their own religion?

Very important	1
Fairly important	2
Not important at all	3

17. If you were asked to use one of the following names for your social class, which would you say you belonged to?

Upper class	1
Upper middle class	2
Lower middle class	3
Working class	4
Lower class	5
Can't say	6
Deny there are classes	7

18. Which of these was the last school you graduated from?

Public/Grade School	1
Secondary School	2
Community College	3
University	4
No formal schooling	5
Other _____	6
(specify)	

19. In comparison to other people your age, how do you feel you are doing economically and socially?

Very much better	1
Better	2
Same	3
Worse	4
Very much worse	5

20. Thinking generally about your neighborhood, how satisfied are you with it?

Very satisfied	1
Satisfied	2
Dissatisfied	3
Very dissatisfied	4

21. As a general rule, how important do you think it is for your children to have a university education to be successful?

Very important	1
Important	2
Unimportant	3
Of no importance	4

22. How long has your child (children) attended this school? (i.e. 1 month, 4 years, etc.)

---

**PART II****Your School**

Thirteen statements about schools are on the following pages. You are asked to respond to each one as a separate statement. Although some items may seem similar, they express differences that are important in describing how you feel about Your School.

There are no right or wrong answers. The purpose of the statements is to make it possible for you to describe as accurately as you can Your Child's School, or your feeling about That School.

**Directions:**

1. Read each item carefully.
2. Decide whether you (1) have no basis for opinion (2) strongly agree (3) tend to agree (4) neither agree nor disagree (neutral) (5) tend to disagree (6) strongly disagree.
3. Draw a circle around one of the six numbers 1,2,3,4,5,6 following the item to show the answer you have selected:

1 = no basis for opinion

2 = strongly agree

3 = tend to agree

4 = neither agree nor disagree  
(neutral)

5 = tend to disagree

6 = strongly disagree

Part II (cont'd)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	No Basis For Opinion	Strongly Agree	Tend To Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree (Neutral)	Tend To Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The students seem to have a lot of respect for the teachers in this school.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
2. The school this child attends is trying to do too many things all at once, rather than doing a few things well.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
3. This school does a lot of things that I wish it would not do.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
4. When the school does things I do not like, I feel powerless to do anything about it.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
5. Getting ahead depends on who you know more than how well you do something.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
6. The Principal and teachers in this school don't pay much attention to what parents think.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
7. The rate of student learning is above average in this school, in comparison with most other schools.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
8. In my opinion, this school is making good use of the money it gets.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
9. It seems to me that student discipline is better in this school than in most other schools.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
10. This child's teacher seems to try very hard to do a good job.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
11. When I see how dedicated many teachers are in this school, I feel I must do my best to help out.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
12. Almost all teachers at this school seem very well trained for the jobs they do.					1 2 3 4 5 6	
13. The following of rules and regulations by students is important in this school.					1 2 3 4 5 6	

**PART III****School In General**

The following seven items are extreme statements about schools in general. You are asked to respond to each one as a separate statement. Although some items may seem similar, they express differences that are important in describing how you feel schools should be organized. There are no right or wrong answers. The purpose of the comparisons is to give you a clear choice to make it possible for you to express your feeling about these school issues.

These statements apply to your feelings about SCHOOLS IN GENERAL.

If you agree with the first statement, please circle number 1 under it.

If you agree with the second statement, please circle number 5 under it.

If you are somewhere in between, please circle either the middle number (3) or one of the numbers nearest to (1) or (5).

**PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ONLY**

1. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where students learn practical things they can use when they get out of school (like Woodworking and Cooking).

OR

A school where students study academic subjects most of the time (like Mathematics and English).

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

2. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where students generally learn at an easy rate.

OR

A school where students are constantly pushed and challenged to learn rapidly.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5



**PART III - Schools in General (cont'd)**

3. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A "strict school" where students were tightly disciplined.

OR

A "free school" where students could act naturally

1

2

3

4

5

4. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where students took only the most basic academic subjects until they really learned them.

OR

A school where students took a wide variety of subjects, even before they mastered any of them.

1

2

3

4

5

5. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where the teacher decided what the students would learn most of the time.

OR

A school where the students could choose what they wanted to learn most of the time.

1

2

3

4

5

6. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where a wide range of behaviour is considered morally acceptable.

OR

A school where a clearly defined position is taken on what is moral.

1

2

3

4

5

7. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where teachers and administrators are pretty free to "do their own thing"

OR

A school where a definite set of goals and methods is pursued by everyone.

1

2

3

4

5

**THANK YOU**

Comments:

---



---



---



---



---

## APPENDIX B

### Final Questionnaire

Appendix B contains a copy of the cover letter and the forty-two (42) questions used in the final questionnaire which was distributed to parents in September 1984.

## ATTITUDES ABOUT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

I am presently engaged in a research project to determine what parents think of their child's elementary school and schools in general. In order to provide a better education for your children, it is important for policy makers, principals and teachers to know what parents think of their child's school. Information is required in order to better understand and improve your school system. A summary of the results from all questionnaires will be forwarded to the Director of Education and each principal. The Director of Education has given permission for distribution of the questionnaires through the schools.

I recognize that questionnaires require time to complete. I hope you will find this questionnaire **about yourself (Part I), your child's school (Part II), and elementary schools in general (Part III)** interesting. Because of the personal nature of the questions, individual responses will **NOT** be reported. Confidentiality is assured.

Please do not put any distinguishing marks on the questionnaire. **You as an individual will not be identified.** Neither you nor your school will be identified in reporting the results of this research. If you have any questions about the questionnaire, please contact me.

This study is based on a carefully selected random sample of parents such as you. The return of this questionnaire is, therefore, essential for this study.

Please send the questionnaire, **sealed in the enclosed envelope, to the school with your child.**

All envelopes remain sealed until opened for keypunching purposes.

Sincerely

PAGE NICOLSON, Principal Researcher  
Elementary School Vice-Principal

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 2

### Part I

It is important to have background information on the people who are responding to the questionnaire.

**PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOU.**

1. What type of elementary (k-8) school do your children attend?

Public	1
Separate	2
Children in both systems	3

2. What is your religious preference?

Protestant	1
Roman Catholic	2
Other _____	3
(Specify)	
No religious preference	4

3. What is your husband's/wife's religious preference?

Protestant	1
Roman Catholic	2
Other _____	3
(Specify)	
No religious preference	4
Not applicable	5

4. To which school system do you direct your municipal tax support?

Public	1
Separate	2
Don't Know	3

5. How often do you attend church?

Once a week or more	1
1-3 times a month	2
Several times a year	3
Almost never	4
Not applicable	5

6. How long have you been a member of your current church?

Less than 1 year	1
1-2 years	2
3-5 years	3
5 or more years	4
Not applicable	5

7. What do you do? (Be specific about your job, i.e., salesperson in a department store, but do not give the name of the company).

---

---

---

8. What did your father do when you were in High School? (Again, be specific. If father deceased or not in home, write in his usual occupation before he left home).

---

---

---

9. Does your husband/wife work outside the home?

Yes	1
No	2
Not applicable	3

(If No or Not applicable go to Question #12)

10. What does he/she do? (Again, be specific)

---

---

---

11. What did your husband's/wife's father do when he/she was in high school? (Again, be specific)

---

---

---

12. Think of five close friends. How many of them are members of your church?

None	1
One	2
Two	3
Three	4
Four	5
Five	6

13. How would you rate your participation in church activities?

Very active	1
Active	2
Help when I can	3
Occasionally participate	4
Seldom participate	5
Never participate	6

14. Considering your income, do you feel your contributions to the church are:

A considerable amount	1
A moderate amount	2
A little	3
A meager amount	4

15. Students are often given the grades A, B, C, D and Fail to denote the quality of their work. Suppose that the school your children attend now was graded in the same way. What grade would you give your child's elementary school?

A	1
B	2
C	3
D	4
Fail	5

16. As a general rule, how important do you think it is for young people to marry a member of their own religion?

Very important	1
Fairly important	2
Not important at all	3

17. If you were asked to use one of the following names for your social class, which would you say you belonged to?

Lower class	1
Working class	2
Lower Middle class	3
Middle class	4
Upper Middle class	5
Upper class	6

18. Which of these was the last school you graduated from?

No formal schooling	1
Public/Grade School	2
Secondary School	3
Community College	4
University	5
Other _____	6
(specify)	

19. In comparison to other people your age, how do you feel you are doing economically and socially?

Very much better	1
Better	2
Same	3
Worse	4
Very much worse	5

20. Thinking generally about your neighborhood, how satisfied are you with it?

Very satisfied	1
Satisfied	2
Somewhat satisfied	3
Dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5

21. As a general rule, how important do you think it is for your children to have a university education to be successful?

Great importance	1
Very important	2
Somewhat important	3
Slightly important	4
Not important at all	5

22. How long has your child (children) attended this school? (i.e. 1 month, 4 years, etc.)

---

**PART II**  
**Your School**

Thirteen statements about schools are on the following pages. You are asked to respond to each one as a separate statement. Although some items may seem similar, they express differences that are important in describing how you feel about Your School.

There are no right or wrong answers. The purpose of the statements is to make it possible for you to describe as accurately as you can Your Child's School, or your feeling about That School.

**Directions:**

1. Read each item carefully.
2. Decide whether you (5) strongly agree (4) tend to agree (3) neither agree nor disagree (neutral) (2) tend to disagree (1)strongly disagree (0) no basis for opinion
3. Draw a circle around one of the six numbers 0,1,2,3,4,5, following the item to show the answer you have selected:

5 = strongly agree

4 = tend to agree

3 = neither agree nor disagree  
(neutral)

2 = tend to disagree

1 = strongly disagree

0 = no basis for opinion



Part II (cont'd)

	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Strongly Agree	Tend To Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree (Neutral)	Tend To Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Basis For Opinion
1. The students seem to have a lot of respect for the teachers in this school.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
2. The school this child attends is trying to do too many things all at once, rather than doing a few things well.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
3. This school does a lot of things that I wish it would not do.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
4. When the school does things I do not like, I feel powerless to do anything about it.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
5. Getting ahead depends on who you know more than how well you do something.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
6. The Principal and teachers in this school don't pay much attention to what parents think.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
7. The rate of student learning is above average in this school, in comparison with most other schools.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
8. In my opinion, this school is making good use of the money it gets.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
9. It seems to me that student discipline is better in this school than in most other schools.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
10. This child's teacher seems to try very hard to do a good job.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
11. When I see how dedicated many teachers are in this school, I feel I must do my best to help out.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
12. Almost all teachers at this school seem very well trained for the jobs they do.					5 4 3 2 1 0	
13. The following of rules and regulations by students is important in this school.					5 4 3 2 1 0	

**PART III****School In General**

The following seven items are extreme statements about schools in general. You are asked to respond to each one as a separate statement. Although some items may seem similar, they express differences that are important in describing how you feel schools should be organized. There are no right or wrong answers. The purpose of the comparisons is to give you a clear choice to make it possible for you to express your feeling about these school issues.

These statements apply to your feelings about SCHOOLS IN GENERAL.

If you agree with the first statement, please circle number 1 under it.

If you agree with the second statement, please circle number 5 under it.

If you are somewhere in between, please circle either the middle number (3) or one of the numbers nearest to (1) or (5).

**PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ONLY**

1. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where students learn practical things they can use when they get out of school (like Woodworking and Cooking).

OR

A school where students study academic subjects most of the time (like Mathematics and English).

1

2

3

4

5

2. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where students generally learn at an easy rate.

OR

A school where students are constantly pushed and challenged to learn rapidly.

1

2

3

4

5

**PART III - Schools in General (cont'd)**

3. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A "strict school" where  
students were tightly  
disciplined.

OR

A "free school" where  
students could act  
naturally

1

2

3

4

5

4. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where students  
took only the most basic  
academic subjects until  
they really learned them.

OR

A school where students  
took a wide variety of  
subjects, even before they  
mastered any of them.

1

2

3

4

5

5. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where the teacher  
decided what the students  
would learn most of the  
time.

OR

A school where the stu-  
dents could choose what  
they wanted to learn  
most of the time.

1

2

3

4

5

6. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where a wide range  
of behaviour is considered  
morally acceptable.

OR

A school where a clearly  
defined position is  
taken on what is moral.

1

2

3

4

5

7. Which school would you prefer or at least lean towards?

A school where teachers and  
administrators are pretty  
free to "do their own thing"

OR

A school where a definite  
set of goals and methods  
is pursued by everyone.

1

2

3

4

5

**THANK YOU**

Comments:

---



---



---



---



---

## APPENDIX C

Appendix C contains copies of correspondence to and from the two Directors of Education relating to this research. These include formal permission to conduct the study, information updates, and a follow-up letter from the Director of the Public Board to the parents.

**COPY OF LETTER FROM DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BOARD**

1984 05 08

Mr. Page N. Nicolson

Dear Mr. Nicolson:

This letter will constitute permission to proceed with distribution in the public schools of questionnaires related to your Doctoral thesis. It is understood that the questionnaires will be sent home to parents of students in Grades 3 and 8 and that they will relate to "a study of the attitude parents have toward their child's elementary school and relationship of those attitudes to religious conviction and social mobility". It is further understood that the parents will be asked not to identify themselves through the questionnaires and that the schools will not be identified in your report.

If I can be of any additional assistance in your project please feel free to ask.

Yours sincerely

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & SECRETARY

1984 05 09

**COPY OF LETTER FROM SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR**

Mr. P. Nicolson

Dear Mr. Nicolson:

Please be advised that permission is granted to conduct research in the schools of the Roman Catholic Separate School Board in relation to your doctoral thesis,

A Study of the Attitude of Parents  
Toward Their Child's Elementary  
School and the Relationship of Those  
Attitudes to Religious Convictions and  
Social Mobility.

I wish you success in your very interesting undertaking.

Sincerely yours

Director of Education

80 Fort Creek Drive  
SAULT STE. MARIE, ONTARIO  
P6C 5T9

1984 09 13

**COPY OF LETTER TO DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BOARD**

Dear Sir:

Information Update Re:

**A Study of the Attitude Parents have Towards Their Child's  
Elementary School and the Relationship of Those Attitudes to  
Religious Conviction and Social Mobility**

A presentation regarding the purpose of the study and the process by which the questionnaires are to be distributed was made at the Elementary School Principals' Meeting on September 6, 1984. Co-operation on the part of the principals was excellent.

The questionnaires relating to the study will be sent to over two hundred (200) parents in the Public System on Thursday, September 20, 1984.

A summary of the results will be made available to you and the principals in January 1985.

Yours very truly

N.PAGE NICOLSON

NPN:em

Enclosure (2)

80 Fort Creek Drive  
SAULT STE. MARIE, ONTARIO  
P6C 5T9

1984 09 13

**COPY OF LETTER TO SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD DIRECTOR**

Dear Sir:

Information Update Re:

**A Study of the Attitude Parents have Towards Their Child's  
Elementary School and the Relationship of Those Attitudes to  
Religious Conviction and Social Mobility**

Over the past week, I have visited each Separate School and explained the purpose of the study and the process by which the questionnaires are to be distributed to parents. Co-operation on the part of the principals was excellent.

The questionnaires relating to the study will be sent to over two hundred (200) parents in the Separate System on Thursday, September 20, 1984.

At your next Principals' Meeting, I would be happy to answer any questions/concerns about the study. I will be out of town September 17 and 18, 1984.

A summary of the results of the study will be made available to you and the principals in January 1985.

Yours very truly

N. PAGE NICOLSON

NPN:em

Enclosure (2)



TO: PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS 1984 09 21  
FROM: DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

**COPY OF NOTE SENT TO PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**

**IMPORTANT**

Re: Page Nicolson's Survey

Please see that the attached letters are sent home in envelopes to the parents to whom the survey was sent. Would you take steps to see that no pressure is put on any student to have the survey returned.

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

Attachments

1984 09 24

**COPY OF LETTER SENT TO PUBLIC SCHOOL PARENTS BY  
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BOARD**

Dear Parent

Last week you received a survey related to attitudes about elementary schools. There has been some misunderstanding about the survey and I would like to allay any concerns in that regard.

That survey is not Board or School sponsored and your participation in it is purely voluntary. Distribution on a randomly selected basis was permitted because it is a project of a staff member now engaged in educational research and is part of the requirements for obtaining a doctoral degree. If you are interested in helping in the research then of course complete the survey and return it, unidentified, as requested. If you prefer not to participate then please destroy the survey. There will be no follow-up from the school and your child will not be asked about returning the envelope.

Yours truly

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

#### APPENDIX D

Appendix D contains copies of the notification letter and the thank you letter to parents who received the questionnaire.

**ATTITUDES ABOUT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

September 14, 1984

Dear Parents

You are one of a small group of parents selected from your elementary school to complete a questionnaire about your school. On Thursday, September 20th, 1984, your son/daughter will be bringing home a survey for you to complete.

This survey is part of a doctoral research project designed to provide information to the policy makers and principals of your school system. Information will be calculated on a system wide basis **NOT** on a per school basis. **Individual responses will be confidential.**

Since only a small number of parents from each school are being contacted, it is very important that you complete your survey and send it back to the school with your child.

Your opinion counts!!

**SURVEY DAY ---- SEPTEMBER 20, 1984**

If for some reason you don't receive a survey on Thursday, please contact the school.

Sincerely

N. PAGE NICOLSON  
Principal Researcher  
Elementary School Vice-Principal

ATTITUDES ABOUT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

September 24, 1984

Dear Parents

On Thursday you should have received a school attitude questionnaire. If you have completed your questionnaire and have sent it back to school with your child -- Thank you.

If you have not completed the questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. Since only a few parents have been selected to report from each school, it is important to have all the questionnaires returned.

If you did not receive a questionnaire on Thursday, please telephone the school in order to receive a questionnaire. Your opinion is important to the policy makers of your school system and the researcher.

A summary of the results of the questionnaire will be available in January 1985. If you would like a copy of the summary, please contact me in January.

Sincerely

N. PAGE NICOLSON  
Principal Researcher  
Elementary School Vice-Principal

## APPENDIX E

Appendix E contains copies of the introductory letter,  
and the instructional letter sent to the principals.

PARENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT THEIR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Sept. 5, 1984

Dear Principal

I am asking for your cooperation in distributing a questionnaire to a few parents in your school area. The questionnaire deals with parents' ideas on school discipline, school responsiveness to their concerns and how effective they see their school. There are also a number of questions relating to the sociological background of the parents. Permission to distribute the questionnaire via the schools has been received from the Director of Education.

As we all realize, parental support of the school is an important factor in a child's success and necessary for a successful school. Parents' ideas about our schools are the topic of much speculation but not a great deal of research. The results of this research on a system wide basis, in addition to being used as part of a dissertation will be sent to you in January 1985. **Individual or school responses are confidential and will NOT be reported.**

On a **RANDOM** basis a few parents from each school will be asked to complete a questionnaire. Your cooperation in sending out the notification letter, the questionnaire and the follow-up letter is essential. The more questionnaires returned the more accurate results will be.

It is hoped that the results will provide insight and understanding into how parents view schools. The information will be of value to those administrators and principals who are responsible for organizing schools.

In order to select the parents who will receive a questionnaire, two (2) alphabetized lists are required -- one for Grade III and one for Grade VIII. Next week each school will receive a packet complete with instructions, letters and questionnaires.

Thank you.

N. PAGE NICOLSON  
PRINCIPAL RESEARCHER  
Elementary School Vice-Principal

## PARENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT THEIR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Dear Principal

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to provide information of value to you, your school system and me. Permission to distribute the questionnaire to parents via the school system has been received from the Director of Education. The results on a system wide basis will be reported to each principal. Your cooperation for a successful, meaningful report is essential.

Please follow the instructions for distributing the questionnaire carefully. If you have any questions, please telephone me.

1. You will need an alphabetical list of the entire Grade III and the entire GradeVIII class.
2. In the packet, locate the address labels in multiples of three (3).
3. On the Grade III list locate the \_\_\_\_\_ names. Enter each parent's name on three labels. Thus Mrs. Rosebud will have her name on three (3) labels.
4. On the Grade VIII list locate the \_\_\_\_\_ names. Enter each parent's name on three (3) labels.
5. From each set of three labels, place one label on the blue note, one on the yellow and the third on the small brown envelope.
6. On Friday;, September 14, 1984, have the students whose names were selected in Grade III and Grade VIII take the yellow sheet home. (Notification Letter).
7. On Thursday, September 20, 1984, please send the brown envelope home. (The questionnaire).
8. On Monday, September 24, 1984, send the blue sheet home. (Reminder and Thank you Note).
9. Put all returned questionnaires in the large brown envelope and return it to the Board Office in the September 26 courier. Please leave the questionnaires sealed in their envelopes.
10. Any questionnaires sent in after September 25 can also be forwarded to me via the courier.

If you have any questions about this process, please contact me.

I appreciate your time and cooperation in distributing and collecting the questionnaire.

Sincerely

N. PAGE NICOLSON  
Principal Researcher  
Elementary School Vice-Principal.



## APPENDIX F

Appendix F contains the factor analysis of sets of variables.

# **FACTOR ANALYSIS OF VARIABLES BY CONCEPT PAIRS**

Question Number	Question Precis	Factor 1	Factor 2
<b>Religion and Effectiveness</b>			
A5	attendance at religious services	.89	.03
A6	years active religiously	.43	.14
A12	number of religious friends	.53	.06
A13	participation in church activities	.67	.02
A14	monetary contributions	.66	.01
A16	importance of one religion in marriage	.63	.18
A15	school report card grade	-.00	.44
B7	student learning	-.02	.13
B8	school use of money	.08	.38
B10	teacher hard work	.08	.44
B11	teacher dedication	.06	.68
B12	teacher training	.13	.63
<b>Social Class and Discipline</b>			
A17	social class level	.05	.53
A18	highest education level	-.21	.53
A19	economic comparison	.06	.11
A20	neighborhood satisfaction	.19	.16
A21	importance of university education	.19	.22
B1	student respect for teachers	.64	.03
B9	student discipline	.45	.14
B13	school rules important	.57	.04
<b>Social Class and Desire for a Traditional School</b>			
			(Factor 3)
A17	social class level	.03	.51
A18	highest education level	.02	.50
A19	economic comparison	.02	.04
A20	neighborhood satisfaction	.03	-.00
A21	importance of university education	.08	.17
C1	desired academics	.24	.22
C2	desired challenging pace	.14	.24
C3	desired "tight" discipline	.55	.19
C4	desired "core" curriculum	.19	-.02
C5	desired teacher centred	.53	-.07
C6	desired clear moral stand	.48	.09
C7	desired common goals	.31	.02

**FACTOR ANALYSIS OF VARIABLES BY CONCEPT PAIRS**

Question Number	Question Precis	Factor 1	Factor 2
	Discipline and Responsiveness		
B1	student respect for teachers	.19	.17
B13	school rules important	.19	.44
B9	student discipline	.04	.47
B2	school does a few activities well	.50	.20
B3	school does what I like	.72	.13
B4	have power in school decisions	.60	.07
B5	success dependent on ability	.57	.10
B6	staff listens to ideas	.64	.26

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, T.W.; Frenkel-Brunswick, Else; Levinson, Daniel J.; and Stanford, R. Nevitt. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.
- Alexander, Karl L., and Pallas, Aaron. "In Defense of 'Private Schools and Public Policy': Reply to Kilgore." Sociology of Education, 57 (January, 1984), pp. 56-58.
- Alexander, Karl L., and Pallas, Aaron. "School Sector and Cognitive Performance: When Is Little a Little?" Sociology of Education, 58 (April, 1985), pp. 115-128.
- Allport, Gordon, W. "Attitudes." Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. Edited by Martin Fishbein. New York: John Wiley and Sons., 1967.
- Alwin, Duane, F. "The Use of Factor Analysis in the Construction of Linear Composites in Social Research." Sociological Methods and Research, 2 (November, 1973), pp. 191-214.
- Bahr, Howard M., and Martin, Thomas K. "'And Thy Neighbor as Thyself': Self-Esteem and Faith in People as Correlates of Religiosity and Family Solidarity among Middletown High School Students." Journal For The Scientific Study of Religion, 22 (2), pp. 132-144.
- Bidwell, Charles E. "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client Trust in Client Serving Organizations." Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service. Edited by W.R. Rosegren and M. Lefton. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970.
- Blau Peter, M. "Social Mobility and Interpersonal Relations." American Sociological Review, 21 (February, 1956), pp. 290-95.
- Blau, Peter M., and Duncan, Otis D. The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
- Calamai, P. "Poll Finds Traditional Church Reviving in Canada," The Sault Star, V. 73, No. 145 (September 6, 1984). pp. A1,A2.

- Carr, Leslie B., and Hausen, William J. "Anomie and Religiosity: An Empirical Re-examination." Journal For the Scientific Study of Religion, 15 (1976,1), pp. 69-74.
- Cassie, Bruce J.R.; Student, John E.; and Unwin, Alan L. The Joint Occupancy and Sharing of School Facilities: An Experiment between the Lincoln County Board of Education and the Lincoln County Roman Catholic Separate School Board. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980.
- Chester, Robert. "Marital Stability and Social Mobility." International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 8 (July-Dec. 1978), pp. 159-170.
- Coleman, H.T.J. Public Education in Canada. New York: Brandon Printing Company, 1907.
- Coleman, James S. "Quality and Equality in American Education: Public and Catholic Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (November, 1981), pp. 59-164.
- Coleman, James S. "Rawls, Nozick, and Educational Equality." The Public Interest, 43 (Spring, 1976), pp. 121-128.
- Coleman, James S.; Hoffer, Thomas; and Kilgore, Sally. High School Achievement Public Catholic and Private Schools Compared. New York: Basic Books Inc., Publishers, 1982.
- Coleman, James S.; Hoffer, Thomas; and Kilgore, Sally. Public and Private Schools. Report to the National Center For Education Statistics. March, 1981.
- Crockett, Harry J. "The Achievement Motive and Differential Occupational Mobility in the United States." American Sociological Review, 27(1), pp. 191-204.
- Cronbach, Lee J., Essentials of Psychological Testing. New-York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Dalenius, Tore. Sampling in Sweden: Contributions to the Methods and Theories of Sample Survey Practice. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1957.
- Drehse, Volker. "Dimensions of Religiosity in Modern Society." Social Compass, 27 (1980/1), pp. 51-62.

- Driedger, E.A. A Consolidation of the British North America Act, 1867-1952. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1956.
- Durkheim, Emile. Moral Education. Edited by E.K. Wilson. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Erickson, D.A. "Effects of Public Money on Social Climates in Private Schools: A Preliminary Report." Paper presented at 1981 Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 16, 1981.
- Erickson, Donald A.; MacDonald, Lloyd; Manley-Casimir, Michael E.; and Busk, Patricia L. Characteristics and Relationships in Public and Independent Schools COFIS Baseline Survey Report. San Francisco: Center for Research on Private Education, 1979.
- Erickson, Donald A., and Nault, R.L. Effects of Public Money on Catholic Schools in Western Canada: Exploratory Interviews. A Final Report to the Spencer Foundation. San Francisco: Center for Research on Private Education, 1980.
- Fay, Leo F. "Catholics, Parochial Schools and Social Stratification." Social Science Quarterly, 43 (1973), pp. 420-57.
- Finn, Chester E. Jr. "Why Public and Private Schools Matter." Harvard Educational Review, 51 (1981), pp. 510-18.
- Fleming, W. G. Ontario's Educative Society II, The Administrative Structure. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Frechtling, Joy. "Why Parents Put Kids in Private Schools." American School Board Journal, 170 (January, 1983), pp. 18-19.
- Frechtling, Joy A.; Edwards, Sarah; and Richardson, William M. "The Declining Enrollment Problem: A Study of Why Parents Withdraw Their Children From the Public Schools." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April, 1981.
- Gallup, Alec. "The Gallup Poll of Teacher's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (October, 1984), pp. 97-104.

- Gallup, George. "The 14th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (September, 1982), pp. 37-50.
- Gallup, George. "The 16th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (September, 1984), pp. 23-38.
- Germani, Gino. "Social and Political Consequences of Social Mobility." Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development. Edited by Neil J. Smelser and Seymour Martin Lipset. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1966.
- Grant, Gerald. "The Character of Education and the Education of Character." Daedalus Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 110 (Summer, 1981), pp. 135-149.
- Halevy, Zvi, and Etzioni-Halevy, Eva. "The 'Religious Factor' and Achievement in Education." Comparative Education, 10 (October, 1974), pp. 193-199.
- Hans, Nicholas. Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions. London, England: Unwin Brothers Limited, 1982.
- Hartley, E. L., Hartley, R.E., and Hart, Clyde. "Attitudes and Opinions." The Process and Effects of Mass Communications. Edited by W. Schramm. University of Illinois Press, 1961.
- Hodgins, J.G. ed. Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada from 1791 to 1876. Toronto: Warwick Brothers and Rutter, 1894-1910.
- Huber, Joan, and Form, H. William. Income and Ideology an Analysis of the American Political Formula. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Hull, C. Hadlai, and Nie, Norman, H., ed. SPSS - Statistical Package For the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1981.
- Kandel, I. L. Comparative Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Riverside Press, 1983.
- Kerckhoff, Alan C. Socialization and Social Class. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1972.



- Kessin, Kenneth. "Social and Psychological Consequences of Intergenerational Occupational Mobility," American Journal of Sociology, 77 (July, 1971), pp. 1-18.
- Kim, Jae On, and Mueller, Charles, W. Introduction To Factor Analysis What It Is and How To Do It. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.
- Kleiner, Robert J., and Parker, Seymour. "Goal-Striving, Social Status, and Mental Disorder: A Research Review." American Sociological Review, 28 (April, 1963), pp. 189-203.
- Kohn, Melvin L. Class and Conformity Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Lee, Gary R., and Clyde, Robert W. "Socio-economic Status and Anomie." Journal For The Scientific Study of Religion, 13 (1974), pp. 135-47.
- Lenski, Gerhard. The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics, and Family Life. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1961.
- Livingstone, D.W., and Hart, D.J. Public Attitudes Toward Education in Ontario 1980, Third OISE Survey. Toronto: OISE Press, 1981.
- Lopreato, Joseph. "Upward Social Mobility and Political Orientation." American Sociological Review, 32 (4), pp. 586-92.
- MacLeod, Malcolm G.E. "Voices From The Attic: Canadian Public Opinion on Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (January, 1985), pp. 344-48.
- Marjoribanks, Kevin. "Ethnicity, Family Environment, School Attitudes and Academic Achievements." The Australian Journal of Education, 22 (October, 1978), pp. 249-61.
- Martinson, Oscar B.; Wilkening, E.A.; and Buttell, F.H. "Religion and Community-Orientated Attitudes." Journal For The Scientific Study of Religion, 21 (1982,1), pp. 48-58.
- Matthews, Carl J. "Trends in Separate School Enrolment." CT Reporter, (November, 1981), pp. 19-20.

- McIntosh, William A.; Alston, Letitia T.; and Alston, Jan P. "The Differential Impact on Religious Preference and Church Attendance on Attitudes Toward Abortion." Review of Religious Research, 20 (1979), pp. 209-213.
- Mill, John Stuart. On Liberty, in Utilitarianism, Liberty and Representative Government. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1964.
- Miller, Arthur H., and Wattenburg, Martin P. "Politics From the Pulpit: Religiosity and the 1980 Elections." The Public Opinion Quarterly, 48 (Spring, 1984), pp. 301-317.
- Miller, C. Delbert. Handbook of Research Design and Measurement. Third ed. New York: David McKay, 1977.
- Miner, Betty. "Sociological Background Variables Affecting School Achievement." The Journal of Educational Research, 61 (April, 1968), pp. 372-381.
- Nault, Richard. "Voluntary and Involuntary Student Participation in Nonpublic School Settings: Consequences for Students and Schools." Notre Dame Journal of Education, V6,N4, (Winter, 75), pp. 311-322.
- Nozick, Robert. Anarchy, State, and Utopia. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. Education Statistics Ontario, 1980. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer, 1981.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. Issues and Directions The Response to the Final Report of the Commission on Declining School Enrolments in Ontario. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1980.
- Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Oskamp, Stuart. Attitudes and Opinions. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Pope, Joseph. Memoirs of the Right Honourable Sir John Alexander MacDonald, G.C.B. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1930.

- Porter, A.C. Some Comments on "Public and Private School."  
(paper presented at the NIE-sponsored conference  
on Methodological Considerations Affecting the  
Credibility of Conclusions: The Instance of Three  
Conflicting Studies on Public and Private Schools.  
National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.,  
July 21, 22, 1981).
- Putman, J. Harold. Egerton Ryerson and Education in Upper  
Canada. Toronto: William Briggs, 1912.
- Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Beknap  
Press, 1971.
- Report of the Bishop's Task Force on Secondary Education.  
Sally Riede and William Hoffman co-chairperson.  
Cleveland, Ohio: Diocese of Cleveland, 1980.
- Rhodes, A. Lewis, and Nam, Charles, B. "The Religious Con-  
text of Educational Expectations." American  
Sociological Review, 35 (2), pp. 253-267.
- Roof, W.C. "Traditional Religion in Contemporary Society."  
American Sociological Review, 41 (1976), pp. 195-  
208.
- Rossi, Peter H., and Wright, D. James. "Best Schools -  
Better Discipline or Better Students? A Review of  
High School Achievement." American Journal of  
Education, 91 (November, 1982), pp. 78-89.
- Sault Star, November 12, 1981, March 27, April 3, 20, 1982,  
September 6, 13, 1984.
- Sewell, William H.; Haller, Archie O.; and Straus, Murray  
A. "Social Status and Educational and Occupa-  
tionals Aspiration." American Sociological Re-  
view, 22 (February, 1957), pp. 67-73.
- Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York:  
Random House, 1970.
- Sissons, C.B. Church and State in Canadian Education.  
Toronto, Ontario: Ryerson Press, 1959.
- Sorokin, Pitirim. Social Mobility. New York: John Wiley  
and Sons, 1927.
- Tillich, Paul. Theology of Culture. New York: Oxford Uni-  
versity Press, 1959.

- Titley, Brian E., and Miller, Peter J. Education In Canada An Interpretation. Calgary, Alberta: Detselig Enterprises, 1982.
- Toennies, Ferdinand. On Sociology: Pure Applied and Empirical, Edited by Werner J. Cahnman and Rudolf Heberle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Tumin, Melvin L. Social Stratification: The Forms and Functions of Inequality. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.
- Turner, William, Lloyd. "Reasons for Enrollment in Religious Schools: A Case Study of Three Recently Established Fundamentalist Schools in Kentucky and Wisconsin." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1979.
- Vernberg, Eric M., and Medway, Frederic J. "Teacher and Parent Causal Perceptions of School Problems." American Educational Research Journal, 18 (Spring, 1981), pp. 29-37.
- Wang, Marilyn W., and Stanley, Julian C. "Differential Weighting: A Review of Methods and Empirical Studies." Review of Educational Research, 40 (No. 5), pp. 663-705.
- Weber, Larry; McBee, Janice; and Lyles, Joseph H. "An Evaluation of Fundamental Schools." Evaluation Review, 8 (October, 1984), pp. 595-614.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Son's, 1958.
- West, Michael W. "The Rationale for Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (November, 1981), pp. 164-5.
- Whitney, Ruth. "Religion and The Secular: Creative and Destructive." Religion In Life, 48 (Summer, 1979), pp. 236-247.
- Wilensky, Harold, L. "Measures and Effects of Social Mobility." Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development. Edited by Neil J. Smelser and Seymour Martin Lipset. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1966.

- Willms, D. "Achievement Outcomes in Public and Private Schools: A Closer Look at the 'High School and Beyond' Data." (Occasional Paper. Stanford, C.A.: Stanford Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.), 1982.
- Wright, James D., and Wright R. Sonia. "Social Class and Parental Values For Children: A Partial Replication and Extension of the Kohn Thesis." American Sociological Review, 41 (June, 1976), pp. 527-537.
- Yinger, M. The Scientific Study of Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1970.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293007016847