This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

A STUDY TO EXPLORE THE DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOL RELATED VALUES AND PERCEPTIONS BETWEEN PARENTS WHO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND PARENTS WHO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

presented by

Barbara Wheatley Gothard

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D degree in Education

Major professor

Date June 10, 1982

A STUDY TO EXPLORE THE DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOL-RELATED VALUES AND PERCEPTIONS BETWEEN PARENTS WHO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND PARENTS WHO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By

Barbara Wheatley Gothard

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1982

ABSTRACT

A STUDY TO EXPLORE THE DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOL-RELATED VALUES AND PERCEPTIONS BETWEEN PARENTS WHO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND PARENTS WHO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By

Barbara Wheatley Gothard

The researcher's purpose in this study was to determine why a set of non-Catholic parents elected to remove their children from public schools and enroll them in Catholic secondary schools. There were 196 families in the study: 88 Catholic and 108 public. The questionnaire compared the two groups of families on their (1) demographic make-up, (2) attitude toward the characteristics of their secondary school, (3) attitude toward elements outside school, (4) the role their children played in making the choice of the school, and (5) attitude toward their satisfaction with their school.

Scale B was designed to measure the differences in the perceptions of Catholic and public school parents relative to the structural differences between public and Catholic secondary schools. There were significantly different attitudes toward the characteristics of schools. The public school parents indicated the education provided by the public school is comparable to the education provided by the Catholic school. In contrast, the Catholic school parents perceived their schools to be significantly superior to public schools.

Scale C was designed to measure the differences of elements outside the home that influenced the parents' choice to send their child to a Catholic or public school. The parents of Catholic school children were significantly different from the parents of public school children in the areas of the values systems of teachers and administrators and the desire that the school reflect the value system of the family.

Scale D was designed to determine if the child made the choice of his/her school, not the parent. There was no significant difference between the two sets of parents. Both groups responded similarly. Their children did not have a choice in the school they attend.

There was a significant difference between the satisfaction of the public and Catholic school parents toward their respective schools. A larger percentage of the Catholic school parents indicated satisfaction with their children's teachers than did the public school parents.

The primary factors that contributed to the school choices the families made were identified in order of significance to the families: (1) personal, (2) school characteristics, (3) satisfaction, and (4) children's choice.

To my family.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

So many people have provided assistance in this endeavor that a simple thank-you does not seem to be an adequate way to express my sincere appreciation, but hopefully each of them will know that it is expressed with a great amount of gratitude for all their help.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to my doctoral committee, Drs. Philip Cusick, Keith Anderson, Lawrence Lezotte, and Sam Moore, for their patience, suggestions, and support throughout the doctoral program. To Dr. Philip Cusick, chairman of the doctoral committee, I want to convey a special sense of gratitude for his particular kind of demanding guidance, which made it possible for me to develop a sense of freedom of thought and to know that when there were difficult times he was always encouraging me to grow and expand by offering seemingly endless assistance and wisdom.

A special thanks to Ms. Gabriella Belli of the Bureau of Research Consultation, Michigan State University, whose knowledge of statistics and whose patience were of great assistance during the statistical procedures.

To my working colleagues, Bonnie Loehr and Richard Kazarian, a special thanks for the assistance and encouragement you so generously gave me.

To my mother, Elizabeth Wheatley, thanks for instilling in me the desire to aim high and for the many years of encouragement and sacrifice that started me on this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND SELECTIVE REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the reasons why a set of non-Catholic parents elected to remove their child (children) from public schools and enrolled them in nonexclusive religious secondary schools. Nonexclusive schools were chosen because they are similar in clientele to the public schools. Non-Catholics were chosen to eliminate the element of religion, which is the major reason most parents send their children to those schools.

The researcher was primarily interested in the implications of the parents' decision to send one's child to a Catholic school for the public secondary schools, which are beginning to experience the impact of declining enrollments, the possibility of changes in state-aid funding, the competition set up by various mandated programs, and changes in government services and restrictions. The importance of the information gathered may be its inferences and implications for the possible restructuring of the public secondary schools' philosophy and curriculum.

Background

The Background of Catholic Schools (National)

Today's Catholic schools represent a type of school that existed 25 years ago, the type that was envisioned in the nineteenth

century when, in response to both the Protestant domination and the secularization of the public schools, Catholics decided to build their own schools. The initial efforts of the Catholics in the early nineteenth century were not so much to build their own schools as to resist the inculcation of mainstream Protestantism into the public schools. But their efforts to resist Protestant Bible reading and the teaching of Protestant creeds were initially unsuccessful. Also unsuccessful were the attempts to obtain public money for Catholic schools.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, certain factors contributed to the progressive secularization of the public schools. The primary reason was the accelerating fragmentation of Protestantism that fomented questions about the legitimacy of one type of Protestantism over another. To the school reformers such as Horace Mann, the answer to religious dispute in public schools was a nonsectarian curriculum that simply made no mention of religion.[1] However, this did not satisfy Catholic leaders, who were as interested in propagating their own faith as they were in refuting Protestantism. In fact, they saw the secularization of education as even more dangerous than the teaching of Protestant "heresy." There were other elements that contributed to the rise of Catholic schools, including the fact that ethnic immigrants were quite accustomed to church-run schools and preferred them to the more foreign American public schools. That ethnicity was sufficiently strong to make the Italians, Irish, Polish, and Germans stay away from each other as well as from Protestants.

Moreover, they were quite willing to take on the burden of paying for their own parish schools to help maintain their cultural identity.

Pressed by their own ethnic group and faced with the public schools "offering a soup so thin that it pleased no palate,"[2] the Catholics by 1884 were ready to advocate a system whereby a Catholic child could receive a Catholic education in Catholic schools. At the Third Plenary Council in Baltimore in 1884, American Bishops decreed

> that near every church a parish school, where one does not exist, is to be built and maintained in perpetum within two years of the promulgation of this council, unless the bishop should decide that because of serious difficulties a delay may be granted.[3]

Nationally, the enrollment of elementary and secondary Catholic schools showed a steady increase in numbers from 1900 to 1967. However, the steady increase in 1963 in the number and size of the Catholic schools was, at least temporarily, abated when in response to Pope John's call for modernizzazione, the church began a serious reexamination of the doctrine and practices. This Vatican II movement resulted in a great many changes in the traditional church. According to Greeley,

> Catholic activities, church attendance, prayer, acceptance of key doctrinal issues, acceptance of the church's sexual teaching have declined dramatically in the wake of the second Vatican council. The apostacy rate has doubled approaching almost 30 percent among the college educated young.[4]

These are not merely changes in the young as they are changes in people who were already past their youth. The population that the church has served for so long has also changed. No longer are the Irish, Italians, and Polish locked into their ghettos, language, and customs. No longer are they the poor outsiders. No longer is it

unthinkable to marry and work outside the ethnic lines, and in general, no longer do parents send their children to the parish/ethnic schools to protect them from the non-Polish, non-Irish, and non-Italians.

Table 1.1.--Elementary-secondary school enrollment in the U.S., 1900-1967.[5]

Year	Total Enrollment	Catholic School Enrollment	Percentage of Total School-Age Population
1900	16,357,633	854,523	5.2
1910	19,050,798	1,236,946	6.4
1920	23,404,529	1,826,213	7.8
1930	28,147,047	2,469,032	8.8
1940	28,016,138	2,581,596	9.2
1950	28,191,593	3,080,166	10.9
1960	41,375,576	5,288,705	12.7
1961	42,901,868	5,197,678	12.5
1962	44,450,506	5,614,956	12.6
1963	45,842,255	5,625,040	12.2
1964	47,078,617	5,662,128	12.0
1965	48,637,354	5,982,254	11.4
1966	48,625,606	5,473,606	11.2
1967	49,154,766	5,254,766	10.7

Given the de-emphasis of ethnic origin, and given a decline in the power of clerical authority and in the appeal of religious life, and the increase in apostasy, it appeared for awhile that Catholics would quietly fold up their schools and leave their increasingly secular people to the secular public schools. There

were some indications that this would happen. Not only did the Church have less holding power over its members, but the number of Catholic schools and the number of students in those schools began to decline dramatically. (See Table 1.2.)

Table 1.2.--Catholic secondary school enrollments nationally.[6]

Year	Enrollment	Year	Enrollment
1968-69	1,080,891	1974-75	902,000
1969-70	1,050,930	1975-76	889,000
1970-71	1,008,088	1976-77	882,000
1971-72	959,000	1977-78	868,000
1972-73	919,000	1978-79	853,000
1973-74	907,000	1979-80	846,000

While it is unclear whether or not the Church has lessened its power over Catholics, the Catholic schools have stopped declining and in some areas, such as Michigan, are increasing in size and number.

It appears that for the Catholic leaders and a great many Catholic parents, the school issue remains today as it was in 1884. Since the public schools are less able to take a stand on or even to confront the questions of life's meaning, origins, purpose, and destiny, and since public-school teachers are even less free (evidenced by the Supreme Court ruling against prayer in public schools)[7] to bring up questions about God, conscience, duty, rights, and the after-life, the essential justification for Catholic schools persists. Those

who control them still maintain that the first task of education is to foster an integration of religion with life, and the secularization of the public schools makes this impossible.

While Catholic schools are not as numerous as they were in the 1960s when they peaked at 13,292 Catholic elementary and secondary schools containing 5,575,000 students, they are still strong, active, alive, and well supported.[8] In fact, in the 1980-81 school year, the number of students enrolled nationally in Catholic schools was approximately 861,530,[9] which was an increase of approximately 1 percent over the 1979-80 enrollment of 846,000.[10] The status of the American Catholic school is that of a viable force in today's educational scene.

Since, if anything, public schools are even more secular today than they were in the nineteenth century, the Catholic hierarchy and Catholic educators believe more strongly than ever in the necessity of Catholic schools. For both the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic and non-Catholic population that send their children, the Catholic schools are going to survive, will probably continue to take in 8-10 percent of the school-age children, and will be an important part of the educational scene for a long time to come. The Catholic schools are there, they are quite powerful, and we should take available chances to learn about them. Such endeavors will serve the interests of all educators. In presenting the case for investigating the reasons why a set of parents elected to remove their child (children) from the public schools and then enroll them in nonexclusive religious secondary schools, this researcher's first argument is that the

Catholic schools represent in many ways a very significant element in our total educational scene and therefore warrant serious attention.

Catholic Schools in Michigan

The situation in Michigan is very similar to the situation nationally. In Michigan, the Catholic schools existed before 1850 and were in operation before the organization of public schools. There was a steady incline in enrollment in Catholic schools until 1965. Between 1965 and 1976 these schools decreased substantially, as evidenced by the closing of some 30 schools in 1970 and the closing of 62 schools in 1971. This decline represented a decrease of almost 27 percent.[11]

Within the last six years, the trend appears to be reversing. In the 1980-81 school year, the enrollment of the Archdiocese of Detroit dropped about 1 percent. The number of children in Michigan Catholic schools in 1981-82 was 201,120.[12] There was a significant drop in 1972 just after Proposal C (the movement to obtain public funds) was defeated. But since then, private schools have actually increased their enrollments relative to the public schools. In 1980-81, 10.2 percent of the school children in Michigan attended private schools, while in 1972 that figure was 9.3 percent. This is of particular importance in light of the kind of decline the public schools in Michigan are experiencing.

Nonpublic schools do not appear to be declining at the same rate as public schools in Michigan. In Michigan, the public and

private school member enrollment for grades K-12 in 1980-81 was approximately 1,860,000, with a projected low of 1,746,697 to be expected in 1985-86. The public-school membership for 1980-81 was approximately 1,700,000 students, with approximately 199,000 students enrolled in Michigan nonpublic schools.

The projections for public and nonpublic enrollments for 1985-86 indicate a decline in membership to 1,584,944, while the nonpublic membership is projected to increase to 208,939 students. This represents a possible decrease of 115,056 students in the public schools and an increase of 9,939 students in the nonpublic schools, or an increase of 5 percent in the nonpublic schools and a 7 percent decrease in public-school membership.[13]

The significance of the miniscule decline of Catholic-school enrollments, 1 percent in 1981-82, is most apparent in light of a public-school decline that ranges from 2 percent (Detroit) to 10 percent (suburban) in the same school year. This indicates that Catholic schools are thriving and are attracting a larger number of families than in the recent past.

These figures make it even more imperative that public-school people examine issues related to private schools, including their appeal.

In the Archdiocese of Detroit, which was the site of this study, the student population consists of 82,885 students who are housed in 46 high schools and 165 elementary schools in a six-county area: Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, St. Clair, Monroe, and Lapeer. The

total student population of the four regional bishoprics of the Archdiocese is divided into Northwest, 18,568; Northeast, 20,595; West, 25,042; and South, 18,680.[14]

The ethnic origins of the student population of the Archdiocese of Detroit are shown in Table 1.3.

As indicated by their survival and growth, there is still a great deal of appeal in the private religious schools, and it is to examine this appeal that the present study was undertaken.

The Structure of Public Schools

While the existence and the importance of Catholic schools in the realm of American education are documented by the percentage of students who continue to be enrolled in them, the fact that they present themselves as a "different kind of educational institution" warrants the need not only to study them but also to investigate the reasons why some parents choose them. It may turn out that the comparison of public and private schools, especially if the nonexclusive private schools are compared, may provide benefits for the public schools and enable educators to learn more about the public system.[15]

For the past 50 years, the American public secondary schools have had as their basic characteristics that they are free, public, compulsory, tied to the public tax base, and hence specialized and subject to the criterion of efficiency. In addition, schools are expected to achieve such varied goals as the development of self-development, human relations, economic efficiency, and civic responsibility. In addition to these characteristics, there is the element

Table 1.3.--Ethnic origins of the student population of the Archdiocese of Detroit.[16]

	Ethnic Origin							
	Black		Oriental		Hispanic		White	
	Catholic	Non-Catholic	Catholic	Non-Catholic	Catholic	Non-Catholic	Catholic	Non-Catholic
Northwest	382	1,133	181	25	249	29	15,758	810
Northeast	527	1,665	121	8	140	0	17,323	811
West	2,018	5,187	126	33	855	32	15,150	1,641
South	189	564	89	26	626	27	16,064	1,095
Total	3,116	8,549	517	92	1,870	88	64,295	4,357
	14%		7%		2.3%		83%	

Detroit: 52 elementary schools (57% white)
12 high schools (49% white)

of size, and it has been the practice for the past 25 years to build public schools as large as the constraints of distance will permit.

The concept of tax-supported schools was established in New York in 1812. Compulsory attendance was established in Massachusetts in 1852, with the range of grades defined as elementary, and its principle that the primary or local district is free to offer as diversified a curriculum to students of all ages as it wishes.

The court decision in the Kalamazoo case of 1874 questioned whether or not a public school that was supported by public funds should allocate some of these funds toward the teaching of Latin and Greek at the secondary level. The court decision was that the public schools should teach Latin and Greek so that students from Michigan could go to the University of Michigan. The judge in the case apparently agreed when he said that the University of Michigan would get students from Indiana and not Michigan if this were not permitted.[17] The Kalamazoo decision set the precedent for the diversified curriculum concept that exists in today's public schools and reflects a local autonomy that is a strong characteristic which, as Conant pointed out, "can be related to our historical parish and county autonomy in the south, the seventeenth century independence of New England church congregations and a suspicion of centralized government," all of which contribute to local autonomy.[18]

In Louisiana in the 1920s, our system of free compulsory elementary education was basically in place and ready to respond to the demand for assimilation of immigrants, training of workers, and the maintenance of basic standards of morality, which Horace Mann

and other school leaders envisioned as an indispensable function of the common school.[19] This train of thought is found throughout the history of public schools, including the philosophy found in Puritan Massachusetts readers and the NEA's Seven Cardinal Principles.

The religious and historical antecedents must be viewed simultaneously with the political and social changes occurring in the 1890s. The rate of growth of the nation, the influx of many and varied cultures, the changes in the structure of business organizations, and the changes in the family structure have had an effect on the role of the public school.

According to Callahan's well-known thesis, the emphasis on business and the business ethic that pervaded the country in the first part of the century was responsible for the infusion of vocational or practical education, the de-emphasis on academic education, and for the implementation of the platoon system or Gary Plan by which large numbers of adolescents were "batched" through the school each day and subjected to various subject-matter specialists. But also, according to Callahan, the damaging part was the infusion of the business ethic into the running of schools. The ethic carried with it the popularizing of education, making school administrators subject to the popular concept of efficiency, subverting educational quality by emphasizing efficiency and per-pupil cost and accepting the model of scientific management for analyzing and evaluating schools. According to his thesis, our reliance on the factory or rational-bureaucratic model is a result of its pervasiveness throughout the whole social system.

> It is possible that if educators had sought the finest product at the lowest cost--a dictum which is sometimes claimed to be a basic premise in American manufacturing the results [of the efficiency movement] would not have been unfortunate. But the record shows that the emphasis was not at all on producing the finest product but on "the lowest cost."[20]

For the past 20 years, the changes in American public schools can be related to the findings of the Conant report, which advocated larger, more consolidated schools with more emphasis on academics. In addition, the report advocated a diversification of the curriculum. The recommendation for consolidation suggested that the great number (17,000) of small high schools be consolidated into fewer schools (5,000), each having at least 100 students per class. Conant's reasoning was that only then could the school be sufficiently large to offer a diversified curriculum to a diversified population.

> The enrollment of many American public high schools is too small to allow a diversified curriculum except at exorbitant expense. The prevalence of such high schools--those graduating classes of less than one hundred students--constitutes one of the serious obstacles to good secondary education throughout most of the United States. I believe such schools are not in a position to provide a satisfactory education for any group of their students --the academically talented, the vocationally oriented, or the slow reader. The instructional program is neither sufficiently broad nor sufficiently challenging. A small high school cannot by its very nature offer a comprehensive curriculum.[21]

Conant's thesis was easy to accommodate within an efficiency framework.

Conant's suggestion for consolidation was timely, coinciding as it did with a nationwide need for improved and larger facilities for the increasing number of students. For example, in Michigan it occurred at a time when there were over 4,000 school districts in the state, that the city of Grand Ledge, which served 600 secondary

pupils from its own district and an additional 400 secondary students on a yearly tuition basis from surrounding districts, found itself in need of a new facility. The Grand Ledge board informed the surrounding primary districts that unless they, too, assumed the burden of indebtedness a new school would bring, the city would refuse to accept their secondary students in its new school. The surrounding districts, each with its own board of education, protested, saying that such a move amounted to forced consolidation with Grand Ledge and would eliminate them as autonomous units. Their protest was carried to the state supreme court, which decided that indeed Grand Ledge could accept or refuse whom it wished, in effect forcing the smaller districts to consolidate into a Greater Grand Ledge school district.

That 1958 decision triggered many similar demands by K-12 districts, which, like Grand Ledge, had long taken in secondary students from small primary districts, but faced with the need for a new facility, wanted some help with the debt and now had the court's approval for their move. With legal precedents in place, economic motives pressing, and the weight of the respectable Conant report for support, the consolidation/school-enlargement movement continued unabated for the next 20 years.

By 1960, the number of Michigan districts had dropped to 2,216, by 1967 it was down to 745, and at present there are 526 K-12 districts and an additional 46 primary districts in the state.

The push for efficiency from 1910 to after World War II and the move for consolidation joined each other. Bigger and more

specialized schools were considered more efficient. If one were to ask why that is the case or why it is believed to be the case, the response would be phrased in terms of the rational bureaucratic model. Public schools promoted increased specialization and differentiation, increased order, presumably a decreased need for resources, and an increased set of options for students. Therefore, to the list of characteristics including free, public, compulsory, popularized, and specialized, subject to the dictum of efficiency, one may add large and consolidated. The latter was added for both economic and ideological reasons. But in a society of large, specialized organizations, the K-12 one-room schoolhouse just did not fit at all. That we build large, diversified, specialized schools reflects our thinking about organizations in general. We would point out that the increase in size reinforced both the characteristic that schools are specialized and the characteristic that in a differentiated system there is no way other than personalized values to judge the worthiness of the offerings. When we decided to teach a whole range of courses under one roof, the educators no longer had to judge between a better or worse set of offerings.

There was another political decision at this time that affected the schools' need to appeal to a broader audience. In 1957 in Michigan, state school aid began to be distributed on the basis of students actually in attendance at school, not simply living in the attendance area. Schools then had to find ways to attract and keep students who formerly might have dropped out. The result was further specialization and differentiation. This gave new meaning

to the term "compulsory." Any individual subject that could attract the interest of adolescents, be it "girl talk," auto maintenance, or Shakespeare, was given equal weight in the curriculum. The Conant report made reference to a related point when it decried the fact that students were not given time to both study and participate in activities. He noted that plays and musical and athletic events were conducted during school hours and on evenings before school days, which to him indicated a poor attitude toward the importance of academic achievement. But that part of the report was ignored. What was recalled was what supported the popular and economically feasible thrust toward consolidation. The consolidation itself, creating larger, popular-based, and more specialized organizations, further weakened the ability of educators to say that certain activities and classes were more worthy than others.

The next years brought no fundamental changes in the system the researcher has outlined, but there were many innovations in the 1960s.

> The following innovations attracted the most funding from foundations and the U.S. Office of Education during this decade of innovations:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | team teaching | independent study |
> | modular scheduling | learning centers |
> | nongraded schools | open plan schools |
> | programmed learning | language laboratories |
> | individualized instruction | behavioral objectives |
> | computer assisted instruction | differentiated staffing |
>
> The Ford Foundation spent 30 million dollars on these and other innovations in the 60's but concluded at the end of it, that the money had been spent without any significant results.

"Money alone seemed not to be decisive in innovative improvement. Most innovations were abandoned after the departure of the charismatic

promoter or with the reduction of external funding."[22] In the list above, four of the innovations--team teaching, modular scheduling, nongraded schools, and open-plan schools--might be said to aim toward breaking down the specialization and compartmentalization of the schools and encouraging staff and students to do more interacting across classes, grades, and statuses. Their aim can roughly be said to be the "increase of community." The remainder--computer-assisted instruction, individualized instruction, programmed learning, independent study, and language laboratories--might be said to extend the specialization and differentiation of the school. In fact, one could conclude that the end of those innovations was a completely individualized system with each child having his particular set of skills and needs met by a differentiated and compartmentalized system. Both of these separate and different approaches could be said to emanate from a child-centered approach to teaching, with the child being the important unit, being encouraged to expand his/her social and human skills by associating more freely with others while having his/her individual needs more closely attended to. This has been the major ideological assumption behind almost every one of the reforms mentioned, including some that were not on that list, notably the thrust toward the nine-week mini-classes that took over so many high school curricula. The assumptions are delineated thusly. The schools, as large and bureaucratic organizations, grant priority status to specialization, order, routine, discipline, and uniformity. The individual students are not only unique; that uniqueness should be made the basis of their education. The school has to explore each student's

needs and interests and then construct the curriculum so that each may find his/her own individualized education. The problem is not seen as size or specialization (although the accompanying emphasis on order and discipline is blamed), but an insufficient or inaccurately placed specialization. Whether one advocates a more particularly programmed and objective-based approach, size and specialization result in increased emphasis on the individual as opposed to the community. Operationally, they both stem from our pluralistic and egalitarian values and hence, even while phrased differently, both elicit the same kind of organizational response. This has certainly been the argument used by those who wish schools were more responsive to minorities.

The changes in public education have come from the public (or some segment of the public), identifying some particular need or set of needs, or some individuals or set of individuals who were being treated inequitably by the public schools and have agitated for the addition of some set of courses, some curricular units, some added procedures or checks and balances to meet that need. Since educators had long ago given up on the task of judging which was a better education or even what comprised an education, they had no right or inclination to judge the worthiness of the proposed addition and simply stood outside the political pushing and pulling. Ultimately, if it was decided that such an innovation should be carried into the schools, the administration then devised some location in the building, created some place in the schedule, and found someone on the staff to teach it, letting the students define whether they wanted to take it.

The result was a larger and more complex bureaucracy, which to many seems, in itself, to be the problem. Reflecting on the differences between the youth of former times and the youth of today, the President's Panel on Youth reported:

> The young are now different from their counterparts of the past in that they are more shaped by a self-conscious subculture formed around the adolescent stage of life. The instructional settings for them by society are also becoming fundamentally different. What is new in the present era as contrasted to pre-1945 America is a long self-conscious stage of adolescence and the formal envelopment of that stage within large and complex organizations that operate in a mesh of bureaucratic and professional controls.

While to each problem heretofore the solution was phrased in terms of an increase in bureaucratization and specialization, it was now the case that the solution was seen as the problem. When that occurs, what then is the solution? For the President's Panel, the answer was to begin to de-institutionalize the schools. Among other things, this commission suggested moving the students out of the school environment earlier and more frequently, in order to gather the real-life experiences to be had there. Basing their assumption that "diversity and plurality of paths to adulthood are important for the youth of any society,"[24] the report suggested breaking the monopoly that schools have on youths' time and creating alternative environments for moving to adulthood. Operationally, they suggested using older students to instruct younger students, opening the schools to make greater use of community resources and community people who would take some responsibility for instruction, bringing young people into work situations earlier by simply moving into joblike environments, using community-based organizations to give early experience in taking

leadership and responsibility, and giving teachers increased responsibility for public service through outside agencies. If the foregoing sounds something like career education, it is certainly from the same perspective.

The committee's findings were repeated to a considerable degree by the 1978 Carnegie Council on Higher Education, which, too, looked upon the comprehensive high school (which the Carnegie Foundation advocated in the 1959 Conant report) as the problem rather than the solution. "We must find ways to break up the big monolithic high school with its deadly routine"[25] is the way they put it, forgetting their advocacy of that big monolith 20 years earlier. That advocacy is just what helped put several hundred adolescents under the same roof for their entire school day and hence directly created the need for order and routine that they decried. In their summary of recommended changes for secondary schools, they suggested:

> Change the basic structure of high schools by making them smaller or by creating diversity within them or both; by creating full-time specialty schools, particularly for the grades eleven and twelve; by creating part-time specialty schools--one or two days a week per student on a rotating basis--by providing one or two days a week for education-related work and/or service. We must find ways to break up the big, monolithic high school and its deadly weekly routine.
>
> Create work and service opportunities for students through the facilities of the high schools, making performance part of the school record. We also favor a renewed emphasis on student out-of-class activities.
>
> Stop the tracking of students; <u>all programs should be individualized programs</u>.
>
> Put applied skill training in private shops (with the exception of clerical skills and home economics), when not moved to the post-secondary level. The basic vocational (and academic) skills for the high school to concentrate on are the skills of literacy and numeracy--and good work habits.
>
> Finance needy students through work-study programs and more effective efforts to place them in jobs.

> Create job preparation and placement centers in the high schools that will follow students for their first two years after graduation or other termination.
>
> Improve the capacity of secondary schools to teach basic skills by allocating more federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to secondary schools. We strongly support the "Push for Excellence" program led by Reverend Jesse Jackson.
>
> Encourage earlier entry from high school into college and more programs combining the last year or two of high school with college.
>
> Experiment with vouchers and greater freedom of choice, particularly among public schools. Bureaucratic controls have not assured quality; competition to survive may.[26]

The committee recommended that schools break up the monolith, individualize, further compartmentalize, concentrate on the less-advantaged students, create career-education programs that will facilitate the transition from youth to adulthood, and so on. The latest list is but a list of the same criticisms that the previous two reports contained.

According to public-school people, there are two problems with these criticisms. First is the perspective toward the school routine, as the critics call it, or the "schedule," as the public-school people call it. For the former, it is both monolithic and deadly; for the latter, faced with the problem of having several hundred adolescents under the same roof, it is what makes sense of the diverse educational experiences offered to all those people every day. For school personnel, the problem is not the routine; the problem is the need for orderly and discernible processes. The solution is the routine. To the critics who, interestingly enough, are from foundations, state agencies, universities, private and public research groups, and community-action societies, but not public schools, the problem is not only routine but also the closedness and isolation of

the institution. For the school people, closedness and isolation are (1) solutions to the problem of order and predictability and (2) an answer to community people who do not want their adolescents on the street during the day time. To the residents of Laingsburg, Michigan, a small, semi-rural community, the idea that a few garages, sundry stores, and small businesses could absorb the energy of 330 adolescents is simply absurd. To the residents of Okemos, a bedroom suburb with no downtown, no stores outside of a shopping mall, and no industry, the idea is equally absurd. Perhaps it would work in Lansing with its stores, factories, and government offices, if there were not 6,000 adolescents to contend with. To speak facilely of achieving open, easy access from school to community is to ignore a reality that school people know. The parents, store owners, police, and residents do not want adolescents running around the streets during the day, nor do they want custody of them in the pursuit of educational goals. They expect that of the school.

The organizational reality limits administrative power, for example, contract demands on how much time a teacher must spend with students--no more and no less. A fragmentation set up by the largeness of the plants also exists. This often results in a surrender of administrative authority, which becomes necessary to maintain a cohesive routine.

From the standpoint of clientele, there is a need to coordinate more curriculum functions. The personnel are becoming more highly specialized, which is not necessarily contrary to their liking. This often results in schools that lack vitality, had only limited

ability to control or change the behavior that went on inside them, and in order to impose any unanimity, had to resort to administrative control. The schools were characterized as "department stores" containing an aggregate of individuals who have some generally agreed upon purpose for coming under the same roof, who while there tacitly agree to conduct themselves with some restraint, but do not form among themselves any internal organization, communality, or mutual commitment.

Hence, a loosely coupled system exists that is explained and justified by its relationship to the environment. Meyer and Rowan used Weick's concept of loose coupling to explain the structure of schools.

> Schools less often control their instructional activities or outputs, despite periodic shifts toward "accountability." They avoid this kind of control for two reasons. First, close supervision of instructional activity and outputs can uncover inconsistencies and inefficiencies and can create more uncertainty than mere abstract and unenforced demands for conformity to bureaucratic rules. Second, in the United States, centralized governmental and professional controls are weak. Schools depend heavily on local funding and support. Maintaining only nominal central control over instructional outputs and activities also maintains societal consensus about the abstract ritual classifications by making local variations in the content and effectiveness of instructional practices invisible.[27]

Meyer and Rowan argued that the school organizations survive by incorporating wider institutional structures as their own. Therefore, one can see a healthy functional relationship between the inner workings of a school as described here and the environmental realities of politics, funding procedures, teacher unions, and the pluralistic constituency. The lack of internal supervision is heightened by

contractual restraints, isolation from colleagues, and institutional neglect.[28]

> Although appealing, this explanation does have some problems. Functional explanations in the social sciences always have. While the explanation concentrates on the survival of the unit, mere survival is not necessarily a desirable state. What matters is survival in some healthy state. As Hempel points out,
>
> > For the sake of objective testability of functionalist hypotheses, it is essential, therefore, that definitions of needs or functional prerequisites be supplemented by reasonably clear and objectively applicable criteria of what is to be considered a healthy state or a normal working order of the systems under consideration; and that the vague and sweeping notion of survival then be construed in the relativized sense of survival in a healthy state as specified.[29]
>
> The environment is not so all powerful as to simply and irrevocably impose a kind of structure. The structure is equally dependent on the definition of survival. There may be a great deal more freedom for the school's inhabitants to reconstruct the school according to some different conceptions of what it should be than a functional explanation implies. It is conceivable for public secondary schools to reconsider the importance of the collective entity and begin to make use of that idea for educative ends.

Consolidation and its resultant effects of specialization created a differentiated and compartmentalized system in which a child-centered approach to curriculum followed. The emphasis was placed on the individual as opposed to the community.

In addressing the changes in public secondary schools in the last 20 years, the researcher has to consider also the desegregation decision, which literally threw many urban schools into turmoil, and other legal decisions, such as the Gault case, which outlawed discretionary treatment of young people in juvenile court and stipulated that juveniles must be tried by the same rules of evidence as adults. The spread of children's rights and the awareness of children's rights by the children themselves has, as Grant pointed out, been one of the great untold curriculum success stories of the last decade.[30] Grant's

thesis was that these initiatives on behalf of children's rights dramatically changed the "psychological reality in which adults interact with them." He cited cases in which school staff members demurred from giving guidance to adolescents for fear of trying to "impose an admittedly arbitrary set of personal values on another," and respecting the other's right to do as he so chooses, ignoring the fact that that "other" is a child. Certainly, this position has led to a considerable advance in bureaucratization in terms of the need for increased procedures in dealing with adolescents.

Legislative and judicial actions result in a mandated governance of public schools. This only serves to increase the amount of specialization.

Contract demands, tenure laws, and certification lead to more central control while at the same time limiting administrative power. In addition, the size of the schools fragments and often results in a surrender of authority, which becomes necessary to maintain a daily routine of orderliness and efficiency for students and staff.

The elements that are considered to be essential to public schools are limited class size, student options, teacher preparedness, comprehensiveness, diversity, and individual opportunity. All of these characteristics connote an open, fluid, and opportunity-filled school wherein the individual can fulfill him/herself as an individual, while attending a school that meets the requirements of being free, compulsory, tied to the public tax base, popularized, specialized,

subject to the criteria of efficiency as well as being multi-goal oriented.

In general, public schools have adopted the model of a large bureaucracy with the attendant emphasis on universalism. The public schools' attempt to accommodate all students who enter with as much respect to their individual needs as the bureaucratic system will permit reinforces the universalistic approach to education. The universalism found in the public schools reaches from the state department of education via their mandates and processes.

The role that the legislative and judicial system plays in the governance of the public-school bureaucracy was established as early as the Constitution of the United States stipulated that the function of the courts is to interpret the laws.[31] In addition, from the Ordinance of 1787 through the Morrill Act, this federal partnership existed. Spurlock wrote that the government's contention that schools are for the protection of the state guaranteed constitutional support under the Tenth Amendment.[32] The fact that the courts have no authority to initiate action does not diminish, according to Hooker, how profoundly they have affected American education.

In recent history, some of the court cases that are thought to have had the most far-reaching consequences for public schools are the 1954 decision in Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka, in which the issue of civil rights and equality was dealt with. The United States Supreme Court ruled that

> segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities.[33]

A year later, the court decreed and issued its order that "admissions to public schools on a racially non-discriminatory basis must proceed 'with all deliberate speed.'"[34] School authorities were given the primary responsibility for taking initial action. The impact of this decision continues to affect public schools today.

In Wood versus Strickland, 1975, the courts ruled on the due-process procedures that students must be granted. This case is always mentioned in any discussion on tort liability for public-school educators because it established the fact that school administrators can be held financially liable and suffer penalties for their action. The court went even further when it granted parents the right to sue for monetary damages, therefore removing the cloak of immunity from school administrators. In addition, the actions of the principal in the case were found to be capricious and that the students had been denied due process.

The 1975 case of Goss versus Lopez addressed the issue of procedures for suspending a student from school. Traditionally, parents consider a suspension from school to be a most serious issue. The courts agreed. The findings in this case guaranteed a student and his/her parents the right of due-process procedures, notification of parents, and the right to a hearing under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. A later case, Elliot versus Chicago Board of Education, 1979, addressed the same issue for a three-day suspension instead of ten. The same rights were guaranteed.[36]

The courts eroded the doctrine of "in loco parentis" in the 1973 decision of San Antonio versus Rodrigues. The court recognized

the need for increased state funding to help offset disparities in local spending and to meet the changing educational requirements, and in the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Powell addressed the issue of whether or not education is a federally protected fundamental right. The case challenged the inequitable results of school funding systems that rely primarily on property taxes and widely varying tax-assessment procedures. It addressed the need for the per-pupil expenditures of poorer districts to be on a par with those of wealthier districts. This could be said to guarantee the same kind of equal educational rights to children regardless of the wealth of their school district as Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka guaranteed to children regardless of their race. The impact of this decision is still being felt in the way in which public schools are financed and required to provide equal educational opportunities.

The case of Armstrong versus Kline in 1979 added the burden of change in the kind of education that special-education students are to receive in the public schools. Parents of handicapped students fought to insure that public schools would provide the best possible educational environment for their special-needs students in the least-restrictive environment. The effect of the ruling on the public schools has resulted in increased financing for these programs, the addition of more highly trained staff, and the remodeling or addition of facilities to accommodate them. These actions were mandated by the state and the federal governments after the courts ruled on the case; therefore, public schools were forced to comply or face significant financial penalties.[37]

A good example of this is in Michigan, where the thrust for more attention and care in school to children with "special needs" was begun by a lobbying group, the Parents of Mentally Retarded Children. They went to the legislature via the courts, on the way co-opted the Michigan Department of Education, and came up with the special-education laws that were in line with what was going on nationally. Among other things, these laws demand mainstreaming, increases in school specialties and accompanying specialists, and individual sessions for each special student with the administrator, specialist teacher, guidance counselor, and parent, meeting together to make curricular decisions. All of these have resulted in increased specialization, bureaucratization, and reliance on procedures, rules, and regulations.

In addition, all of the special-interest groups, such as the parents of the gifted and talented students and the child advocates, apply pressure to the legislative and judicial systems. This results in an increase in the kind of bureaucracy in which schools must attempt to function. The bureaucracy common to public schools is grounded in the structure of these schools as loosely coupled organizations that attempt to embrace all categories, subjects, educational pursuits, kinds of students, efficiency, economy, diversity, proceduralness, and value neutrality. These "goals of the organization determine just what the universalistic criteria" should be. These "goals define what is efficient"[38] and the structure of public schools is based on a universalism. These are the things that the Catholic schools have not adopted.

The Structure of Catholic Schools

Catholic schools continue to exist today and enroll a sizable part of the school-aged population. They present themselves as a "different kind of educational institution" in the realm of American education. They are a significant factor based on the increased percentage of students enrolled, and it may be that we can learn a great deal about the public system by studying this contrast. The contrast of public- and private-school philosophies was pointed out by De Santis, the Superintendent of the Archdiocese of Detroit. He stated, "The purpose of Catholic education is to teach doctrine, to build community and to serve in an atmosphere in which the common good supersedes an individual's rights."[39]

Some of the characteristics that we have discussed as common to public schools--size, compulsoriness, free, specialized, and bureaucratic--are in direct contrast to the private and Catholic school. Catholic schools tend to be smaller in size than their public secondary counterparts; for example, a Detroit public high school may house 4,000 students, whereas a Catholic school is more likely to have fewer than 1,000 students.

Attendance in a Catholic school is strictly a voluntary act with the exception that, according to Michigan laws, a student must be in attendance in a school until he/she reaches the age of 16. He/she may choose to be enrolled in a Catholic school; however, the parents are required to pay a tuition fee.

The specialization common to public schools is lacking to the same degree in Catholic schools. The emphasis is primarily placed on

the academic classes, with elective programs being offered minimally. All students are required to take a basic curriculum, which is planned to enable them to enroll in post-high-school institutions rather than preparing the student to meet his/her specific vocational skills.[40]

The bureaucratic structure of Catholic schools or their Catholic school "system" appears to have very little "system" about it. It always was and still is an aggregate of private, independent schools; some are parish controlled, some are parish owned but controlled by orders of nuns or brothers, and some are order owned and order controlled. But even in the order-owned and order-controlled schools, each school is a separate unit.

Michigan, with its urban factory environments, has always had a strong Catholic school system. Within this system, the schools must follow Archdiocesan Policies and State Guidelines. However, the Catholic Schools Office is primarily a service organization. Each school is controlled in the following manner: private Catholic--the religious orders; parish schools--elected school boards, with authority resting with the pastor; consolidated and regional schools--elected school boards, with authority resting with the cooperating pastors; principal.

> The principals have much autonomy as administrators and supervisors. They hire the staff, negotiate their salary, determine what the organization will be, are secretaries to the Boards of Education, set up local policies in keeping with Archdiocesan policies, are responsible for the physical plant and grounds, the curriculum, the materials used, in-service experience, spiritual leadership, etc.[41]

Consequently, there is much less central control and much more control within the building.

The Catholic school proclamation, which places emphasis on making the student responsible to some larger school unit and on evoking social responsibility from the student, is in direct contrast to the characteristics of public schools. This makes the private and Catholic school a very different setting than the public schools, which in general have ignored the power of the collective and have organized themselves to allow as much personal opportunity for students as possible.

The fundamental difference between the public and private schools is the emphasis of the latter on the collective element and the fostering of a sense of responsibility toward that collectivity, while the former have generally opted to create environments with as much individual opportunity and freedom as possible. The researcher's task, then, is to see what lessons a study of parents' motivations would hold for public schools.

The first element that is representative of the collective is a common religion; that is, the teachers and staff, the parents, and, through them, the students share a common attitude toward religion. Even if only half of the attendees are Catholics, at least they share the same view that moral training should be at the center of the school.

The second element that they share immediately is a volunteerism, a feature most easily distinguishing the public from the private schools.

> 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.[42]

As Bidwell pointed out, the clientele more or less selects itself, if by nothing other than the parents' ability to pay. That is volunteerism on the part of the parents. This volunteerism extends to students, who take the cue from the parents and who also know that if they violate the rules they may be asked to leave a school that is not obligated to keep them, a school that will not resort to the quasi-legalistic procedures of the public schools for removing them.

This volunteerism also extends to the teachers. Teachers in many Catholic schools earn $13,500 per year or less. Public-school teachers in the Detroit area making up to $30,000 plus liberal benefits may feel that they are locked into their jobs because of economic necessity, but no competent person with a college education could feel locked into a job that paid poverty-level wages. Consequently, the teacher who chooses to work in a Catholic school at those wages has bought the concept of volunteerism. Persons who teach in private schools have made a deliberate choice to be there because no one has to remain in that kind of economic constraint.

The volunteerism leads to a second point Bidwell made--that volunteerism on the part of students creates a situation in which the students are more likely to place trust in a teacher's judgment, thus protecting that teacher from having to expend his/her efforts allaying an initial distrust. In a school where an attitude of nonvolunteerism exists, students may be unfavorably disposed toward teachers and place on teachers the burden of improving relationships. In the effort to do that, teachers may have to compromise their own standards of

academic achievement. But in the private schools, students, influenced by their parents, may enter the student-teacher relationship quite favorably disposed, and hence the teacher and the teacher's definition of proper behavior and achievement may go relatively undiluted.

As Bidwell argued, a professional-client relationship is likely to be inferior if either party to the exchange lacks the ability to go elsewhere. But if the ability to go elsewhere is present, then the teacher is more free to exercise his/her professional judgment of appropriate behavior, and that judgment is more likely to prevail. This suggests that the element of volunteerism is at the center of the appeal of private schools in that, as Greeley said, parents who send their children to Catholic schools believe that the instruction is better.[43]

Along this same line of thought, Coleman et al. perceived private schools as "producing better cognitive outcomes than do public schools."

> When family background factors predict achievement, students in both Catholic and other private schools are shown to achieve at a higher level than students in public schools. The difference at the sophomore level was greater for Catholic schools than for other private schools.[44]

Intertwined with that notion is the parents' belief that in private schools "the student receives more personal attention . . . and . . . there is a strong tendency to judge quality by the way students are dealt with as individuals."[45] Parents perceive that the instruction is better, not only because the standards may be less diluted in a voluntary atmosphere, but because students seem to

receive more individual attention. How, then, do the perceptions of better instruction and more personal attention relate to the element stated as most distinguishing private schools: their emphasis on community?

Erickson suggested that there are two separate models or perspectives that explain school success. First, there is the professional model wherein the quality of the school depends on the quality of the instructors and the facilities.

> The professionalism argument is that improvements in teacher salaries and working conditions attract more competent, well trained people into teaching and enhance the morale and self image of teachers. Teachers who are well prepared, well paid, and given good conditions respond well. They view themselves as responsible, competent professionals. They demonstrate high dedication to their work. Their competence and dedication induce high levels of performance from their students.[46]

The professional model is at the center of the "quality" issue in public education. But, as Erickson explained, for private schools a different model holds. There the important element is the basic voluntary commitment by parents, teachers, and students who form a communal structure.

Erickson asserted that the voluntary nature of the private schools creates a system that is conducive to the deprivation in these schools that actually strengthens that feeling of the collective. Unlike the professional model that suggests that increased resources and increased salaries beget increased teacher quality, effort, and achievement, Erickson's model suggests that, while the initial voluntary commitment is important to the development of the collective, equally important is the continuing sense of frailty and jeopardy to

the maintenance of the same. "The professionalism model predicts that good things follow liberal public support, while the gemeinschaft model indicates that good things follow lack of such support." Erickson's conclusion was that, despite the inferior facility and fragile funding processes, the private schools in his sample were characterized by "superior commitment, consensus, community, accomplishment, and exceptionality" (uniqueness).[47]

Trying to analyze the appeal of private, particularly Catholic, schools began with citing a common attitude among the parents and participants that religion, or at least moral training, should be at the center of the school. But that alone is insufficient to explain the appeal of Catholic schools. There are large numbers of non-Catholics enrolled in Catholic schools.

A more important element seems to be that the volunteerism on the part of parents and participants contributes to the notion that standards are higher and that students receive more individual attention. The common attitude toward religion, the volunteerism, and the perception of superiority combine to create a collective that, according to Erickson, results in superior consensus, commitment, and achievement.

Volunteerism, then, not only explains the perception of higher standards, it also contributes to the perception of increased individual attention. Erickson would add, however, that difficult circumstances strengthen the collective even further; that is certainly applicable to the financially marginal schools of which we are speaking.

The concept of a collective is at the center of the private school and tends to be noted by people who study small, private, successful schools in any locale. Martin described such a community, a successful alternative school within a public secondary school.[48]

Kleinfeld cited the communal entity at the center of a successful Eskimo school she studied in Alaska.

> These patterns did not define the reality of social relationships at the school. St. Mary's was a small, highly personalized school society very similar to the small, highly personalized village societies in which the students had grown up. People knew each other in many roles and across many situations. A volunteer and a young man at St. Mary's might be teacher and student, coach and basketball player, co-member of a school repair crew and buddies in late night bull sessions. The fundamental force of social control at the school, as in the villages, was group opinion, a method of influence to which students were extremely sensitive. The metastructure of personalized relationships outside the classroom redefined the formal teacher-student relationship within the classroom.[49]

In "What Makes a Good School," a study supported by NIE, Grant and his colleagues identified the community to mean not only what characterized a Catholic school, but also what was responsible for the school's success.[50]

So, private schools, in this case Catholic schools, built their appeal first around a commitment to integrate religion with the rest of education, and second, through volunteerism, to build a sense of community among the participants. The sense of community then serves as the organizing principle of the school, the school's appeal to its clients, and that which sustains the school even in difficult times. With this in mind, we can even better understand the survival of Catholic schools, despite the repeated refusal of public funds.

Note, it is not being said that private schools are superior to public schools nor that the concept of community is a fact of private schools. The researcher is suggesting that "community" is the appeal of private schools and that studying them will help explain their organization.

There is another explanation for the appeal of a school with a strong community. Developing and nurturing a gemeinschaft serves an educative purpose. Durkheim said that the principal purpose of schooling is to learn responsible participation in the large society.

> Education is above all a social means to a social end--the means by which a society guarantees its own survival. . . that is the task and glory of education. It is not merely a matter of allowing an individual to develop in accordance with his own nature disclosing whatever hidden capacities lie there. . . . Education creates a new being.[51]

For Durkheim, the educational organization does not merely house and coordinate individual instructional components; it is constructed to teach students responsibility to the social unit and hence helps socialize them for the larger society. The school collective serves a very important pedagogical function. It supports the notion of the private schools eliciting a higher standard of behavior because the students are more likely to develop higher standards of social responsibility.

The argument for the study was that it would help in thinking about the organization of public schools. The counter to that argument is that the elements of religion and volunteerism make the private schools so different from public schools that there is nothing that can be learned. One cannot think of the public schools in terms

of the communality or the gemeinschaft that the private schools proclaim as their strength. However, that line of thought would ignore the findings of Rutter et al. in the Fifteen Hundred Hours. They demonstrated (in four public schools in London) that those who came closest to instilling a sense of community in their students had better results. When their subject schools more closely resembled a community with attendant norms and expectations of student behavior, then the students performed better.

> Outcomes tended to be better when both the curriculum and approaches to discipline were agreed and supported by the staff acting together. Thus attendance was better and delinquency less frequent where courses were planned jointly. . . . Much the same applied to standards of discipline. Exam successes were more frequent and delinquency less common in schools where discipline was based on general expectations set by the school rather than left to individual teachers to work out for themselves.[52]

While we admit that these four London schools are, in many ways, unlike American public schools, the evidence is that a sense of community need not be limited to the private religious schools. Indeed, studying the elements of community as they exist in private Catholic schools may have some implications for their public counterparts.

The argument so far has been that the investigation of what aspects of private schools motivate parents to send their children to them is warranted by (1) the fact that the choices those parents make enable and insure the continued existence of private schools and (2) the promise that studying an educational organization in which the element of community pervades it may have some implications for public schools.

Summary

The differences between the public and the private school setting can be clearly defined by contrasting these six areas. First, the size of the schools--public schools tend to be large, and Catholic schools tend to have smaller enrollments.

Second, the public schools are characterized by their compulsoriness, and private schools adopt a voluntary posture although the law requires a student to go somewhere.

Third, the public schools are considered to be diversified and comprehensive at the same time and noted for offering student options within that framework, while the private schools' form of specialization tends to place more emphasis on the academics.

Fourth, public schools operate on a large bureaucratic base with the attendant emphasis on universalism, which permits an open, fluid environment in which individual opportunity is valued for its own sake and in which the embracing of all categories, subjects, educational pursuits, and special needs of the students is addressed, while the Catholic schools operate from a posture of particularism, which provides an atmosphere of greater dependence, greater control of student discipline, and the lack of a chain of central command that is common to the public schools. The universalistic, bureaucratic constraints of contracts, tenure, certification, legislation, court action, and special-interest groups are not a major part of the private-school environment, but they are accepted in the public school.

Fifth, the public school is supported by a public tax base, and the private school is funded by tuition monies, fund-raising events, and gifts.

Last, the expectation of the public school that demands decency, mutual respect, and courtesy that is accepted but is undefined as an unproclaimed Christian morality, and this is in direct conflict with the purpose of Catholic schools, which is to teach a proclaimed Christian morality. The differences in the characteristics of the public and the Catholic schools provided the basis upon which the researcher attempted to delineate the parents' perceptions.

Characteristics	Public	Catholic
Size	Large	Somewhat smaller
Offerings	Student option, individualized, comprehensive, special-interest groups	Academic orientation
Organization	Universalism, contractual, tenure certification, central control	Particularism, independent, more building control
Financial Base	Free	Tuition, fund raisers, gifts
Value	Unproclaimed Christian morality, decency, mutual respect, courtesy	Proclaimed Christian morality

Thus, there is a sufficient number of differences in size and structure between public and private schools--differences that may be perceived by those parents who choose them for their children or who

support their child's choice of them. It is to explore their perceptions of these differences by parents that this study was undertaken.

Purpose

The researcher's purpose was to investigate the reasons why a set of non-Catholic parents elected to remove their child (children) from public schools and enrolled them in nonexclusive religious secondary schools. Nonexclusive schools were chosen because they are more similar to the public schools than are the exclusive private schools. Non-Catholics were chosen to eliminate the element of religion, which is the major reason most parents send their children to those schools.

The researcher was primarily interested in the implications of this decision for the public secondary schools, which are beginning to experience the impact of declining enrollments, the possibility of changes in state-aid funding, the competition set up by various mandated programs, as well as changes in government services and restrictions. The importance of the information gathered may be its inferences and implications for the possible restructuring of the public secondary schools' philosophy and curriculum.

Exploratory Questions

Specific questions guided this study. The first question was: Are the elements the researcher cited as structural differences the reasons why parents send their children to either Catholic schools or public schools? Or, stated another way, of which and to what degree of these structural differences are the reasons that parents

give for electing nonelite religious secondary schools (size, compulsoriness, diversification, bureaucratic, tax supported)?

This led to a second question: What elements outside the school, in the homes, or from the parents' experience and environment contribute to their choices (personal reasons, value neutrality)?

Another question had to do with the possibility that the child made the important choice, not the parent. If the child expressed his/her desires and the parent merely acquiesced to the decision and in effect had no strong feeling about the structure of either set of schools, the third question was: Was the child's preference the major factor in the decision?

A final question helped summarize the information gathered from the other questions: Are the plausible differences the same as the perceptive differences of the Catholic-school and the public-school parent?

Significance

Hence, a deliberate choice is being made by parents as to which school to send their child to, and increased understanding of the basis on which the decision is made will provide both school systems with a better impression of how they are perceived by parents.

Notes--Chapter I

[1]N. McCluskey, Catholic Education in America (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 19.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Bredeway, "Catholic Schools and Their American Roots," in Standard Education Almanac (Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1979-80), p. 223.

[4]A. Greeley, W. McCrealy, and K. McCount, Catholic Schools in a Declining Church (Kansas City, Kansas: Sheed and Ward, 1976), p. 303.

[5]Official Catholic Directory (New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons); Biennial Survey of Education and School Life (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1968).

[6]Digest of Educational Statistics (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1979-80.

[7]E. Edmond Reutter, Jr., and Robert R. Hamilton, The Law of Public Education (New York: The Foundation Press, 1976), p. 33.

[8]McCluskey, pp. 86, 107.

[9]F. DeSantis, "Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of Detroit" (unpublished paper, n.d.), p. 10.

[10]Digest of Educational Statistics, 1979-80.

[11]DeSantis, p. 1.

[12]Ibid.

[13]F. Ignatovich and S. Hecker, Michigan's Public and Private School Population (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1981), p. 17.

[14]DeSantis, p. 1.

[15]Denis P. Doyle, "Public Policy and Private Education," Phi Delta Kappan 62 (September 1980): 16-19.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Reutter and Hamilton, p. 8.

[18]James B. Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), p. 9.

[19]McCluskey, p. 48.

[20]Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[21]Conant, p. 77.

[22]The Reform of Secondary Education, Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 7.

[23]James Coleman et al., Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 145.

[24]Ibid., p. 157.

[25]Giving Youth a Better Chance, a Report with Recommendations of the Carnegie Council of Policy Studies in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), p. 24.

[26]Ibid., pp. 23-24.

[27]J. Meyer and B. Rowan, "The Structure of Educational Organizations," in Environments and Organizations, ed. Meyer, Marshall, and associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978).

[28]Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), p. 169.

[29]C. Hempel, Aspects of Scientific Explanation (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 321.

[30]G. Grant, "What Makes a Good School?" (Boston: The New Policy in Educational Research Association, 1980).

[31]Edward Newton, The Courts and the Public Schools, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 4-5.

[32]Spurlock.

[33]Reutter and Hamilton, p. 622.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Clifford E. Hooker and Robert A. Koenig, The Courts and Education NSSE (Chicago: University or Chicago Press, 1978), p. 8.

[36]Reutter and Hamilton, p. 615.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Charles Perrow, Complex Organizations (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1967), pp. 12-13.

[39]DeSantis, p. 2.

[40]McCluskey, p. 107.

[41]DeSantis, pp. 1-2.

[42]C. Bidwell, "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client Trust in Client Serving Organizations," in Organizations and Clients, ed. W. Rosengren and M. Lefton (Columbus: Charles Merrill, 1970), p. 54.

[43]Greeley et al., p. 303.

[44]James Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, "Public and Private Schools: A Report to the National Center for Education Statistics at the American Educational Research Association," March 1981.

[45]DeSantis, p. 4.

[46]D. Erickson, L. MacDonald, M. Manley-Casimir, and P. Busk, Characteristics and Relationships in Public and Independent Schools (San Francisco: Center for Research on Private Education, 1979), p. 5.

[47]Ibid.

[48]W. Martin and S. Polonsky, "Organizational Structure and Student Behavior in Secondary Schools," Journal of Curriculum Studies 8,1 (1976).

[49]J. Kleenfeld, Eskimo School on the Andreafsky (New York: Praeger, 1979), p. 131.

[50]G. Grant, unpublished paper (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1981).

[51]Emile Durkheim, Moral Education, ed. E. K. Wilson (New York: Free Press, 1961), p. xiv.

[52]M. Reutter, B. Maugham, P. Mortimore, J. Ouston, and A. Smith, Fifteen Thousand Hours (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 192.

CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Overview

This chapter contains descriptions of the procedures employed in this study. The construction, pilot testing, and administration of the questionnaire used to collect data about Catholic- and public-school parents' perceptions and reasons why they chose to enroll their child in a particular kind of school are described. The process of selection of the 300 parents for inclusion in the sample is related. Demographic details of the sample population are presented. The design of the study is laid out in detail. Procedures used for analysis of data are discussed.

Design of the Study

The study was organized into three major phases consistent with the purpose of the study, which was to investigate the reasons why a set of non-Catholic parents chose to remove their child (children) from public schools and enroll them in nonexclusive religious secondary schools. The researcher was primarily interested in the implications of this decision for the public schools. Nonexclusive schools were chosen because they are more similar to the public schools than are the exclusive private schools. Non-Catholics were chosen to eliminate the concept of religion, which is the major reason most parents send their children to those schools.

The first purpose of the study was to investigate the reasons for the parents' choice of school. The second was to compare the perceptions and attitudes of the non-Catholic parents who enrolled their child in a Catholic school with the attitudes and perceptions of the parents who enroll their child in a public school.

The two groups of parents were compared on the following basis: perceptions of the structure of Catholic or public schools, perceptions of influences outside the school setting, perceptions of the child's choice of school. The study was designed to compare the satisfaction each set of parents feels they achieve, based on their perception of their child's school versus the plausible reasons for their choice of school.

More specifically, this study was guided by the following exploratory questions:

1. Are structural differences in public and private schools the reasons why parents send their children to either Catholic or public schools? Which of these structural differences account for parents electing or not electing nonexclusive Catholic secondary schools?

    a. Size
    b. Compulsoriness
    c. Diversification
    d. Bureaucratic
    e. Tax supported

2. What elements outside the school, in the homes, or from the parents' experience and environment contribute to their choices?

   a. Personal reasons

   b. Value neutrality

3. Was the child's preference the major factor in the decision?

4. Are the plausible differences the same as the perceived differences of the Catholic-school and the public-school parent?

   a. Satisfaction

   b. Dissatisfaction

The unit of analysis was the perception of the parents as to why they enrolled their children in Catholic schools. The questionnaire was sent to the home with the instructions that either the mother, the father, or the guardian could answer the items. For clarity and intelligibility, some of the statements were phrased as if both parents were responding.

Methods of Research and Sources of Data

The first task was to identify a small number of parents (12) who had made a decision to move their children from public to Catholic schools. The identification was made possible by word of mouth and by reviewing a printout of the names of families whose children had left the Utica Community Schools in the summer of 1980.

The second task was to contact by telephone each of these families and ask them to consent to a personal interview about the

reasons they chose to change their children's school setting. These families had children in junior and senior high schools.

The third task was to develop a questionnaire of some 46 items. It was designed with a significant number of open-ended questions to permit the interviewer to follow the families' individual reasons.

The fourth task was to meet with and interview them either at their homes or at their places of business, and each was more than willing to talk about the reasons for their decision.

The fifth task was to synthesize their open-ended responses into the formal terms that have been defined as the characteristics that differentiate the structure of public and Catholic schools. All of those interviewed were very specific about their choice of education for their child. Since only two of the families made their decision specifically on religious grounds, the reasons cited by the other families included their perception that Catholic schools provide more individualized attention due to the use of self-contained classrooms. They perceived the school atmosphere as one of purpose, dedication, quietness, and purity, with the overriding implication that the school offers a more disciplined environment in which a higher standard of student behavior is expected by the administration and the teaching staff and subsequently supported by the parents. The term "hassle-free education" was used to describe the environment in which there exists the cooperation of the staff in implementing the discipline procedures of the school and in which this is backed up by a firm administrative posture.

Several of the parents indicated that attendance in a Catholic secondary school can or will guarantee college admission since the emphasis on academics is stressed. Parents appear to perceive that there is a greater amount of parental support for the school and the staff in the Catholic-school setting. This is generally held to be based on the fact that these parents are much more involved in the success of the school programs than they might have been in the public school.

Parents also indicated their willingness to spend money in addition to the taxes they are normally assessed for public education to see that their children had a value-centered education. This was often done without regard to the inconvenience of transportation problems, disruption of the household schedule, economic constraints placed on the family, or effects on other children within the household.

The amount of informal communication between individual parents, teachers, counselors, and administrators was seen as a very important aspect of the parents' involvement in the school. These parents felt that the Catholic-school setting offered them smaller, more intimate schools in which teachers appeared to maintain more continuous contact with the students, and a larger number of counselors or peer counselors were available to their students. Several of the parents concluded from this that the motivation of students was somewhat higher in the Catholic schools because the interaction between the family and the school community appeared to influence student motivation, behavior, and academic orientation. The integration of these

comments, the background information, and literature resulted in the formation of the exploratory questions.

Exploratory Questions

The first question was: Are the elements the researcher cited as structural differences the reasons why parents send their children to either Catholic schools or public schools? Or, stated another way, of which and to what degree of these structural differences are the reasons that parents give for electing or not electing nonelite religious secondary schools (size, compulsoriness, diversification, bureaucratic, tax supported)?

This led to a second question: What elements outside the school, in the homes, or from parents' experience and environment contribute to their choices (personal reasons, value neutrality, integration)?

Another question had to do with the possibility that the child made the important choice, not the parent. If the child expressed his/her desires and the parent merely acquiesced to the decision and in effect had no strong feeling about the structure of either set of schools, the third question was: Was the child's preference the major factor in the decision?

A final question helped summarize the information gathered from the other questions: Are the plausible differences the same as the perceptive differences of the Catholic-school and the public-school parent?

Data-Gathering Techniques

Population Selection

The geographical limits of the study were defined as within the metropolitan Detroit area, specifically the Archdiocese of Detroit's six-county area: Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, St. Clair, Monroe, and Lapeer.

The first step in identifying the non-Catholic parents who had children enrolled in Catholic schools was to meet with the Superintendent of the Archdiocese of Detroit, Frank DeSantis. Mr. DeSantis provided the names of 12 of the high school principals who could act as resources for providing the names of parents in their individual attendance areas who met the criteria of being non-Catholic parents whose children had been enrolled previously in a public school and were now enrolled in a Catholic school. The students were to be between the ages of 12 and 18.

The second step was to contact each of the Catholic principals by letter and then telephone to determine if each of them could provide such a list of names. Upon learning the nature of the study and what would be involved for each set of parents, the principals provided a list based on the criteria above.

The third step was to contact the superintendent of the Utica Community Schools to enlist his help in identifying the parents whose children are presently enrolled in public schools. He contacted several of his superintendent colleagues so that the cross-section of public-school parents would be as representative of the metropolitan Detroit area as that of the Catholic-school parents. This also

eliminated the possibility of a bias should the researcher, as a school administrator in Utica, have chosen to use the parents in her own school attendance area. These superintendents agreed to provide lists of parents' names for the study.

Development of the Instrument

Variables

The problem was to attempt to investigate the reasons why a set of non-Catholic parents elected to remove their child (children) from public schools and enroll them in nonexclusive religious secondary schools. The unit of analysis was the differences in perceptions between parents who enrolled their children in Catholic schools and parents who enrolled their children in public schools. Four scales were developed to measure these differences in parents' perceptions of what they thought the Catholic school offered their child and to measure the perceptions of a set of public-school parents relative to what they thought the public school offers: (1) the structural differences between Catholic and public schools, e.g., size, compulsoriness, diversification, bureaucratic, tax supported; (2) the elements outside the school that may have influenced the parents, e.g., personal reasons, value neutrality; (3) the child's preference of school; and (4) the satisfaction or dissatisfaction parents felt about their child's school.

Description of the Scales

The instrument is made up of 55 statements, which are distributed into five scales.[1]

Scale A includes eight statements that are designed to measure the demographics of the sample.

The remaining 47 statements are distributed into four scales--B, C, D, E--of varying numbers of statements that are of the Likert type. The response format is a five-point scale ranging from 1 to 5. Five indicates strongly agree (SA), 4 indicates agree (Agr), 3 indicates uncertain (Unc), 2 indicates disagree (Dis), and 1 indicates strongly disagree (St D). A high score indicates a favorable attitude toward the statement about their child's school, and a low score indicates a negative attitude toward the corresponding statement about their child's school. The Likert-type scale was selected because of its ability to collect large amounts of information per item.[2] Each item in a Likert-type scale is itself a rating scale.[3] Two items are sufficient to constitute an adequate scale for the measurement of a criterion.[4] Likert scales can be combined with other types of items in the construction of indices and scales.

Scale B includes 25 statements designed to measure the criterion: of which and to what degree of the structural differences between Catholic schools and public schools are the reasons for electing or not electing nonexclusive religious secondary schools.

Scale C includes 13 statements designed to measure the criterion: which elements outside the home or from the parents' experience and environment contribute to their choice of school.

Scale D includes six statements designed to measure the criterion: whether the child's preference was the major factor in choosing a school.

Scale E includes three statements designed to measure the criterion: the maximization of satisfaction with the parents' choice, which may indicate if their perceived differences are the same as the plausible differences between the two kinds of schools, Catholic and public.

The 47 statements, in their four scales, should provide a comparison of the reasons why some parents enroll their child in a Catholic school, why some parents enroll their children in a public school, and provide both systems with a better impression of how they are perceived by parents.

Construction of the Questionnaire

Following Likert's advice, more statements than would be included in the final scales were assembled.[5] The initial interviews resulted in responses to a series of 46 statements or questions. Later, some of these responses were used as statements among the four scales.

Statements were selected from the Utica Community Schools Education Survey: 1981 Project HEAR Survey, the 1981 Shelby Junior High School Survey. This survey was developed by the researcher as the building principal in conjunction with a parent advisory board and the school district's public relations director. This was the first time in the Utica Community Schools that an entire junior-high-school parent group had been surveyed. Other sources included the 1981 Montgomery County Public Schools Survey, the 1981 Gallup Poll, newspaper articles, professional journals, interviews, conversations

with educational colleagues, and friends. The Shelby survey and the interviews were the best sources of statements because of their close parallel to the content needed.

The statements were presented to administrative colleagues, neighbors, teachers, and a public relations director to evaluate the reading ease and to estimate the time required for completion of the questionnaire. Many of the statements were rewritten as a result of the group feedback. The time estimated for completion of the 55 statements was 35 minutes.

Reliability

To test the reliability of the questionnaire, which contained 55 statements, a copy was mailed to 80 families, 40 who have children enrolled in Catholic schools and 40 who have children enrolled in public schools. Families were instructed to return the completed questionnaire within one week after they had received it. The questionnaire had stamped self-addressed envelopes for the return. Eighty questionnaires were mailed, and 51 were returned. The return rate was 63 percent.

The responses of the 51 parents in the reliability sample were scored, coded, and punched onto data cards. A program was written for the CDC 6500 computer to correlate the responses to the statements. The results of the correlation computation indicated the strength of the relationship between the statement and the characteristics of the schools. The number of statements was reduced from 55 to 48 based on this information.

In regard to the sample, the method of sampling was to obtain a large, representative sample wherein the group of parents was consciously selected on the basis of being reasonably representative of the total population. This method or technique of sampling has also been referred to as "purposive sampling," which is a form of judgment sampling.[6]

The next step in the research process was to send out the revised questionnaire. On March 9, 300 questionnaires were mailed to both the Catholic-school parents and the public-school parents. Sixteen days later, 31 percent of the Catholic-school parents and 42 percent of the public-school parents were accounted for. Post-cards were sent to each of the parents who had not returned their questionnaires. Ten days later, 77 percent of the Catholic-school parents had returned their questionnaires. Sixty-nine percent of the public-school parents had returned their questionnaires.

Included with the questionnaire was a cover letter, which comprises Appendix C of this study, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the parents to return the questionnaire to the researcher's home address. The methods for analysis of the questionnaire were developed with the cooperation and the assistance of the Office of Research and Statistical Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University.

The initial step in the analysis of the survey data was the computation of the inter-item correlation matrix. Given this matrix, the sum scores of the correlations between all items in the questionnaire are presented in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1.--Inter-item correlation matrix.

Item	Quality	Item	Quality
B Scale: Structure of Schools			
1	90	21	88
2	89	22	89
3	89	23	88
4	89	24	88
5	89	25	88
6	88	26	88
7	88	27	88
8	89	28	88
9	88	29	88
10	88	30	88
11	89	31	88
12	88	32	88
13	89	33	88
14	89	34	88
15	88	35	88
16	89	36	88
17	88	37	90
18	89	38	90
19	88	39	88
20	88	40	89

Standard score coefficient = 89

Table 2.1.--Continued.

Item	Quality	Item	Quality
C Scale: Personal Aspects			
1	73	8	73
2	72	9	76
3	73	10	76
4	74	11	76
5	78	12	72
6	79	13	75
7	73		
Standard score coefficient = 77			
D Scale: Child's Choice			
1	43	4	45
2	49	5	46
3	43	6	51
Standard score coefficient = 51			
E Scale: Satisfaction			
1	91		
2	87		
3	86		
Standard score coefficient = 92			

The first analysis was the construction of a measurement model. The measurement model specifies how the underlying constructs (usually attitudes) are defined in terms of the items. In this study, constructs are referred to as variables. For example, a 100-item questionnaire might ultimately be measuring only five underlying variables or attitudes. Traditionally, the measurement model is defined via a factor analysis; the factors are interpreted as the higher-order constructs.

The factor analysis that represents the correlation of each item on the questionnaire with the items from each scale is shown in Table 2.2.

Once the variables are defined, the major question of the study may be pursued--what is the network of causal relations among the variables? That is, the investigator should analyze the structural relations among the variables. This phase of the analysis is referred to as the construction of the structural model. A multiple-regression model was used. The variables are defined through a factor analysis, and then the factors are regressed in a suitable "dependent variable."

Measurement Model

The primary analysis here is cluster analysis. The purpose of a cluster analysis is to evaluate how well various subgroups or clusters of items define a corresponding set of more (global) variables. Each such variable represents a single underlying attitude. It is difficult to measure an attitude with a single item because of

Table 2.2.--Factor analysis table of correlation with each factor.

Item	1	2	3	4
		B Scale		
1	20	-05	-43	-21
2	-05	06	-43	-05
3	-04	11	-58	-02
4	-05	3	63	13
5	26	06	-07	65
6	14	75	-15	26
7	38	23	19	70
8	12	62	04	05
9	35	54	-19	03
10	39	51	-01	31
11	25	55	05	23
12	25	59	-09	02
13	02	39	-01	03
14	04	03	20	66
15	05	50	13	15
16	08	24	18	63
17	43	17	38	57
18	-05	07	25	66
19	37	09	21	52
20	87	28	-10	02
21	82	25	02	08
22	-09	60	39	-16
23	73	37	-05	-07
24	21	57	35	24
25	24	61	03	02
26	51	39	28	07
27	81	17	18	04
28	81	22	19	12
29	64	19	22	06
30	80	01	35	22
31	59	36	36	-15
32	67	32	28	-22
33	52	53	-11	20
34	43	44	28	20
35	42	50	31	03
36	60	45	03	-18
37	-27	22	12	-20
38	-12	-16	40	15
39	40	30	51	10
40	04	-02	-20	05

Table 2.2.--Continued.

Item	1	2	3	4
		C Scale		
1	54	51	32	29
2	49	33	36	39
3	53	34	33	24
4	27	12	57	07
5	28	-03	-06	-23
6	18	08	-42	0
7	30	11	82	15
8	15	17	70	08
9	17	-02	34	-28
10	22	02	-07	11
11	27	01	21	04
12	23	48	26	14
13	09	65	0	28
		D Scale		
1	10	16	39	18
2	18	08	25	07
3	14	-01	28	19
4	04	28	0	55
5	62	20	-09	29
6	27	-10	-15	18
		E Scale		
1	50	35	-10	50
2	73	35	-15	42
3	78	28	03	34
		Proportion of Variance		
	.02[a]	.02[a]	.01[a]	.01[a]

[a]Amount of variance accounted for in each factor.

measurement error. This error consists of a random-response component and a stable component (item specificity), which measures something different than the underlying attitude. But a cluster of items allows a more error-free measure of the attitude. This is a stable measure of the cluster score, the average (or sum) of the individual's responses across the items in the cluster.

The first step in a cluster analysis is the partitioning of the items into distinct subsets. That is, each item is placed in only one cluster. The measurement model itself specifies how the underlying variables are related to the items. Thus, after each item has been placed in a cluster, the measurement model is defined. The measurement model for a cluster analysis specifies that each item is a cluster of items in a measure of exactly one indulging variable.

So as cluster analysis begins by forming distinct subsets of items, the clusters may be defined in two ways. An initial measure is constructed by writing the items appearing on the questionnaire into various subscales. The items are grouped according to their meaning.

The second method is to let the computer define the clusters. In this kind of situation the investigator does not specify a structure in advance. Instead, he/she attempts to "let the computer" find the structure purely on the basis of statistics, i.e., without consideration of meaning. The most popular technique for this approach is a traditional factor analysis. The primary output of a factor-analysis program is a table of factor loading, i.e., a table of the correlations between each of the items with each of the underlying

factors. In terms of cluster analysis, one cluster is defined for each factor, and the items are assigned to clusters on the basis of their factor loadings. Each item is assigned to that cluster for which it has the highest loading on the corresponding factor. For this purpose a traditional factor analysis is only a preliminary step toward the analysis of interest-cluster analysis.

The final step is a means and standard-deviations score of each item on the questionnaire, which is presented in Table 2.3.

Summary

This chapter contained descriptions of the procedures used in this study. First, the methods of research were delineated. Second, the techniques on how the data were gathered were described. The construction, field testing, and administration of the questionnaire comprised the third procedure. Last, the procedures for data analysis were described.

Table 2.3.--Mean item values and standard deviation item values.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
B 1	2.948	1.413
B 2	2.538	1.143
B 3	3.538	1.166
B 4	3.435	1.095
B 5	3.538	.995
B 6	3.871	.800
B 7	3.692	1.021
B 8	4.538	.505
B 9	4.102	.787
B 10	3.820	1.072
B 11	4.256	.637
B 12	4.051	.759
B 13	2.974	1.038
B 14	3.948	.793
B 15	3.205	1.004
B 16	3.076	1.109
B 17	3.512	1.189
B 18	3.923	.983
B 19	3.307	1.173
B 20	4.102	.820
B 21	4.076	.870
B 22	4.128	.732
B 23	4.076	.532
B 24	4.000	.917
B 25	4.333	.621
B 26	4.051	.887
B 27	3.820	.914
B 28	3.974	.777
B 29	3.846	1.089
B 30	3.948	.825
B 31	3.948	.723
B 32	3.666	.805

Table 2.3.--Continued.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
B 33	4.179	1.048
B 34	4.153	.708
B 35	4.051	.686
B 36	4.000	.858
B 37	2.461	1.143
B 38	3.230	1.087
B 39	2.564	.911
B 40	3.282	1.212
C 1	3.923	.604
C 2	3.589	.809
C 3	3.871	.832
C 4	2.230	1.327
C 5	2.897	1.165
C 6	3.974	.902
C 7	2.410	1.332
C 8	2.410	1.332
C 9	3.615	.962
C 10	4.205	.800
C 11	4.102	.787
C 12	4.000	.888
C 13	4.153	.987
D 1	3.179	1.211
D 2	2.974	1.180
D 3	2.230	.985
D 4	4.282	.604
D 5	3.871	.832
D 6	3.307	.922
E 1	4.128	.732
E 2	4.000	.794
E 3	4.051	.856

Notes--Chapter II

[1]Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973), p. 270.

[2]C. A. Moser and G. Kalton, Survey Methods in Social Investigation (New York: Basic Books, 1972), p. 364.

[3]Ibid., p. 362.

[4]John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasious, and Kendra B. Head, Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969), p. 4.

[5]Rensis Likert, "A Technique for Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology 140 (June 1932): 46.

[6]Francis J. Rummel, An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1964), p. 80.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS

In this chapter each of the exploratory questions is presented and analyzed quantitatively in terms of the independent variables: Catholic-school parents and public-school parents. Levels of the independent variables are compared to determine if significance exists.

The intention was to investigate the differences in the reasons why parents chose to remove their child (children) from a public secondary school and enrolled them in a Catholic school and why parents chose to enroll their child (children) in public secondary schools.

Reliability Analyses

The specific questions that guided this study dealt with the school characteristics: Are the elements the researcher cited as structural differences the reasons why parents send their children to either Catholic schools or public schools? Or, stated another way, of which and to what degree of these structural differences are the reasons that parents give for electing nonelite religious secondary schools?

The second question, Personal Aspects, was: What elements outside the school, in the homes, or from the parents' experience and environment contribute to their choices?

Another question had to do with the possibility that the child made the important choice, not the parent. If the child expressed his/her desires and the parent merely acquiesced to the decision and in effect had no strong feeling about the structure of either set of schools, the third question, Child's Choice, was: Was the child's preference the major factor in the decision?

A final question addressed the satisfaction level of the parents' perceptions of their school: Are the plausible differences the same as the perceptive differences of the Catholic-school and the public-school parent.

The data for the reliability analysis indicated the relationship between the statements within each scale. Cronbach's alpha was used to check the reliability. The reliability coefficients for each scale are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1.--Reliability.

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
School Characteristics	.91938
Personal	.72694
Child's Choice	.31245
Satisfaction	.89066

Demographics

One hundred fifty questionnaires were mailed to Catholic-school parents, and 150 questionnaires were mailed to public-school parents for a total of 300. Of this number, 77 percent of the Catholic parents returned their questionnaires and 69 percent of the public-school parents returned their questionnaires.

There were 196 families represented in this study: 88 Catholic-school parents and 108 public-school parents. Of these 196 respondents, there were 46 males (23.5 percent), 147 females (75.0 percent), and 3 responses from both parents (1.5 percent).

For each family that participated there were 24 families with one child (12.2 percent), 54 families with two children (27.6 percent), 52 families with three children (26.5 percent), 27 families with four children (13.8 percent), 17 families with five children (8.7 percent), 9 families with six children (4.6 percent), 9 families with seven children (4.6 percent), 3 families with nine children (1.5 percent), and 1 family with ten children (.5 percent).

The children in these families were enrolled as follows: 7 in kindergarten, 4 in first grade, 7 in second grade, 11 in third grade, 26 in sixth grade, 38 in seventh grade, 47 in eighth grade, 52 in ninth grade, 66 in tenth grade, 57 in eleventh grade, and 55 in twelfth grade.

The marital status of the total number of respondents was 1 single male and 45 married males. There were 41 single females and 117 married females. The marital status included 33 single parents from the public-school group (16.8 percent) and 75 married public-school

parents (38.3 percent). Among the Catholic-school parents 10 were single (5.1 percent) and 78 were married (39.8 percent).

Of the level of education of the 167 female respondents, 1 had an elementary education (.6 percent), 8 had attended high school (7.2 percent), 34 were high-school graduates (22.4 percent), 28 had attended college (18.4 percent), 30 were college graduates (19.7 percent), and 46 had some post-graduate work (31.6 percent).

The male occupations included 2 unemployed persons (1.4 percent), 4 with clerical positions (2.9 percent), 26 skilled labor (18.6 percent), 7 unskilled labor (5.0 percent), 4 in sales (2.9 percent), 19 in management positions (13.6 percent), 68 professionals (48.6 percent), and 10 retired (7.1 percent).

Among the 167 female respondents, 18 held clerical positions (19.8 percent), 4 were in skilled-labor jobs (2.4 percent), 2 were in unskilled-labor jobs (4.2 percent), 7 held sales jobs (4.2 percent), 12 were in management (7.2 percent), 83 were professionals (49.7 percent), 28 were homemakers (16.8 percent), 7 were retired (4.2 percent), and 3 were unemployed (1.8 percent).

The total family income of the 196 respondents ranged from $10,000 to over $60,000. There were 2 families that earned less than $10,000 (1.1 percent), 6 families earned between $10,000 and $14,999 (3.2 percent), 12 families earned between $15,000 and $19,999 (6.3 percent), 38 families earned between $20,000 and $29,999 (20.0 percent), 24 families earned between $30,000 and $39,999 (12.6 percent), 41 families earned between $40,000 and $49,999 (21.5 percent), 26 families

earned between $50,000 and $59,999 (13.7 percent), and 36 families earned $60,000 or over (18.9 percent).

The demographic information was compared to the variable school to determine significance using the chi-square test. The following exploratory questions were analyzed in the study and comparisons were made between the Catholic-school parents and the public-school parents to see if there was a significant difference between the two groups.

A. Can it be demonstrated that the makeup of the families, based upon the number of children and their grade placement, differs between the Catholic- and public-school families based upon the demographic variables?

The majority of public-school families had three children, and among the Catholic-school families, the majority had two children. Among the public-school parents, 67 had girls attending school during 1981-82. Catholic-school parents had 58 girls in school. The number of boys of the public-school parents who attended school in 1981-82 was 90 and 60 boys from Catholic-school parents. These results are summarized in Tables 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.

B. Does the grade placement of the public-school students differ from that of the Catholic-school students?

There was no significant relationship in grade placement between the two groups. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents had children in grades 7 through 12. Public-school families had the largest number of students in the eleventh grade. The results are summarized in Table 3.5.

Table 3.2.--Demographics--number of children.

Number of Children	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
1	9	4.6	15	7.7
2	27	13.8	27	13.8
3	35	17.9	17	8.7
4	17	8.7	10	5.1
5	12	6.1	5	2.6
6	4	2.0	5	2.6
7	1	.5	8	4.1
8	0	0	0	0
9	3	1.5	0	0
10	0	0	1	.5
Column total	108		88	

Chi-square = 20.15251 Significance = .0098 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient (corrected for degrees of freedom) = .32065

Table 3.3.--Demographics--number of girls.

Number of Girls	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
0	41	20.9	30	15.3
1	40	20.4	30	15.3
2	18	9.2	20	10.2
3	9	4.6	7	3.6
4	0	0	1	.5
Column total	108		88	

Chi-square = 2.47299 Significance = .6495 Significant: No
Chi-coefficient = .11233

Table 3.4.--Demographics--number of boys.

Number of Boys	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
0	17	8.8	27	13.9
1	57	29.4	31	16.0
2	16	8.2	20	10.3
3	7	3.6	5	2.6
4	10	5.2	2	1.0
5	0	0	1	.5
6	0	0	1	.5
Column total	107		87	

Chi-square = 16.17572 Significance = .0128 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient = .28876

C. Does the sex of the respondent differ between the public-school parent and the Catholic-school parent?

The respondents for both family groups were mostly females. There was a significant difference in both cases. There was a relationship summarized in Table 3.6.

D. Does the marital status differ between the public-school parent and the Catholic-school parent?

The number of married couples was about the same between the public-school parents and the Catholic-school parents. However, there was a larger number of single parents among the public-school parents. Table 3.7 contains a summary of these data.

Table 3.5.--Demographics--grade placement.

Grade	Public		Catholic		
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent	
K	4	57.1	3	42.9	
1	2	50.0	2	50.0	
2	0	0	7	100.0	
3	8	72.7	3	27.3	
4	12	63.2	7	36.8	
5	13	65.0	7	35.0	
6	16	61.5	10	38.5	
7	20	52.6	18	47.4	Chi-square = .64653 Significance = .1256 Chi-coefficient = .24845
8	26	55.3	21	44.7	
9	30	57.7	22	42.3	
10	39	59.1	27	40.9	Chi-square = .03471 Significance = .8522 Chi-coefficient = .14907
11	35	61.4	22	38.6	Chi-square = .00218 Significance = .9627 Chi-coefficient = .07673
12	26	47.3	29	52.7	Chi-square = .00204 Significance = .9560 Chi-coefficient = .14372

Table 3.6.--Demographics--sex of respondents.

Sex	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
Male	32	16.3	14	7.1
Female	73	37.2	74	37.8
Both	3	1.5	0	0
Column total	108		88	

Chi-square = 8.09374 Significance = .0175 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient = .20321

Table 3.7.--Demographics--marital status.

Marital Status	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
Single	33	16.8	10	5.1
Married	75	38.3	78	39.8
Column total	108		88	

Chi-square = 9.33838 Significance = .0022 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient = .23067

E. Are the public-school parents more or less educated than the Catholic-school parents?

The educational level of both groups was significantly different, specifically among both the male and female Catholic-school parents. This is indicated in Tables 3.8 and 3.9.

F. Does the occupational status of the public-school parents differ from that of the Catholic-school parents?

A slight difference between the two groups of families was reflected among the female parents, whereas the male parents did not appear to differ greatly. This is summarized in Tables 3.10 and 3.11.

G. Does the income level of the public-school parents differ from the income level of Catholic-school parents?

The data indicated that the Catholic-school parents earned more money than the public-school parents. The data are presented in Table 3.12.

Analysis of Variance

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to assess statistically whether significant differences existed in the responses of the two groups of parents to each of the scales: School Characteristics (B), Personal (C), Child's Choice (D), and Satisfaction (E).

According to the analysis of variance, there was a significant difference in how the public-school parents and the Catholic-school parents responded to three of the four scales: School Characteristics (B), Personal (C), and Satisfaction (E). In each group the Catholic-school parents' responses were more positive than those of the public-school parents. The C Scale, Personal, had a significant response. The B and E Scales, School Characteristics and Satisfaction,

Table 3.8.--Demographics--male educational level.

Male Educational Level	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
Elementary	1	.7	0	0
Some high school	7	4.6	4	2.6
High school graduate	24	15.8	10	6.6
Some college	19	12.5	9	5.9
College graduate	24	15.8	6	3.9
College post-graduate	10	6.6	38	25.0
Column total	85		67	

Chi-square = 36.67032 Significance = .0000 Significant: No
Chi-coefficient = .49117

Table 3.9.--Demographics--female educational level.

Female Educational Level	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Total	Number	Column Total
Elementary	1	.6	0	0
Some high school	3	1.8	5	3.0
High school graduate	27	16.2	12	7.2
Some college	25	15.0	17	10.2
College graduate	19	11.4	22	13.2
College post-graduate	10	6.0	26	15.6
Column total	85		82	

Chi-square = 16.07496 Significance = .0066 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient = .31025

Table 3.10.--Demographics--male occupational status.

Male Occupational Status	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
No response	1	.7	1	.7
Skilled labor	21	15.0	5	3.6
Unskilled labor	5	3.6	2	1.4
Sales	0	0	4	2.9
Management	7	5.0	12	8.6
Professional	33	23.6	35	25.0
Retired	8	5.7	2	1.4
Unemployed	0	0	0	0
Column total	78		62	

Chi-square = 19.53304 Significance = .0067 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient = .37353

Table 3.11.--Demographics--female occupational status.

Female Occupational Status	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
No response	2	1.2	1	.6
Clerical	13	7.8	5	3.0
Skilled labor	2	1.2	2	1.2
Unskilled labor	2	1.2	0	0
Sales	3	1.8	4	2.4
Management	6	3.6	6	3.6
Professional	37	22.2	46	27.5
Homemaker	11	6.6	17	10.2
Retired	6	3.6	1	.6
Unemployed	3	1.8	0	0
Column total	85		82	

Chi-square = 14.81568 Statistics = .0961 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient = .28876

Table 3.12.--Demographics--total family income.

Total Income	Public		Catholic	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
Less than $10,000	2	1.1	0	0
$10,000-$14,999	6	3.2	0	0
$15,000-$19,999	11	5.8	1	.5
$20,000-$29,999	27	14.2	11	5.8
$30,000-$39,999	18	9.5	6	3.2
$40,000-$49,999	23	12.1	18	9.5
$50,000-$59,999	12	6.3	14	7.4
$60,000 or over	3	1.6	33	17.4
Column total	104		86	

Chi-square = 53.81148 Significance = .0000 Significant: Yes
Chi-coefficient = .53218

were also significant. However, there was no significant difference on the D Scale, Child's Choice.

The means and standard deviations for each scale are summarized in Tables 3.13 and 3.14.

Table 3.13.--Standard deviation scale value.

Scales	Public	Catholic
School Characteristics	.5549	.3754
Personal	.4724	.4734
Child's Choice	.6292	.6701
Satisfaction	.9927	.8032

Table 3.14.--Means scale value.

Scales	Public	Catholic
School Characteristics	3.4670	3.8505
Personal	3.2241	3.9486
Child's Choice	2.8836	3.0227
Satisfaction	3.6975	4.1061

In the analysis of variance, the between-group variance estimate reflects the magnitude of the difference between and/or among the group means. The larger the difference between means, the larger the between-group variance. The within-group variance estimate reflects the dispersion of scores within each treatment group.

The ANOVA tables for the (B) School Characteristics, (C) Personal, (D) Child's Choice, and (E) Satisfaction Scales are summarized in Tables 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, and 3.18.

Table 3.15.--ANOVA table--B Scale: School Characteristics.

	Sum of Squares		Degrees of Freedom		Mean Square
Between groups	7.1324	÷	(1)	=	7.1324
Within groups	45.2127	÷	(194)	=	.2331
Total	52.3452		(195)		

F = 30.6041 Significance = .0000

Table 3.16.--ANOVA table--C Scale: Personal.

	Sum of Squares		Degrees of Freedom		Mean Square
Between groups	25.4549	÷	(1)	=	25.4549
Within groups	43.3778	÷	(194)	=	.2236
Total	68.8327		(195)		

F = 113.8429 Significance = .0000

Table 3.17.--ANOVA table--D Scale: Child's Choice.

	Sum of Squares		Degrees of Freedom		Mean Square
Between groups	.9301	÷	(1)	=	.9301
Within groups	80.6306	÷	(192)	=	.4200
Total	81.5601		(193)		

F = 2.2147 Significance = .1383

Table 3.18.--ANOVA table--E Scale: Satisfaction.

	Sum of Squares		Degrees of Freedom		Mean Square
Between groups	8.0928	÷	(1)	=	8.0928
Within groups	161.5739	÷	(194)	=	.8329
Total	169.6667		(195)		

F = 9.7169 Significance = .0021

B Scale: School Characteristics

The B Scale was designed to measure the differences in the perceptions of Catholic-school parents and public-school parents relative to the structural differences or characteristics between public and Catholic secondary schools. The exploratory question addressed in B Scale is:

> Are the elements the researcher cited as structural differences the reasons why parents send their children to either Catholic schools or public schools? Or, stated another way, of which and to what degree of these structural differences are the reasons that parents give for electing nonelite religious secondary schools (size, compulsoriness, diversification, bureaucratic, tax supported)?

Of the families whose children attend public school, 49.5 percent indicated that the education provided by the public school is comparable to the education provided by the Catholic school. In comparison, 11.8 percent of the Catholic-school parents shared the same opinion.

On the B Scale, School Characteristics, both sets of parents expressed different attitudes about the characteristics of public and Catholic schools. The results of the B Scale, School Characteristics, are summarized in Table 3.19.

C Scale: Personal

This scale was designed to measure the differences of elements outside the home that influenced the parents' choice to send their child (children) to a Catholic or public secondary school. The question addressed in Scale C is:

> What elements outside the school, in the home, or from the parents' experience and environment contribute to their choices (personal reasons, value neutrality, integration)?

Table 3.19.--Parents' attitudes toward the characteristics of public and Catholic schools.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	The education provided by the public school is comparable to the education provided by the Catholic school.					
Public	N	9	21	22	31	20
	%	8.7	20.4	21.4	30.1	19.4
Catholic		37	29	9	9	1
		43.5	34.1	10.6	10.6	1.2
Statement:	Children are better off in schools that have larger enrollments.					
Public		29	47	12	16	4
		26.9	43.5	11.1	14.8	3.7
Catholic		34	41	5	5	3
		38.6	41.6	5.7	5.7	3.4
Statement:	A school that offers a large variety of courses provides a better preparation for our children.					
Public		0	16	13	39	40
		0	14.8	12.0	36.1	37.0
Catholic		10	15	17	31	15
		11.4	17.0	19.3	35.2	17.0
Statement:	Our children receive individualized attention from their teachers.					
Public		11	27	24	41	4
		10.3	25.2	22.4	38.3	3.7
Catholic		2	9	12	42	23
		2.3	10.2	13.6	47.7	26.1
Statement:	There is an adequate amount of homework given to the students.					
Public		12	14	7	40	33
		11.1	13.0	6.5	37.0	30.6
Catholic		0	2	8	49	27
		0	2.3	9.3	57.0	31.4

Table 3.19.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	Teachers provide an adequate amount of follow-up to assigned work.					
Public	N	17	16	20	49	6
	%	15.7	14.8	18.5	45.4	5.6
Catholic		0	6	9	51	22
		0	6.8	10.2	58.0	25.0
Statement:	A good high school education is important to success in life.					
Public		7	4	3	32	61
		6.5	3.7	2.8	29.6	56.5
Catholic		0	2	6	24	56
		0	2.3	6.8	27.3	63.6
Statement:	Our child's school gives adequate attention to each of the programs and services listed below: Reading					
Public		0	13	0	68	27
		0	12.0	0	63.0	25.0
Catholic		0	4	2	46	36
		0	4.5	2.3	52.3	40.9
Statement:	Writing and grammar skills					
Public		1	9	6	71	21
		.9	8.3	5.6	65.7	19.4
Catholic		0	9	2	48	29
		0	10.2	2.3	54.5	33.0
Statement:	Mathematics					
Public		3	11	2	58	34
		2.8	10.2	1.9	53.7	31.5
Catholic		0	3	4	42	39
		0	3.4	4.5	47.7	44.3

Table 3.19.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	Science					
Public	N	3	14	13	54	24
	%	2.8	13.0	12.0	50.0	22.2
Catholic		0	5	5	51	27
		0	5.7	5.7	58.0	30.7
Statement:	Training students for jobs					
Public		5	26	26	23	28
		4.6	24.1	24.1	21.3	25.9
Catholic		0	14	37	32	5
		0	15.9	42.0	36.4	5.7
Statement:	Social studies and history					
Public		2	14	14	62	16
		1.9	13.0	13.0	57.4	14.8
Catholic		2	4	12	52	18
		2.3	4.5	13.6	59.1	20.5
Statement:	Helping students choose careers					
Public		9	24	31	15	28
		8.4	22.4	29.0	14.0	26.2
Catholic		4	14	25	31	14
		4.5	15.9	28.4	35.2	15.9
Statement:	Training to help parents become more involved in their children's education					
Public		9	40	35	19	5
		8.3	37.0	32.4	17.6	4.6
Catholic		2	11	26	37	12
		2.3	12.5	29.5	42.0	13.6

Table 3.19.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	Moral and ethical behavior					
Public	N	12	33	24	31	7
	%	11.2	30.8	22.4	29.0	6.5
Catholic		0	3	3	39	43
		0	3.4	3.4	44.3	48.9
Statement:	Parent involvement in school activities					
Public		2	18	8	57	21
		1.9	17.0	7.5	53.8	19.8
Catholic		1	1	9	51	26
		1.1	1.1	10.2	58.0	29.5
Statement:	The emphasis is placed on the development of study skills and teaching students how to learn.					
Public		8	16	26	42	15
		7.5	15.0	24.3	39.3	14.0
Catholic		2	10	10	43	23
		2.3	11.4	11.4	48.9	26.1
Statement:	The student behavior is generally good in our children's school.					
Public		2	22	14	47	22
		1.9	20.6	13.1	43.9	20.6
Catholic		2	3	2	47	34
		2.3	3.4	2.3	53.4	38.6
Statement:	Student discipline in our children's school is administered well.					
Public		0	10	27	51	19
		0	9.3	25.2	47.7	17.8
Catholic		2	0	3	53	30
		2.3	0	3.4	60.2	34.1

Table 3.19.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	The more discipline or respect that the school requires, the easier it is for our children to learn.					
Public	N	3	6	28	33	37
	%	2.8	5.6	26.2	30.8	34.6
Catholic		0	0	12	43	33
		0	0	13.6	48.9	37.5
Statement:	Our children's school makes an adequate attempt to prevent students from intimidating other students.					
Public		0	6	30	47	24
		0	5.6	28.0	43.9	22.4
Catholic		0	1	17	51	19
		0	1.1	19.3	58.0	21.6
Statement:	A school's dress code has a positive effect on student behavior.					
Public		14	17	26	25	25
		13.1	15.9	24.3	23.4	23.4
Catholic		0	2	7	42	37
		0	2.3	8.0	47.7	42.0
Statement:	As parents, we support the discipline policies of our children's school.					
Public		0	11	1	47	48
		0	10.3	.9	43.9	44.9
Catholic		0	1	7	40	40
		0	1.1	8.0	45.5	45.5
Statement:	Our children's school adequately handles these kinds of student behavior problems: Truancy (skipping school)					
Public		0	11	1	47	48
		0	10.3	.9	43.9	44.9
Catholic		0	1	7	40	40
		0	1.1	8.0	45.5	45.5

Table 3.19.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement: Vandalism of school property						
Public	N	2	17	29	44	14
	%	1.9	15.9	27.1	44.1	14.0
Catholic		0	2	7	41	38
		0	2.3	8.0	46.6	43.2
Statement: Fighting in school						
Public		9	8	25	44	21
		8.4	7.5	23.4	44.1	19.6
Catholic		0	5	5	30	48
		0	5.7	5.7	34.1	54.5
Statement: Using alcohol or drugs on school property						
Public		1	15	45	28	18
		.9	14.0	42.1	26.2	16.8
Catholic		2	2	6	38	40
		2.3	2.3	6.8	43.2	45.5
Statement: Abusive language to teacher						
Public		3	11	30	45	17
		2.8	10.4	28.3	42.5	16.0
Catholic		0	2	13	31	42
		0	2.3	14.8	35.2	47.7
Statement: Stealing money or clothing from other students						
Public		4	22	30	37	14
		3.7	20.6	28.0	34.6	13.1
Catholic		0	5	19	37	27
		0	5.7	21.6	42.0	30.7

Table 3.19.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Disagree
Statement:	Abusive language between students					
Public	N	8	18	42	29	10
	%	7.5	16.8	39.3	27.1	9.3
Catholic		0	5	30	34	19
		0	5.7	34.1	38.6	21.6
Statement:	The school made an adequate attempt to inform us of student discipline policies prior to our enrolling our children in school.					
Public		3	4	6	62	32
		2.8	3.7	5.6	57.9	29.9
Catholic		0	7	2	35	44
		0	8.0	2.3	39.8	50.0
Statement:	The teachers in our children's school are qualified.					
Public		0	5	21	59	22
		0	4.7	19.6	55.1	20.6
Catholic		0	3	13	49	23
		0	3.4	14.8	55.7	26.1
Statement:	Our children's school is well staffed with support personnel.					
Public		2	19	20	46	20
		1.9	17.8	18.7	43.0	18.7
Catholic		0	0	22	47	19
		0	0	25.0	53.4	21.6
Statement:	The principal of our children's school is effective.					
Public		2	8	28	45	24
		1.9	7.5	26.2	42.1	22.4
Catholic		0	6	14	33	35
		0	6.8	15.9	37.5	39.8

Table 3.19.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	The principal's effectiveness is hampered by the controls imposed by the central administration.					
Public	N	10	39	36	17	5
	%	9.3	36.4	33.6	15.9	4.7
Catholic		15	32	18	17	6
		17.0	36.4	20.5	19.3	6.8
Statement:	Fewer regulations from the courts and the legislatures should be imposed upon the school's principal.					
Public		7	32	26	33	9
		6.5	29.9	24.3	30.8	8.4
Catholic		0	5	19	37	27
		0	5.7	21.6	42.0	30.7
Statement:	The salaries of the teachers in our children's school are too low.					
Public		10	63	23	1	9
		9.4	59.4	21.7	.9	8.5
Catholic		2	15	41	20	9
		2.3	17.2	47.1	23.0	10.3
Statement:	The teacher unions have helped teachers in the public schools.					
Public		2	21	26	40	17
		1.9	19.8	24.5	37.7	16.0
Catholic		7	12	29	32	8
		8.0	13.6	33.0	36.4	9.1

Of the families whose children are enrolled in Catholic schools, 85.2 percent indicated the value system the teachers and administrators exhibit in their children's school is adequate. In comparison, 50.5 percent of the public-school families shared the same opinions. The percentage of Catholic-school parents was 82.1 percent who indicated that the school should represent the families' value system, as compared with 61.7 percent of the public-school parents. Catholic-school parents indicated that 87.4 percent attend their children's school activities, compared with 83.1 percent of the public-school parents. The results of C Scale are summarized in Table 3.20.

D Scale: Child's Choice

This scale was designed to determine if the child made the choice of his/her school, not the parent. The exploratory question addressed in Scale D is:

Was the child's preference a major factor in the decision?

Of the public-school parents, 42.4 percent indicated their children should not have the choice of which school they attend. This is compared with 27.5 percent of the Catholic-school parents.

Sixty-eight percent of the Catholic-school parents indicated their children receive a positive influence on learning from the other students in their school. In comparison, 59.5 percent of the public-school parents responded similarly.

The results of D Scale are summarized in Table 3.21.

Table 3.20.--Parents' attitudes toward the elements outside school that influenced their choice of school.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	The value system the teachers and administrators exhibit in our children's school is adequate.					
Public	N	2	15	36	46	8
	%	1.9	14.0	33.6	43.0	7.5
Catholic		0	2	10	49	26
		0	2.3	11.4	55.7	29.5
Statement:	Our children's school stresses character building.					
Public		0	22	35	39	12
		0	20.4	32.4	36.1	11.1
Catholic		0	2	4	53	29
		0	2.3	4.5	60.2	33.0
Statement:	It is important for our children to attend a school where the value system resembles that of our family.					
Public		4	16	21	47	19
		3.7	15.0	19.6	43.9	17.8
Catholic		0	3	4	46	35
		0	3.4	4.5	52.3	39.8
Statement:	Our family tradition is to attend Catholic schools.					
Public		49	50	1	2	6
		45.4	46.3	.9	1.9	5.6
Catholic		13	42	5	13	12
		15.1	48.8	5.8	15.1	14.0
Statement:	Religion, in general, should be taught in our children's school.					
Public		46	26	15	6	15
		46.2	24.1	13.9	5.6	13.9
Catholic		0	20	14	29	22
		0	23.5	16.5	34.1	25.9

Table 3.20.--Continued.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	Some government tax money should be used to help parochial schools make ends meet.					
Public	N	44	30	13	16	5
	%	40.7	27.8	12.0	14.8	4.6
Catholic		4	20	15	27	22
		4.5	22.7	17.0	30.7	25.0
Statement:	We attend our children's school activities.					
Public		2	9	7	59	30
		1.9	8.4	6.5	55.1	28.0
Catholic		0	10	1	50	26
		0	11.5	1.1	57.5	29.9
Statement:	We participate in our children's school activities.					
Public		2	18	7	55	25
		1.9	16.8	6.5	51.4	23.4
Catholic		0	13	2	50	23
		0	14.8	2.3	56.8	26.1
Statement:	We are willing to make financial sacrifices to send our children to this particular school.					
Public		1	14	10	52	30
		.9	13.1	9.3	48.6	28.0
Catholic		0	1	4	33	46
		0	0	3.4	44.3	52.3
Statement:	Our children's school provides us with an adequate amount of information about what goes on at school.					
Public		0	7	12	52	36
		0	6.5	11.2	48.6	33.6
Catholic		0	0	3	39	46
		0	0	3.4	44.3	52.3

Table 3.21.--Parents' attitudes toward their children's input into a choice of school.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	Our children should be able to make the choice as to which school to attend.					
Public	N	10	35	15	29	27
	%	9.4	33.0	14.2	27.4	16.0
Catholic		5	19	23	29	11
		5.7	21.8	26.4	33.3	12.6
Statement:	Our children wanted to attend this school because of the sports program.					
Public		31	47	18	7	2
		29.5	44.8	17.1	6.7	1.9
Catholic		20	47	11	7	3
		22.7	53.4	12.5	8.0	3.4
Statement:	The other students have a positive influence on their learning in this particular school.					
Public		5	15	23	48	15
		4.7	14.2	21.7	45.3	14.2
Catholic		0	14	14	48	12
		0	15.9	15.9	54.5	13.6

E Scale: Satisfaction

This scale was designed to summarize the information gathered from the other questions and to determine parental satisfaction of choice. The exploratory question addressed in Scale E is:

> Are the plausible differences the same as the perceptive differences of the Catholic-school and the public-school parent?

Of the Catholic-school parents, 83 percent indicated satisfaction with their children's school compared with 71.3 percent of

the public-school parents. A larger percentage of the Catholic-school parents, 87.4 percent, indicated satisfaction with their children's teachers. In comparison, 64.8 percent of the public-school parents indicated satisfaction with teachers.

The results of E Scale are summarized in Table 3.22.

Table 3.22.--Parents' attitudes toward the satisfaction of their perception of their children's school.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
Statement:	We are satisfied with our children's school.					
Public	N	4	15	12	44	33
	%	3.7	13.9	11.1	40.7	30.6
Catholic		2	9	4	41	32
		2.3	10.2	4.5	46.6	36.4
Statement:	We are satisfied with the teachers in our children's school.					
Public		2	20	16	15	19
		1.9	18.5	14.8	47.2	17.6
Catholic		0	6	5	50	26
		0	6.9	5.7	57.5	29.9
Statement:	We are satisfied with the way in which our children's school is administered.					
Public		2	19	15	47	24
		1.9	17.8	14.0	43.9	22.4
Catholic		0	4	7	46	30
		0	4.6	8.0	52.9	34.5

Standard Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

This process created a new variable and multiplied actual scores by the new weights. There was a significant correlation between all scales by maximally discriminating between scores. The C Scale, Personal, discriminated the most. (See Table 3.23.)

Table 3.23.--Standard canonical discriminant function coefficients.

Scale	Coefficient
School Characteristics	.20960
Personal	1.01438
Child's Choice	.04756
Satisfaction	-.34637

Classification Results of Canonical Discriminant Function

This function shows numerically how many cases were classified correctly. Out of the total number of cases, 78.35 percent were classified correctly (76 percent public and 80 percent Catholic). Table 3.24 is a summary of the data.

Table 3.24.--Classification results.

Actual Group		Number of Cases	Predicted Group Membership 1	2
Public	1	106	81	25
Catholic	2	88	17	71

Pearson Correlation

The Pearson correlation was run to determine the extent to which the same individuals occupied the same relative position on two variables. The quantitative expression of the extent of the relationship is given in terms of the magnitude of the correlation coefficient. Correlation coefficients vary between values of -1.00 and +1.00. Both extremes represent perfect relationships. A coefficient of zero indicates the absence of a relationship between two variables.

Two scales had a high correlation, three were moderately correlated, and one had a low correlation. The correlated coefficient for B and E Scales was .7275. B and C Scales were correlated at .6099. The C and E Scale was .4883. The B and D Scale was .4163 with C and E Scale at .1761.

The Pearson correlation coefficients for Scales A, B, C, D, and E are presented in Table 3.25.

Summary

In this chapter each of the scales and the exploratory questions was presented and analyzed quantitatively in terms of the independent variables: public-school parents and Catholic-school parents. Levels of the independent variables were compared to determine if there were significant differences across the scales between the public-school parents and the Catholic-school parents.

Given the variables School Characteristics (B), Personal (C), Child's Choice (D), and Satisfaction (E), the researcher can predict

with 89 percent accuracy whether a family chose their children's school based on their perceptions of that kind of school as a result of the analysis. These results are shown in Table 3.1. According to this solution, all scales except D Scale, Child's Choice, had a direct effect on a family's choice of school, and all were significant contributors.

Table 3.25.--Pearson correlation coefficients.

	B	C	D	E
B		.6099 p=.001	.4163 p=.001	.7275 p=.001
C			.1761 p=.007	.4883 p=.001
D				.4136 p=.001
E				

B/C = .6099
B/D = .4163
B/E = .7275

C/D = .1761
C/E = .4883

D/E = .4136

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The researcher's purpose in this study was to investigate the reasons why a set of non-Catholic parents elected to remove their child (children) from public schools and enrolled them in nonexclusive religious secondary schools. The researcher was primarily interested in the importance of the information gathered for its inferences and implications may be for the possible restructuring of the public secondary schools' philosophy and curriculum.

A 48-statement questionnaire was developed, field tested, and mailed to 300 families, of which 150 were parents of students in Catholic schools and 150 parents of students in public schools. The questionnaire was designed to compare the two groups of families on their (1) attitude toward the characteristics of their children's secondary school, (2) attitude toward the thing outside school that may have influenced their decision on a choice of school, (3) attitude on the role their children played in making the choice of school, and (4) attitude toward their perception of the school based on a satisfaction level.

Scale A was designed to provide the personal information that became the basis for the demographic data. The analyses indicated that Catholic-school parents had a larger number of boys enrolled in

Catholic schools. Single parents were more prevalent among the public-school parents. The educational level was highest among both the male and female Catholic-school parents. The majority of both sets of parents had only one or two children. The income level was highest among the male and female Catholic-school parents, with the latter group having the largest number of persons employed in the professional category.

Scale B, School Characteristics, was designed to measure the attitudes of the families toward the characteristics of schools. The specific question of this scale was:

> Are the elements the researcher cited as structural differences the reasons why parents send their children to either Catholic schools or public schools? Or, stated another way, of which and to what degree of these structural differences are the reasons that parents give for electing nonelite religious secondary schools (size, compulsoriness, diversification, bureaucratic, tax supported)?

The analyses indicated that on this scale a significant difference existed between the Catholic-school parents' perceptions of the characteristics of secondary schools and those of public-school parents.

Scale C, Personal, was designed to measure the difference in attitudes of the families relative to aspects other than the school that may have influenced their choice of school. The specific question of this scale was:

> What elements outside the school, in the homes, or from the parents' experience and environment contribute to their choices (personal reasons, value neutrality)?

The analyses of this scale indicated that there was a significant difference between the Catholic-school parents and the

public-school parents relative to their attitudes about the influences outside school or personal aspects.

Scale D, Child's Choice, was designed to measure the difference in attitudes of the two groups of families about how much input their children had into a choice of school.

Was the child's preference the major factor in the decision?

The analysis of this scale indicated that there was no significant difference between the Catholic-school parents and the public-school parents toward the input from their children.

Scale E, Satisfaction, was designed to measure the difference in attitude between the two groups of families as to their perceptions about the respective schools as reflected in their satisfaction with the schools.

Are the plausible differences the same as the perceptive differences of the Catholic-school parent and the public-school parent (satisfaction)?

The analysis of this scale indicated a significant difference between the satisfaction expressed by the Catholic-school parents and the public-school parents.

Discussion of the Findings

According to the analysis of variance, there was a significant difference in how the public-school parents and the Catholic-school parents responded to three of the four scales: School Characteristics (B), Personal (C), and Satisfaction (E). In each group the Catholic-school parents' responses were more positive than those of the public-school parents. There was no significant difference on the D Scale, Child's Choice.

The first exploratory question was: Are the elements the researcher cited as structural differences the reasons why parents send their children to either Catholic schools or public schools? Or, stated another way, of which and to what degree of these structural differences are the reasons that parents give for electing or not electing nonelite religious secondary schools (size, compulsoriness, diversification, bureaucratic, tax supported)? The answer, according to the information, was a resounding yes. In fact, the statistical differences do not convey the magnitude of the response. On almost every question in that category, the parents of Catholic-school children expressed a greater degree of faith and confidence in their schools than did the parents of public-school children. It was interesting that 77.6 percent of the parents of Catholic-school children believed that their Catholic schools were superior to public schools, but 29.1 percent of the parents of the public-school children believed that their own schools were, in fact, inferior to the Catholic schools. On the other side of the scale, only 11.8 percent of the Catholic-school parents believed that the public schools are, in fact, even as good as their own schools.

It was also interesting that even the heralded disadvantages of the Catholic schools--their limited teacher salaries, their fewer options of classes for students, their (according to Coleman) larger class sizes, their fewer specialists in mathematics and reading--were not perceived by the parents who send their children as disadvantages, when compared to the better-funded public schools with more options, more specialists, and better-paid teachers. That is not to

say that the public-school parents were unhappy with their schools in those areas. In many cases they, too, were quite positive about their schools, but they were no more positive, and in a few cases were less positive, than the parents of Catholic-school children.

On the other hand, there are those areas for which the Catholic schools are noted, e.g., discipline, homework, small size, moral and ethical studies, and teacher concern for individual students. On each of those, there was a very strong positive response from the parents of the Catholic-school children, much more generally positive than the response of the parents of the public-school children. On those elements, that response about the follow-up of teachers to individual students was particularly interesting just because in these schools with larger classes and less-well-paid teachers, one could argue that the opposite would occur. But it did not. The parents of the Catholic-school children were very enthusiastic about their schools in that regard.

The researcher particularly noted this in such areas as moral behavior, where a total of 93.2 percent of the Catholic-school parents were in strong agreement; dress code, where 89.7 percent were in agreement; lack of vandalism, where 89.8 percent were in strong agreement; character building, where 93.2 percent were in agreement; the congruence of the value system between the school and the home, where 92.1 percent were in agreement; and family participation, where 82.9 percent were in agreement. All of those are the areas wherein one might expect the Catholic-school parents to show strong support for their schools, and indeed they did.

In sum, it seems that the parents who sent their children to the Catholic schools did so for all the reasons one would expect: discipline, moral teaching, family, and so on. On the other hand, it also seems that they did not perceive the standard disadvantages of such schools to be disadvantages, e.g., limited funding, large class size, etc. They were not less enthusiastic about their schools because of those elements. In fact, according to this study, there was not one item in the list of structural elements that this study asked about that evoked a negative response from the Catholic-school parents.

Conversely, there were a number of elements that evoked a more negative response from parents of public-school children than from parents of Catholic-school children. The statement "children are better off in schools with larger enrollments" received a 70.4 percent disagree from public-school parents and 80.2 percent from Catholic-school parents. Also, 28.7 percent of the public-school parents took a negative view of the way their school trained students for jobs, 30.8 percent took a negative view of the way their school helped students choose careers, 45.3 percent took a negative view of the way their school trained them to become involved, 42 percent took a negative view of the way moral and ethical studies were handled in their schools, 29 percent took a negative view of the student dress, and 45.7 percent believed their principals to be hampered by central administration. All of the above were greater than the negative responses received on those questions from parents of Catholic-school children.

What is common to the items listed above is that they do not relate to the curriculum of the public schools per se. In fact, on the matters of curriculum, e.g., mathematics, reading, history, social studies, etc., the public schools received high marks, as good as or even in some cases better than did the private schools. But on the matters outside of the curriculum--the dress, language, parent involvement, job training, etc.--the parents of public-school children were considerably less satisfied with their schools than were parents of private-school children.

Given all of this, we might go back to the work of Erickson, cited earlier, which suggested that the private schools have a generally higher esprit, which he attributed to a sense of community called up by the perception of jeopardy. One may also refer to the work of Bidwell, who suggested that the volunteerism of Catholic schools makes them more appealing, not only in specific ways but in an overall sense. There was just generally more positive response by the parents of Catholic-school children to almost everying about their schools than there was by the parents of public-school children. Whereas the parents of the public-school children were fairly positive about the curriculum, those other outside elements were not nearly so positively perceived as they were by Catholic-school parents.

This, too, is supported by a statement taken from Coleman's study of public and private schools, that "there is a strong tendency to judge quality by the way students are dealt with as individuals." In other words, people who perceive, as did the parents of

Catholic-school children, that their children are being treated the way they want them treated regarding discipline, values, ethical and moral considerations, also see other aspects of the school as positive, even those noted earlier that could be construed as negative. All of the above addresses the second as well as the first exploratory question, which has to do with the elements outside the home contributing to the choices of school. In fact, as the data came out, it was hard to believe that the parents of the Catholic-school children really differentiated between what were called school characteristics and personal considerations regarding their child's school. Rather, they joined the two types of considerations together, and in the case of Catholic-school parents, both types of elements drew stronger positive responses than did the public schools. And this generalized positive response to all aspects of the schools was in line with the suggestions by Erickson, Bidwell, and Coleman that Catholic-school parents tend to be generally positive about everything.

One could contrast that with the responses of the public-school parents across the two scales. While the public schools did get high marks from parents on a number of curricular elements, in general, there was both more negativism and more uncertainty on almost everything than there was from the Catholic-school parents. They were negative toward their schools on such areas as stressing character building (20.4 percent) and the value system of teachers and administrators (15.9 percent). Also, the value system of teachers and administrators, the schools stressing character building,

and the congruence between the value system of the family and the school evoked a high "uncertain" response from parents of public-school children contrasted to a high positive from parents of Catholic-school children. In sum, there were not only some heavier negative responses, but a higher "uncertain" response on those elements.

Finally, the researcher may consider the final scale of the study. The question "we are satisfied with our child's school" evoked a high positive response from both public (71.3 percent) and Catholic (83 percent). But typically, the following question, "we are satisfied with the teachers in our child's school," evoked only 64.8 percent positive against the Catholic's 87.4 percent positive. On that same question, only 5.7 percent of the Catholic-school parents gave an "uncertain" response, whereas 14.8 percent of the public-school parents gave an uncertain response. Throughout the public-school responses there was much more division than there was among the Catholic-school parents, whose responses were much more unified, intelligible, and positive.

Implications

There are a number of implications that can be drawn from this study. First, there is the question of causality. The logic of the dissertation would have one believe that the parents chose Catholic schools for their children because they were positive about certain elements in particular, but in fact one could make the argument that parents chose Catholic schools for a number of reasons, but once committed and paying the tuition, they were apt to be more committed than

the parents of public-school children, who took whatever was provided by the state and the district for their child. This, too, may account in part for the greater number of responses from public-school people in the uncertain category. It is not that they were dissatisfied. It is that they may not have given much thought to the processes: "There is a school and my child goes there, and that's all; what are all these questions about?"

But what all these questions are about is important to those administrators who run public schools and who have been put more than a little on the defensive by the positive reactions from parents (documented here) toward the private schools--schools that, in terms of curriculum, are no better and often inferior to public schools. The question that we need to ask is whether the public schools can duplicate some of the consistently positive responses from the public as do the Catholic schools. The researcher's opinion is that there are a number of elements endemic to the public schools that would prevent that. The first of these is that public-school administrators are much more bound by legal considerations, such as due process, rules of search and seizure, rules of evidence, the doctrine of reasonable doubt, and other considerations--all of which emphasize the rights of the individual relative to the organization and, in the eyes of the parents, weaken the organization. It is not surprising to the researcher, a public-school administrator, that the private schools enjoy a consistently better backing just because it is so much easier for them to present an intelligible and coherent view to the public and a greater coherence between their total organization and the goals

of that organization. The student is indoctrinated toward the community in the Catholic school, in spite of the amount of individualized attention that the parents perceive their children are enjoying.

As pointed out in Chapter I, the Catholic schools do not constitute a "system" as do the public schools. There is much more building autonomy, principal control, and school unity than in the public system, wherein the building is integrally locked into a larger system. In the Catholic school, the principal has the right to hire and fire. In the larger public system, he/she has neither, and with the advent of declining enrollments and teacher layoffs, the public-school administrator has less input into the selection of teachers for his/her building than at any time in the past. In the Catholic school, the staff in common can work out school policies concerning entrance requirements, attendance policies, etc., but in the public system, these are frequently decided at the systemwide levels. It then becomes the responsibility of the public-school administrator to work within that system to try to establish school goals and a consistent attitude among the staff. Members of a staff who have been hired by the building principal and respect the fact that he/she may indeed fire them, as in the Catholic school, develop a different sense of allegiance to that building principal and therefore may be more inclined to work toward the common goals of the school rather than accepting a posture that a signed contract binds them to that position. The result of this is a public system that is more fragmented than the Catholic system, less intelligible at

the school level and hence less able to project the consistent image enjoyed by the Catholic schools.

The need for the public system to meet and accommodate the amount of diversification that exists in public schools contributes to the fragmentation. Public schools must meet the needs of all the special-interest groups, e.g., bilingual, gifted, special education, in addition to offering the basic education to the majority of public-school students, while the Catholic schools control the entrance requirements of all students and teach a curriculum that is much less diversified than that of the public school. The role of the public-school administrator is expanded so that he/she may be prepared to meet these often rapidly changing courses, and he/she does not have the advantage common to the Catholic-school administrator wherein the curriculum offerings are somewhat leaner and more clearly defined along the lines of what the parents refer to as basics.

In the area of value systems and the teaching of morals and ethics, the public schools are handicapped because they are prohibited by law from becoming involved in the teaching of how morality can be attained. Therefore, most of the public schools either avoid the topic altogether or try to offer a smattering of clarifying values under the guise of teaching students to have respect for one another, courtesy, and respect for others' property. The fact that this study revealed the large number of Catholic-school parents who want this to be a part of their child's education is important in light of the fact that the parents surveyed were not Catholic but had enrolled their children in Catholic schools. This is an area in which the public-school

administrator cannot begin to match the competition from the Catholic school. However, it would seem that if the public-school environment were one of order and discipline, one that the parents perceived as being a safe place for their children, and one in which an atmosphere conducive to learning existed, the public-school administrator would not be placed in the position of competing.

The fragmented responses of the public-school parents, e.g., they are satisfied with their children's school but not as satisfied with the teachers in that school, versus the consistently positive responses of the Catholic-school parents make it difficult to build a public-relations campaign for public schools. It then becomes more difficult to build a sense of community for the public schools. It would seem that the public-school administrators have a responsibility to develop not only a campaign to promote the good things about public schools but to develop a stronger sense of community among the parents.

Conclusions

The researcher undertook the study to determine why non-Catholic parents remove their children from public school and send them to Catholic schools. The answer is that those parents perceive that the Catholic schools offer a more limited curriculum and a more disciplined environment. In addition, they appreciate the emphasis on values, and they perceive that the teachers are more personally dedicated to their children's welfare. Overall, those parents were much more positive about all aspects of their children's school than

were parents of public-school children. For the purposes of public-school policy, this researcher suggests that while the public schools may make some concentrated efforts to emulate the sense of community, parental support, and high esprit of the private-school parents, the constraints under which the public schools operate would in all likelihood prevent the public schools from going too far in emulating the private schools.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF DETROIT

4815 Kings Row
Utica, Michigan 48087
November 14, 1981

Mr. Frank DeSantis, Superintendent
Archdiocese of Detroit
305 Michigan Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48216

Dear Mr. DeSantis,

By way of introduction, I am a junior high school principal in the Utica Community Schools and a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University. I am in the process of completing my dissertation and my chairman, Dr. Philip Cusick, suggested that I meet with you to discuss the topic of my dissertation.

The title of my dissertation is "A Study to Investigate the Differences in School Related Values and Perceptions Between Parents Who Send Their Children to Catholic Secondary Schools and Parents Who Send Their Children to Public Schools."

I would like to meet with you to discuss my enlisting your help in identifying families from your schools that would meet the criteria that I have established in my proposal. I will call your office the first of next week to make an appointment.

I will appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Barbara W. Gothard

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

4815 Kings Row
Utica, Michigan 48087
January 11, 1982

Dear

By way of introduction, I am a junior high school principal at Shelby Junior High School in the Utica Community Schools. I am in the process of completing a Ph.D. program at Michigan State University.

On December 2, 1981, I met with Frank DeSantis, to explain the topic of my dissertation and to enlist his help in identifying approximately two hundred families who would meet the criteria outlined in my study.

The title of my dissertation is "A Study to Investigate the Differences in School Related Values and Perceptions Between Parents Who Send Their Children to Catholic Secondary Schools and Parents Who Send Their Children to Public Schools."

Mr. DeSantis suggested I contact you to discuss the possibility of sending my questionnaire to some of the parents in your particular school. I will need the names and addresses of fifteen of your parents who meet the following criteria.

The criteria are (1) the parents must have one or more students presently enrolled in your school; (2) their student(s) must have completed grades K-6 or K-8 in a public school; (3) the student must be non-Catholic and (4) you feel that these parents would be willing to share their ideas with me.

The questionnaire will be mailed to each parent with a self-addressed envelope enclosed for its return. There will be no expenses involved for the parents except the time to fill out the questionnaire.

During the next week, I will telephone to discuss this with you and to answer any questions you may have. I will greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Barbara W. Gothard

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER TO CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PARENTS

4815 Kings Row
Utica, Michigan 48087

To the Parents:

By way of introduction, I am a junior high school principal at Shelby Junior High School in the Utica Community Schools and a doctoral student at Michigan State University. I am in the process of completing my dissertation for my Ph.D.

The title of my dissertation is "A Study to Investigate the Differences in School Related Values and Perceptions Between Parents Who Send Their Children to Catholic Secondary Schools and Parents Who Send Their Children to Public Schools."

In order to determine why some parents have chosen to enroll their child in a Catholic secondary school rather than a public school, I have constructed the enclosed questionnaire to assist me in trying to see what these reasons might be. The questionnaire will be sent to a set of Catholic school parents and a set of public school parents. The responses will be compiled, analyzed and conclusions drawn from the responses. My hope is that this will result in some recommendations for future research and/or implications for public schools.

Your participation is completely voluntary and you will incur no expense except the time that it will take you to complete the questionnaire.

If you have one child in a Catholic school and one child in a public school, please respond to the statements in the questionnaire for the child in Catholic school ONLY.

All replies are strictly confidential and will be used only in combination with all other questionnaires received. A number will appear on each envelope. This number is to be used for coding purposes only and has no other significance.

Please do not write your name or address on the questionnaire nor on the self-addressed stamped envelope that is enclosed for the return of the questionnaire.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope within five days after you receive it.

Your cooperation and assistance in helping me complete my dissertation are greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Barbara W. Gothard

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER TO PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL PARENTS

4815 Kings Row
Utica, Michigan 48087

To the Parents:

By way of introduction, I am a junior high school principal at Shelby Junior High School in the Utica Community Schools and a doctoral student at Michigan State University. I am in the process of completing my dissertation for my Ph.D.

The title of my dissertation is "A Study to Investigate the Differences in School Related Values and Perceptions Between Parents Who Send Their Children to Catholic Secondary Schools and Parents Who Send Their Children to Public Schools."

In order to determine why some parents have chosen to enroll their child in a Catholic secondary school rather than a public school, I have constructed the enclosed questionnaire to assist me in trying to see what these reasons might be. The questionnaire will be sent to a set of Catholic school parents and a set of public school parents. The responses will be compiled, analyzed and conclusions drawn from the responses. My hope is that this will result in some recommendations for future research and/or implications for public schools.

Your participation is completely voluntary and you will incur no expense except the time that it will take you to complete the questionnaire.

If you have children in both junior high school and senior high school, please respond to the statements as a consensus opinion for your family's views of public schools.

All replies are strictly confidential and will be used only in combination with all other questionnaires received. A number will appear on each envelope. This number is to be used for coding purposes only and has no other significance.

Please do not write your name or address on the questionnaire nor on the self-addressed stamped envelope that is enclosed for the return of the questionnaire.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope within <u>five</u> days after you receive it.

Your Your cooperation and assistance in helping me complete my dissertation are greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Barbara W. Gothard

APPENDIX E

PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT THEIR CHOICE OF SCHOOL

QUESTIONNAIRE

All replies are strictly confidential and will be used only in combination with all other questionnaires received.

Please DO NOT put your name or address on this questionnaire.

Purpose of the Questionnaire:	Our purpose is to compare reasons why some parents chose to enroll their child (children) in Catholic secondary schools to why some parents enroll their children in public secondary schools.
Directions:	Please circle or write in the response that applies to you and your family.

A Scale

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. How many children do you have?

   None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

2. How many of your children did you have attending school during the 1980-1981 school year?

   FEMALE None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

   MALE None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

3. What grades are your children in?

   Number of children:

	1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3
Kindergarten	____	____	____	7th	____	____	____	10th	____	____	____
1st	____	____	____	8th	____	____	____	11th	____	____	____
2nd	____	____	____	9th	____	____	____	12th	____	____	____
3rd	____	____	____								
4th	____	____	____								
5th	____	____	____								
6th	____	____	____								

4. What is your sex? MALE FEMALE

5. What is your marital status? SINGLE MARRIED

6. What was the last grade level in school you (parents) completed?

	MALE	FEMALE
Elementary	_____	_____
Junior High/Middle School (7-9)	_____	_____
Some High School (10-12)	_____	_____
College Graduate	_____	_____
College Post Graduate	_____	_____

7. What is your occupation?

Male _____

Female _____

8. In which of these groups did your total family income fall last year, 1981?

A. Less than $10,000

B. $10,000 to $14,999

C. $15,000 to $19,999

D. $20,000 to $29,999

E. $30,000 to $39,999

F. $40,000 to $49,999

G. $50,000 to $59,999

H. $60,000 or over

Directions; Please circle the response that applies to your child's secondary school and to you and your family.

Responses:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Uncertain
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS

B Scale

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The education provided by the public school is comparable to the education provided by the Catholic school.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Children are better off in schools that have larger enrollments.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	A larger variety of courses offered to a student provides him/her with a more balanced background.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	An emphasis on the basic skills is better preparation for our children than a large selection of diversified classes.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Our child receives individualized attention.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	There is an adequate amount of homework given to the students.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Teachers provide an adequate amount of follow-up to the assigned work.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	A good high school education is important to success in life.	1	2	3	4	5

17.	Our children's school gives adequate attention to each of the programs and services listed below:					
	Reading	1	2	3	4	5
	Writing and Grammar Skills	1	2	3	4	5
	Mathematics	1	2	3	4	5
	Science	1	2	3	4	5
	Training students for jobs	1	2	3	4	5
	Social Studies and History	1	2	3	4	5
	Helping students choose careers	1	2	3	4	5
	Training to help parents become more involved in their children's education.	1	2	3	4	5
	Morals and ethical behavior	1	2	3	4	5
	Parents involvement in school activities	1	2	3	4	5
18.	The emphasis placed on the development of study skills and teaching students how to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	The student behavior is generally good in our child's school.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Student discipline in our child's school is administered well.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	The more discipline or respect that the school requires, the easier it is for our child to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Our child's school makes an adequate attempt to prevent students from intimidating other students.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	A school's dress code has a positive effect on student behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	As parents, we support the discipline policies of our child's school	1	2	3	4	5

25.	Our child's school adequately handles these kinds of student behavior problems.					
	Truancy (skipping school)	1	2	3	4	5
	Vandalism of school property	1	2	3	4	5
	Fighting in school	1	2	3	4	5
	Using alcohol or drugs on school property	1	2	3	4	5
	Abusive language to teacher	1	2	3	4	5
	Stealing money or clothing from other students	1	2	3	4	5
	Abusive language between students	1	2	3	4	5
26.	The school made an adequate attempt to inform us of student discipline policies prior to our enrolling our child in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	The teachers in our child's school are qualified.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Our child's school is well staffed with support personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	The principal of our child's school is effective.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	The principal's effectiveness is hampered by the controls imposed by the central administration.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	There should be fewer regulations from the courts and the legislatures imposed upon the school's principal.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	The salaries of the teachers in our child's school are too low.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Teacher unions have helped teachers in the public schools.	1	2	3	4	5

C Scale

34.	The value system the teachers and administrators exhibit in our child's school is adequate.	1	2	3	4	5

35.	Our child's school stresses character building.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	It is important for our child to attend a school where the value system resembles that of our family.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Our family tradition is to attend Catholic schools.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	There is some prestige to be gained from having our child attend this particular school.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	It is important for our child to attend a school with a diverse student body.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Religion, in general, should be taught in our child's school.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Some government tax money should be used to help parochial schools make ends meet.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	It is important to send a child to the school of the parent's choice.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	We attend our child's school activities.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	We participate in our child's school activities.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	I/we are willing to make financial sacrifices to send our child to his/her particular school	1	2	3	4	5
46.	Our child's school provides us with an adequate amount of information about what goes on at school.	1	2	3	4	5

D Scale

47.	Our child should be able to attend a school of his or her choice.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	My/our child wanted to attend this particular school because his/her friends go there.	1	2	3	4	5

49.	Our child wanted to attend his/her school because of the sports program.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	Our child is happy attending this particular school	1	2	3	4	5
51.	The other students have a positive influence on his/her learning in this particular school.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	My/our child finds it easier to make friends in this particular school.	1	2	3	4	5

E Scale

53.	I am/we are satisfied with the choice of school.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	I am/we are satisfied with the teachers in our child's school.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	I am/we are satisfied with the way in which our child's school is administered.	1	2	3	4	5

Please feel free to share any additional comments you may have on the issues presented above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return this questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that has been enclosed.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT THEIR CHOICE OF SCHOOL

QUESTIONNAIRE

All replies are strictly confidential and will be used only in combination with all other questionnaires received.

Please DO NOT put your name or address on this questionnaire.

Purpose of the Questionnaire: Our purpose is to compare reasons why some parents chose to enroll their child (children) in Catholic secondary schools to why some parents enroll their children in public secondary schools.

Directions: For each statement please circle or write in the response that applies to you and your family's opinions.

A Scale

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. How many children do you have?

   None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

2. How many of your children did you have attending school during the 1981-1982 school year?

   FEMALE None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

   MALE None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more

3. How many children do you presently have in each grade?

No. of Children	GRADES K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1													
2													
3													

4. What is your sex? MALE FEMALE

5. What is your marital status? SINGLE MARRIED

6. What was the last grade level in school each parent completed?

	MALE PARENT	FEMALE PARENT
Elementary	_____	_____
Some High School	_____	_____
High School Graduate	_____	_____
Some College	_____	_____
College Graduate	_____	_____
College Post Graduate	_____	_____

7. What is the occupation of each parent?

A.	Clerical	_____	_____
B.	Skilled Labor	_____	_____
C.	Unskilled Labor	_____	_____
D.	Sales	_____	_____
E.	Management	_____	_____
F.	Professional	_____	_____
G.	Homemaker	_____	_____
H.	Retired	_____	_____
I.	Unemployed	_____	_____
J.	No response	_____	_____

8. In which of these groups did your total family income fall last year, 1981?

A.	Less than $10,000	E.	$30,000 to $39,999
B.	$10,000 to $14,999	F.	$40,000 to $49,000
C.	$15,000 to $19,999	G.	$50,000 to $59,999
D.	$20,000 to $29,999	H.	$60,000 or over

Directions: For each statement please circle the response that applies to your children's secondary school and to you and your family.

Responses:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Uncertain
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS

Following is a set of statements. Please read each statement and indicate your feeling about this statement.

B Scale		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
9.	The education provided by the public school is comparable to the education provided by the Catholic school.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Children are better off in schools that have larger enrollments.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	A school that offers a large variety of courses provides a better preparation for our children.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Our children receive individualized attention from their teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	There is an adequate amount of homework given to the students.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Teachers provide an adequate amount of follow-up to assigned work.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	A good high school education is important to success in life.	1	2	3	4	5

16.	Our children's school gives adequate attention to each of the programs and services listed below:					
	Reading	1	2	3	4	5
	Writing and Grammar Skills	1	2	3	4	5
	Mathematics	1	2	3	4	5
	Science	1	2	3	4	5
	Training students for jobs	1	2	3	4	5
	Social Studies and History	1	2	3	4	5
	Helping students choose careers	1	2	3	4	5
	Training to help parents become more involved in their children's education	1	2	3	4	5
	Moral and ethical behavior	1	2	3	4	5
	Parent involvement in school activities	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The emphasis is placed on the development of study skills and teaching students how to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	The student behavior is generally good in our children's school.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Student discipline in our children's school is administered well.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	The more discipline or respect that the school requires, the easier it is for our children to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Our children's school makes an adequate attempt to prevent students from intimidating other students.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	A school's dress code has a positive effect on student behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	As parents, we support the discipline policies of our children's school.	1	2	3	4	5

24.	Our children's school adequately handles these kinds of student behavior problems.					
	Truancy (skipping school)	1	2	3	4	5
	Vandalism of school property	1	2	3	4	5
	Fighting in school	1	2	3	4	5
	Using alcohol or drugs on school property	1	2	3	4	5
	Abusive language to teacher	1	2	3	4	5
	Stealing money or clothing from other students	1	2	3	4	5
	Abusive language between students	1	2	3	4	5
25.	The school made an adequate attempt to inform us of student discipline policies prior to our enrolling our children in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	The teachers in our children's school are qualified.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Our children's school is well staffed with support personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	The principal of our children's school is effective.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	The principal's effectiveness is hampered by the controls imposed by the central administration.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Fewer regulations from the courts and the legislatures should be imposed upon the school's principal.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	The salaries of the teachers in our children's school are too low.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	The Teacher unions have helped teachers in the public schools.	1	2	3	4	5

C Scale

33.	The value system the teachers and administrators exhibit in our children's school is adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Our children's school stresses character building.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	It is important for our children to attend a school where the value system resembles that of our family.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Our family tradition is to attend Catholic schools.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Religion, in general, should be taught in our children's school.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Some government tax money should be used to help parochial schools make ends meet.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	We attend our children's school activities.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	We participate in our children's school activities.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	We are willing to make financial sacrifices to send our children to this particular school.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Our children's school provides us with an adequate amount of information about what goes on at school.	1	2	3	4	5

D Scale

43.	Our children should be able to make the choice as to which school to attend.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Our children wanted to attend this school because of the sports program.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	The other students have a positive influence on their learning in this particular school.	1	2	3	4	5

E Scale

46.	We are satisfied with our children's school.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	We are satisfied with the teachers in our children's school.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	We are satisfied with the way in which our children's school is administered.	1	2	3	4	5

Please feel free to share any additional comments you may have on the issues presented above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return this questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that has been enclosed.

Thank you for your time and your assistance.

APPENDIX G

COMMENTS OF PARENTS

Open Ended Comments

I feel public schools are much better and offer more to the students.

Schools today, have forgotten the three R's---reading, writing and arithmetic. If one (refind) these by the seventh or eighth grade, there should be no problem in controlling algebra, trig, geometry, etc. In Detroit, kids cannot read or write with a diploma. I for one would like to control Detroit Public Schools--to bring back old concepts.

I began to attempt to answer the questions but cannot. I received this as a parent of public school children. I also have a daughter in Immaculate High School, my oldest son is at Cass, my younger daughter is in public elementary and my youngest son is in learning disabled classes in public elementary. I would answer many of the questions differently as they applied to each of the circumstances of my children. There were obviously, different reasons for enrolling my son at Cass and my daughter at Immaculate.

I apologize for screwing up your study this way. I don't fit into the "norm". My oldest daughter is the only "white" child enrolled at Immaculate. My two youngest children are black. I'd mess up anyone's study. Good luck on your dissertation anyway.

I want to point out the fact that, as Catholics, religion is a very important part of our life. But I have always felt that education was in no way related to religion and should be separate. My

husband went to a Catholic school, but had no strong feeling, one way or the other.

My children only had secondary education in Catholic schools. They now attend Public High School, Cass Tech. I answered these questions based on my feeling during the time they were in Catholic school.

Cass High School is an excellent school. It builds character and the teachers strive to promote the children to their highest potential. Likewise with the elementary system that my children have gone through. These people care that these children's lives are not wasted!!!

Students who respect their parents and are highly obedient generally succeed in school as well as in their life endeavors. Because of the religious training and beliefs, children who attend parochial schools tend to graduate and do well in life. There are thousands of children who attend public schools, have better than average abilities, but tend to drop out and fail in life because they suffer from a lack of faith in anything other than material well-being. As Attendance Department Supervisor (Truant Officer Supervisor), we have encountered students who were academically brilliant but failed because they were morally depraved and believed that the only thing that mattered in life was having wealth without concern as to how the wealth was obtained. In order to be educated one must first be moral, a good person who loves and respects fellow human beings. Too many of our students who matriculated in higher institutions of learning are gravely lacking in morality.

Your questions leave room for explanations--very few are as cut and dry as the answers. However the answers checked are as close as I could get to the real answers.

Since my child is now in high school this survey applies to his secondary and high school.

In 1982, September, my nine year old and my thirteen year old will be transferred from Public School to Provate Schools: Reason - Better educational opportunities and a much better learning climate.

Our last son is attending Cass because his father and three brothers before him also attended. The school has somewhat declined in esteem since the earlier years. However, it still ranks above most of the other high schools, in my opinion. The Catholic schools have the advantage of demanding parental support. The public schools do not. "If" the Catholic schools appear to be better, this might be the reason.

It was difficult to answer some of these questions since two of my children are in parochial schools and two are in public high schools.

Public education as a whole leaves a lot to be desired. However not everyone can afford private education. Therefore, we have striven to qualify for the public school which offers the highest academic achievements possible for public school students in Detroit, Cass Tech or Rennaissance. Perhaps public schools in your area (Utica) are better.

I refuse to send my children to Catholic school because of their transference of religious scriptural symbolism to skin

color, its anthropomorphic (manlike) racial portrayal of God as man, the interpolation and allegorization of world scriptures and the establishment of world finance information propogation and control.

We have become disenchanted with the secondary school our child is attending but decided not to make a change since our daughter was a senior this year. We are extremely pleased with the school our sixth grader attends.

Education is a combination of many things, including strong teacher involvement, and student responsibility. This particular child realized the lack of the public school, and finally after two years there, chose to enter the best Catholic high school (academically) in the 11th grade.

I responded as a single parent though I answered numbers six and seven for both parents. I found that the questions were shallow and the conclusions that you may draw from my responses would not fully answer your stated purpose.

I chose to send my oldest son to a college preparatory school which was mostly male because there was no male figure in our home with which to identify, also he is extremely smart and needed more than was offered in public school. My youngest son is in private school because he needed a smaller class size and more individual attention. Both attended public school for awhile.

Although our children have always attended private schools, I strongly object to government tax money being used for private institutions which may or may not accept a child because of his/

her social, economic or racial background. The public school institutions must accept any child within its boundaries. Because of my financial status, I am able to make a choice of private or public. However, there are many tax payers who can not choose a private institution because of low income. It is criminal to take a part of their tax dollars to support a select and private school that their children can not possibly attend.

My reasons for choosing the Catholic school were based on options for the 7th and 8th grade only. I feel the public school my child attended was superior in many ways to the 1-6 grade levels in her present Catholic school. She will attend a public high school.

Our children attend two different schools. Although there are some differences, I have tried to answer all questions as honestly as possible. Overall we are pleased with the education our children are getting.

One area you failed to touch on--the ability of a parochial school with an all white staff and their inability to relate to blacks. As there is an increasing number of blacks who attend yearly, it would seem to warrant the need on the part of the school to invest in sensitivity training or something its equivalent.

The main reason for selecting a Catholic school was because it was the best choice in this neighborhood.

We chose U. of D. High for our son because of its academic excellence, its dedication to building men of good character and its diversified student body. We are extremely happy with the school. We believe in separation of church and state and feel

that parents who choose to send their children to private schools should bear the expense themselves.

Having had three older children attend public schools through grade six and then transfer to Catholic schools, I can truly say that the Catholic schools do an infinitely better job. Training and discipline are the keys.

All four of our children attended parochial schools, two have attained college degrees and one is now attending U. of M. We feel that much of this success is attributable to their grade/high school education.

I am an employee of a public school system and strongly believe in public schools. I chose to send my child to parochial because as a Catholic convert myself, I wanted her to receive religious training at school. I also believe the Catholic school may be better than the nearby public school. I do not believe in the voucher system. It would be detrimental to public education.

We are not Catholic. We chose this particular school for its fine academic environment. We are disturbed by our public schools--teaching quality, discipline etc. Question the value of middle schools or junior highs. I would like our children to be able to read and write a correct sentence!

We selected this high school for both our sons because it is the top college prep high school in the area. Religious preference had little to do with it, although we believe that certain values should be a part of education, i. e. honesty, self-reliance, a sense of purpose, service to others, etc.

Both boys have above 3.80 average. Oldest son attends

U. of M. Dearborn - half days and will have completed freshman year by the time he graduates from high school. Both attend U. of D. High.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.

Bidwell, C. "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client Trust in Client Serving Organizations." In Organizations and Clients. Edited by W. Rosengren and M. Lefton. Columbus: Charles Merrill, 1970.

Bredeway. "Catholic Schools and Their American Roots." In Standard Education Almanac. Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1979-80.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Coleman, James et al. Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Conant, James. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1979-80.

Durkheim, Emile. Moral Education. Edited by E. K. Wilson. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Erickson, D.; MacDonald, L.; Manley-Casimir, M.; and Busk, P. Characteristics and Relationships in Public and Independent Schools. San Francisco: Center for Research on Private Education, 1979.

Giving Youth a Better Chance. A Report With Recommendations of the Carnegie Council of Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Greeley, A.; McCrealy, W.; and McCount. Catholic Schools in a Declining Church. Kansas City, Kansas: Sheed and Ward, 1976.

Hempel, C. Aspects of Scientific Explanation. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Hooker, Clifford E., and Koenig, Robert A. The Courts and Education NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Kleenfeld, J. Eskimo School on the Andreafsky. New York: Praeger, 1979.

Lortie, Dan. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McCluskey, N. Catholic Education in America. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Meyer, J., and Rowan, B. "The Structure of Educational Organizations." In Environments and Organizations. Edited by Meyer, Marshall, and associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Moser, C. A., and Kalton, G. Survey Methods in Social Investigation. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Newton, Edward. The Courts and the Public Schools. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Official Catholic Directory. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. Biennial Survey of Education and School Life. U.S. Office of Education, 1968.

Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1967.

The Reform of Secondary Education. Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Reutter, E. Edmond, Jr., and Hamilton, Robert R. The Law of Public Education. New York: The Foundation Press, 1976.

Reutter, M.; Maugham, B.; Mortimore, P.; Ouston, J.; and Smith, A. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Robinson, John P.; Athanasious, Robert; and Head, Kendra B. Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, 1969.

Rummel, Francis J. An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.

Periodicals

Doyle, Denis P. "Public Policy and Private Education." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (September 1980): 16-19.

Likert, Rensis. "A Technique for Measurement of Attitudes." Archives of Psychology 140 (June 1932): 46.

Martin, W., and Polonsky, S. "Organizational Structure and Student Behavior in Secondary Schools." Journal of Curriculum Studies 8,1 (1976).

Unpublished Materials

DeSantis, F. "Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of Detroit." Detroit, Michigan, n.d.

Other Sources

Coleman, James; Hoffer, Thomas; and Kilgore, Sally. "Public and Private Schools: A Report to the National Center for Education Statistics, at American Educational Research Association, March 1981.

Grant, G. "What Makes a Good School?" Boston: The New Policy in Educational Research Association, 1980.

Ignatovich, F., and Hecker, S. Michigan's Public and Private School Population. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1981.