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Literature of educational research supports the existence of significant relationships among parent self-concepts/locus of control, child self-concepts/locus of control, and child achievement. If parent participation in the school system could be related to parent self-concepts and locus of control, it would be of interest and significance in the development and enhancement of the overall educational and achievement process of that system. It was the purpose of this study to determine the nature of the relationship between selected parent participation activities in the Florida model of Project Follow-Through and parent self-concepts and locus of control.

Persons chosen to participate in this study were those selected by Project Follow-Through staff and classified as lower socio-economic members according to Office of Economic Opportunity Income Poverty Guidelines. Conclusions and
generalizations were therefore restricted to this socio-
economic group.

Parents exhibited positive measures concerning inter-
personal adequacy, teacher-school relationships, and personal
appearance, and negatives attitudes concerning personal com-
petence on the How I See Myself (HISM) self-concept scale
prior to project participation. These same parents exhibited
an internal measure, or a positively perceived degree of con-
trol over one's destiny, on the locus of control instrument.
Social Reaction Inventory (SRI).

Of the four selected parent involvement activities,
project participation was most frequent in the basic project
element of the home visitation and successively less frequent
in the other project activities of classroom volunteering,
Parent Advisory Committee meetings, and Parent Advisory
Committee activities. Measurements of project participation
were limited to measurements of frequency.

The multi-variate analysis of canonical correlation
failed to provide predictors of project participation from
pretest attitudinal factors.

Posttest attitudinal change indicated less positive
responses in the HISM factors of interpersonal adequacy,
personal appearance, and teacher-school, and a more positive
response to the HISM factor of personal competence. Also,
post-SRI scores indicated that participants increased in their
degree of internality. This pre-post change was significant
only for the competence factor of the HISM scale and the SRI measure of locus of control.

Canonical correlation analyses were again used to investigate the relationships between the independent variable set of pretest attitudinal and project participation measures with a dependent variable set of posttest attitudinal scores. A strong variability associated with the pretest experience was indicated, and additional correlations supported the premise that the participation variables accounted for some of the posttest attitudinal variance. The home visitation activity was consistently associated with this variance, and it is the conclusion of this study that parent participation in the home visitation process, and in this project, was directly related to positive change in parent self-concepts and locus of control.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The growing concern and mandate of state and local school districts for the increased participation of citizens in advisory, decision-making, and programmatic activities is, in part, the outgrowth of a national concern and desire to make the overall educational endeavor more relevant and effective. Professional educators and laypersons at all levels of the educational system are striving to meet the changing needs and desires of its student clientele. Colleges and universities are encouraged to have citizen input and involvement in program development and administration. Technical, vocational, and secondary schools utilize to an increasing degree resources within their service communities to train, advise, and regulate programs and activities. Elementary schools have become aware of the necessity, and potential, of increased parent participation in regular and compensatory instructional activities. Federal and state governments have also encouraged increased parent participation through such legislation and programs as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Title II), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966 (Title I), the federally funded project Follow-Through vocational/technical programs, and state regulations such as the Florida
mandate of 1973 for the establishment of advisory committees for school boards (Breivogel and Greenwood, 1973). It is the specific intention of this study to identify and examine selected elements of parent participation within the early childhood educational milieu.

Three historical trends are largely responsible for the recent urgent reactivation of interest and realization of the importance of involving parents in early child care programs. Accumulative research data have given impetus to a growing awareness of the basic and critical nature of parent involvement for producing healthy, happy, and active child-learners, regardless of whether those learners are yet in some sort of more formal child care or schooling system, or in the primary care of parent and parent surrogates.

1) The first historical stream feeding the present rushing tide to involve parents stems from the undisputed failure of almost all intervention programs without such involvement to sustain the often considerable cognitive gains demonstrated during the child's participation in such a program.

2) A second source of data consists in observed cultural and familial differences in parent-child interactions.

3) The third factor is accumulating positive evidence of the effectiveness of parent involvement in young children's education in influencing academic motivation. (Honig, 1975, pp. 9-14)

There is little doubt in contemporary thought that parent and family involvement is, and should become, more pervasive in child development programs and early education (Lillie, 1975). Research efforts, such as the work of Gray, Klaus, Miller, and Forrester (1970), Karnes (1972), and Levenstein (1970) point out that educational efforts in day care centers, nurseries, Head Start Centers, and public schools should be augmented with training programs for the
parents of those children involved. Deutsch (1964) feels that appropriately organized cognitive stimulation during the early years can be highly effective in accelerating the development of intellectual functions. A summary of the 1976 Gordon and Guinagh longitudinal study indicates that there are clear, lasting school achievement and performance effects for children who were in the parent education program with their parents. Several investigations (Casler, 1965; Rheingold, 1961; Sayegh and Dennis, 1965; White, Castle and Held, 1964) have demonstrated the feasibility of positively altering early development through introducing stimulation programs for infants.

Working with the child is therefore not enough. What is needed is a coordinated effort to identify the ecological variables of the family and community which need to be changed for the child's good, as well as for that of the family and community, and to try to change them. "The devastating effects of the environment cannot be changed until the environment itself is changed" (Palmer, 1976, p. 3).

Studies such as Brookover, Thomas, and Fatterson (1964); Combs (1964); Fink (1962); Shaw and Alves (1963); Shaw, Edson, and Bell (1960); Wattenburg and Clifford (1966) and others (to be further discussed later in this study) clearly indicate that child achievement is significantly related to child self-concept and locus of control. Additionally, research by Combs and Spoer (1963), Rogers (1958), Battle and Rotter (1963), Crandall, Katkovsky, and Crandall (1965)
and many more indicates that child self-concepts and locus of control are significantly related to those same measures in parents and "significant others."

It would, therefore, be extremely important to identify specific activities and experiences which could be significantly related to positive changes in parent self-concept and locus of control, and thereby, related to child self-concept, locus of control, and ultimately, child achievement.

The Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of the relationship between selected types of lower socio-economic parent participation in school activities and parent self-concepts and internal-external locus of control. This study will specifically address the following questions:

1. What is the nature of the measured self-concept and locus of control of lower socio-economic parents prior to their participation in this study?

2. Do lower socio-economic parents exhibit negative measures on each of four factors of a self-concept scale?

3. Do lower socio-economic parents exhibit an external measure on a locus of control scale?

4. What is the nature of parent participation in the following four selected activities:
1) Policy Advisory Committee Meetings,
2) Policy Advisory Committee Activities,
3) Classroom Volunteering, and 4) Home Visitations?
5. Will parent participation be most frequent in the basic program element of Home Visits and become successively less frequent in Parent Advisory Committee Activities, Parent Advisory Committee Meetings, and least frequent in Classroom Volunteering?
6. What factors of parent self-concept and measure of internal-external locus of control can individually and in combination predict the type and/or frequency of parent participation in the four selected participation activities?
7. What is the nature of the pre/post change in measures of self-concept and locus of control after participation in this study?
8. What is the nature of the relationship between the four selected parent participation activities and pre/post change in measures of self-concept and locus of control?

**Delimitations and Limitations**

The following delimitations are basic to this investigation:
1. The primary source of data for this study will be the recorded participation of an estimated sample (n) of 180 parents in Richmond, Virginia, newly enrolled in the Florida Model of Project Follow-Through.

2. Parent participation measures will be selected from programmed activities of the Florida Model of Project Follow-Through.

3. Self-concept and internal-external locus of control measures are self-reported and administered by local (Richmond) project personnel.

4. The How I See Myself (HISM) Scale is assumed to measure parent self-concepts, and the Social Reaction Inventory (SRI) is assumed to measure parent internal-external locus of control.

5. Persons chosen to participate in this study are those selected by Project Follow-Through staff and classified as lower socio-economic members according to Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) Income Poverty Guidelines (See Appendix A).

The following limitations are recognized:

1. The self report nature of the HISM and SRI may not accurately reflect the real behavior and beliefs of the participating parents. Reactive and testing threats to validity may occur.
2. Data collection is the responsibility of the Richmond project personnel with the Florida Model Sponsor providing consultative and evaluative services.

3. Data will be collected from persons in the state of Virginia. Therefore, generalizations may be restricted to similar socio-economic members in the Richmond school district and in other school districts with a comparable socio-economic mix.

Definition of Terms

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). An organization of Follow-Through parents authorized to take a cooperative role in program decision-making. Representatives of other groups and the Follow-Through staff may, with PAC approval, participate. The PAC elects its own officers, makes its own meeting plans, has its own funds, plans how to use these funds, organizes its own activities, and makes its own rules.

Policy Advisory Committee Meetings and Activities. PAC meetings will be defined as those planning, budgeting, and decision-making sessions authorized and conducted by the PAC. All other sponsored activities will be distinguished as PAC Activities.

Home Visitation. Two adults, usually mothers from low-income backgrounds, are trained to work in the classroom
with the teacher as a team. These adults, called "parent educators," also visit the homes of the children in the classroom weekly in order to teach an enrichment type learning activity called a "task" to the child's mother, who later teaches it to the child.

**Classroom Volunteering.** Parents are encouraged to participate in the classroom as parent volunteers by the parent educator during home visits, as well as by the PAC, the classroom teacher, and other program personnel. Whenever possible, parent volunteers are involved in the actual classroom instructional process. Teachers, parent educators, and parent volunteers each take their turn at the clerical, housekeeping, and other non-instructional activities which must occur within the classroom.

**Self-concept.** "Those perceptions, beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and values which the individual views as describing himself" (Perkins, 1958, p. 221). A more detailed description of this measure will be given in the Instrumentation section of this study.

**Internal-External Locus of Control.** Locus of control refers to the disposition to perceive one's reinforcements as consequences of one's own behavior or as due to extrinsic factors; those who believe that they exercise some control over their destinies are considered to be internally controlled. Externals believe that their reinforcements are controlled by luck, chance, fate, or powerful others (Rotter, 1966).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The major topic under investigation in this study is parent participation in the school system and its relationship to parent self-concepts and locus of control measures. This relationship becomes a significant link in the educational process when associated with two previously researched relationships in this process: 1) child self concepts/locus of control, and child achievement, and 2) parent self-concepts/locus of control, child self-concepts/locus of control.

This review will cite related research which documents these two significant relationships and then describe parent participation/parent education programs, characteristics, goals and activities.

Child Self-Concepts, Locus of Control, and Achievement

Academic achievement in the educational process is the subject of much research and in the opinion of most is the complex product of many variables. Sex, race, and socio-economic status among other characteristics of the student clientele as well as parental-environmental influence, teachers, school, and the curriculum are integrally involved in determining the rate and extent of academic achievement.
One of the subsets of this very complex system of determining factors is that of the self-concept and locus of control. Research has suggested the importance of the role of the self-concept, and the closely related concept of locus of control, with achievement in all areas of life. Piaget and Inhelder (1965) called the earliest self an "undifferentiated absolute" where there are no boundaries; neither between one's body and other objects nor between reality and fantasy. "The self is more than a possession, it is the center of the individual's universe of experience and is the criteria against which the world is measured" (Purkey, 1967, p. 4). The self-concept, then, moves with experience to bring greater definition to this earliest "undifferentiated absolute." It becomes a "hypothetical construct devised to explain the continuing effect of past experience on present behavior" (Llabre, 1977, p. 1) and includes "those perceptions, beliefs, feelings, attitudes, and values which the individual views as describing himself" (Perkins, 1958, p. 221). As an attitude, the self-concept involves three components: cognitive, affective, and behavioral (Goodman, 1972) and is considered an important factor both in guiding a person's immediate behavior and in the later development of his personality (Combs and Snygg, 1959).

As postulated by Arthur Combs and Spoer (1963), Carl Rogers (1958), Purkey (1967), and others, the self has numerous properties, some of which are these:
The self develops out of the individual's interaction and communication with his environment; it is a social product. The individual's perceptions of himself and his environment will determine his behavior. The individual's continuous struggle to maintain and enhance the perceived self is the basic motive for all behavior; thus, people are always motivated.

The self strives for consistency and behaves in ways which are consistent with itself; self-concepts are followed in a compulsive manner.

Learning is more rapid if it is perceived by the learner as related to positive aspects of self.

The self determines what is perceived and the closer the experience to self, the greater its effect.

The self can be changed through school experiences.

Understanding these properties of the self it becomes clear, then, why the self-concept is so significantly related to academic achievement and is confirmed in research studies by Allport (1936), Davidson and Lang (1960), Gough (1955), and Hartshore and May (1930). Research by Wattenburg and Clifford in 1966 clearly indicates that measures of self-concept and ratings of ego-strength made at the beginning of kindergarten are more predictive of reading achievement two-and-one-half years later than are measures of intelligence. This study indicates that self attitudes stand in a causal relationship to later achievement and this effect is long-lasting. Shaw, Edson, and Bell (1960) found that male achievers feel relatively more positive about themselves than do male underachievers. Fink (1962) concluded that there is a significant relationship between self-concept and academic underachievement, and
that this relationship appears stronger in boys than in girls. Shaw and Alves (1963) confirmed Shaw's 1960 study and added that male underachievers were less accepting of self and attributed a similar lack of self-acceptance to their peers. There also appeared a difference in the general perceptual mode between males and females. Combs in 1964 contrasted underachievers and achievers and found that they "saw themselves as: less adequate and less acceptable to others; saw peers and adults as less acceptable; showed less effective approach to problems, and less freedom and adequacy of emotional expression" (p. 48). Brookover, Thomas, and Patterson (1964) found a significant and positive correlation between self-concept and performance in the academic role, specific self-concepts of ability related to specific academic areas, and, finally, that the self-concept was significantly and positively correlated with perceived evaluation of the student by other significant people. Additionally, Bilker (1970), Lefcourt and Ladwig (1965), and Battle (1962) found that Negroes were significantly more external in their control expectancies than Caucasians, and that this degree of externality was related to academic underachievement.

Research clearly indicates that self-concept is a major factor in the academic achievement of the child. Further, it is theoretically clear that the self-concept of the child is related to those of his mother and father,
teacher, and significant others. Research confirms this theoretical assumption.

**Parent Self-Concepts/Locus of Control, and Child Self-Concepts/Locus of Control**

During the early developmental years a child is completely dependent upon the love and care of those responsible for him. The nature of this love and care has an overwhelming influence on the way the infant sees himself and the world (Purkey, 1967). If the experiences with important people in his life are good, then the child can begin to grow and develop to his fullest potential. Love is facilitated, and intelligence is increased by exposure to an enriched and varied perceptual environment. Loretan (1966) felt that any of the early years spent in a poor environment are almost irretrievable. For good or bad, the child is molded by the behavior of the significant people in his life.

Sigel (1964) stated that one of the reasons why children from disadvantaged homes have difficulty in kindergarten and first grade is that they have not had appropriate stimulation during the early years. Lewis (1963) stresses the significance of the first three years of life in the future cognitive development of the child, and states that the process of the growth of meaning during the second year of life is a complex interaction of cognitive and affective factors. "Any behavior of significant people that causes
a young child to think ill of himself, to feel inadequate, incapable, unworthy, unwanted, unloved, unable is crippling to the self" (Purkey, 1967, p. 7). Significantly, Grant (1967) found that the transmission of self-concept is largely a one-way process from adults to children.

Moss and Kagan (1964) reporting on the Fels Research Institute Longitudinal Study which followed 36 males and 35 females from birth to adulthood found that maternal treatment from birth to three years of age was generally a better predictor of child and adult intellectual status than was maternal treatment of the child during subsequent periods of life. This was based upon Stanford Binet testing, observations, and interviews. Hess, Shipman, Brophy, and Baer (1968) found that parent conveyance of positive attitudes toward education and school and realistic expectations for the child's behavior were significant predictors of the child's performance. Bradshaw (1968) looked at several factors of maternal behavior and infant performance in environmentally disadvantaged homes. Such factors as maternal verbalizations, maternal punishment and discipline, infant performances on speech and hearing, family density, intelligence, housing, paternal/maternal relationships, and nutrition were analyzed. Results indicated a cause/effect relationship but were not precise or specific. Other investigations in the area of intellectual stimulation of infants from environmentally deprived situations have demonstrated gains for the experimental groups on measures of intellectual functioning associated
with increased levels of stimulation (Klaus and Gray, 1965; Kittrell, 1968; Gordon, 1969). Deutsch (1964), Rheingold (1961), Sayegh and Dennis (1965), Casler (1965), and White, Castle and Held (1964) have each studied the possibility of positively changing early development through stimulation programs. However, the nature of the experiences which initiate adaptation and stimulation is not fully understood.

Weschler (1971) hypothesized that one way to improve the self-acceptance of an underachieving child might be to improve the mother's attitude toward the child. Mothers of underachievers underwent group counseling, and later testing indicated that boys achieved an increased self-acceptance and a sustained academic improvement. Achievement was measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity, while self-concept was measured by five sorts of the Catherall-Reece, Ipsative, True-Ideal, Q-sort Upper Elementary Test. Underachieving boys whose mothers did not undergo counseling did not improve on either measure.

Another important variable demonstrated by Bayley and Schaeffer (1960) and Samuels (1969) indicate that many personality and behavioral traits of the mother tend to be functions of the mother's socio-economic class. Those studies indicate that socio-economic status is a factor in the transmission of self-concept from mother to child. Battle and Rotter (1963) found that low socio-economic class
(determined by father's or mother's occupation) was related to a feeling of powerlessness (externality). Dean (1961) reports similar findings. Franklin (1963), Crandall et al. (1965) and Strodtbeck (1958) found that the lower the socio-economic class of an individual, the more likely he will be external. The importance of this relationship to the transmission of self-concept variables is presented in a study by Phares (1965). Phares indicates that internally oriented people are able to induce significantly greater changes in the expressed attitudes of others than externally controlled ones. This may indicate that internals have more influence in changing the child's self-concept than externals. Externals would then tend to breed externals and be less effective in bringing about any positive change in the child's locus of control.

Goff (1949), Ausubel (1963), and Kvaraceus (1965) state that the position of the American Negro leads to negative self-perceptions, and Coleman (1966) emphasized the importance of the Negro's perceptions of inability to control his own environment. Additional studies by Rotter and associates show a high correlation between internal control and affiliation and initiative in improving the conditions of school performance (Gore and Rotter, 1963; Rotter, 1966). Friego, Gordon, and Bilker (1968) investigated control expectancy in the Early Child Stimulation Through Parent Education project and found a significant difference
between Negro and white mothers. White mothers had significantly lower (more internal) scores on the Social Reaction Inventory, and the same group of mothers investigated by Friejo et al. were found to be low on the Autonomy factor of the How I See Myself Scale (HISM). There was also a low but significant correlation between the Interpersonal Adequacy factor of the HISM and the Social Reaction Inventory (SRI).

Finally, a study at the University of Florida took self-concept measures from 323 Florida Model Follow Through kindergarten and first grade children and their mothers at the beginning and end of the 1968-69 school year. The mothers and children were compared with a variety of statistical techniques, and the author concluded: 1) mother's self-concept measures (HISM and SRI) are related to children's self-concept measures (Child's Self-Social Constructs Test), and 2) mother's self-concept measures are related to change in children's self-concept measures over the course of the year (Tocco, 1970).

Parent Education and Parent Participation

The integration of parent education and parent participation programs into the mainstream of the American educational system has been a long, slowly developing process. European educator-philosophers such as Pestalozzi (1965) and Froebel (1907) emerged as leaders in the parent involvement process and were commonly associated with such American
educators as Dewey and the Progressive Education movement in the early 1900's. The child-study movement, the PTA, parent cooperative nursery schools and the community school movement each characteristically contained elements designed to generate increased parent participation in the educational process. In addition, the country's social system increasingly demanded the active participation of schools in the democratization of the society for all of its members. This national desire has continued to the present and often centers its energy in the form of compensatory programs.

Compensatory programs were initially designed to "remedy" "deficient" child groups of lower socio-economic members. But educators who began to work with the children of the socially disadvantaged soon realized that there were problems associated with the value systems of the parents, the attitudes of parents associated with these values, and the value systems of schools and the success of the children within these value systems (Karnes and Zehrback, 1975). Deutsch (1963) suggests a number of characteristics normally found in the milieu of the environmentally disadvantaged. These include overcrowding, sub-standard housing, lack of sanitary facilities, restriction to the immediate environment, few toys and creative materials, and reduced verbal communication. In addition to these demographic or structural variables as Gordon (1976) would call them, there are the attitudinal and process home variables which also play an important role in the child-development process. These
would include areas such as educational aspirations for the child, parental self-concepts and locus of control, academic guidance, intellectuality, dominance patterns, stimulation, and reinforcement practices.

An educational system which attempts to remedy ineffective development in the child-learning triad of parents, child, and the program without parental involvement is destined to only marginal success (Lillie, 1975). Scheinfield (1969) proposes that . . .

parents cannot construe a child's relationship to the world in ways that are fundamentally different from the way they construe their own relationship to the world. Therefore, to change child-rearing practices effectively, one must change the parent's own experience in the world. The required changes in child-rearing would necessitate significant shifts in family cultures, particularly a shift from a family environment in which the chief concerns of child-rearing center on external control or avoidance of trouble, to one in which the internal experience of the child and the development of competence become pivotal family concerns. If parents are to foster competence in their children, then it would seem imperative that the parents experience "competence-gaining-activity" in their own lives. (pp. 2-3)

If the parent does not perceive these "competence-gaining-activities" as having been gained through valid experience, then Scheinfield suggests that there is relatively little chance for substantial change.

Involvement of parents with the process of their children's learning in ways consistent with a given compensatory program is advantageous in several ways. First, such involvement often bridges a continuity gap which may exist between home and school. The use of parental-applied
Techniques can encourage the practice of important cognitive skills lacking in many disadvantaged children. Third, the indirect effects of parental self-worth and respect engendered by a meaningful contribution to their children's development may go a long way toward improving affectional relationships in the home (Evans, 1975). As Weikart and Lambie (1968) suggest, the most fruitful outcomes of compensatory programs could be in terms of changes in parental behavior and the total home environment of disadvantaged children.

Head Start

In an effort to rectify the cultural disadvantages of an increasingly large number of children, the federal government began a series of compensatory programs in the early 1960's. Chief among these programs was Operation Head Start, initiated on a national scale in the summer of 1965. This "concrete deployment of resources to wage the war on poverty" was mainly concerned with early childhood education but included many other facets (Evans, 1975, p. 64). Project Head Start was conceived as a seven-component, multidisciplinary enterprise including education, medical-dental care, nutrition, social services, psychological services, parent education, and the involvement of community volunteers (Evans, 1975). Head Start goals included among others:

- helping the emotional and social development of the child by encouraging self-confidence, spontaneity, curiosity, and self-discipline.
-increasing the child's capacity to relate positively to family members and others while at the same time strengthening the family's ability to relate positively to the child and his problems.
-developing in the child and his family a responsible attitude toward society, and fostering constructive opportunities for society to work together with the poor in solving their problems.
-increasing the sense of dignity and self worth within the child and his family. (p. 12)

In addition, Head Start served to illuminate the general question of how to achieve changes in local institutions utilizing a nationwide educational innovation as the intervention strategy (National Survey of the Impacts of Head Start Centers on Community Institutions, 1970).

Some well known figures in the social and behavioral sciences contend that there is no evidence that the goals of early compensatory education have been accomplished (Palmer, 1976). Bronfenbrenner, in his U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report of 1974, states that early results indicate that the effects were short-lived, modest achievement gains, with substantial overlap in the distributions for experimental and control groups. Experimental groups did not continue to make gains when the intervention was discontinued for one year. But, this evidence of failure is with respect to cognitive change (IQ). Bronfenbrenner stated that "there is evidence that such programs are contributing in important ways to the development and welfare of the child and his family, community and society" (p. 52). Bronfenbrenner also felt that the evidence for social change as well as cognitive performance was inconclusive, but the review finds that "the magnitude
of IQ gain was inversely related to the age at which the child entered the program, the greatest gains being made by children enrolled as one and two year olds" (p. 53).

Bronfenbrenner's Head Start Survey also found that, in terms of parent participation, the greater the frequency of participation in Head Start programs, the greater the change process. In the communities surveyed there was a notable increase in the participation of parents in the activities of, and decisions concerning, local institutions. One manifestation of change was the increase in the numbers of volunteers helping with school-sponsored activities. Another is the greater use of school facilities after class hours for all types of community meetings, adult-education classes, and service programs. In many communities it was noted that the schools had begun to encourage greater involvement by low-income parents, changing policies and regulations to permit this. A majority of the school systems surveyed had been influenced by the activities of neighborhood or parent organizations seeking involvement in or control over school affairs. In many communities parent advisory committees had been formed by grass-roots organizations. These were both permanently established organizations and groups established for a special purpose.

The results of this 1974 survey cannot be construed as solely derivative of operation Head Start. They reflect to a great extent the influence of subsequent Federal projects developed throughout the late 1960's and early 1970's.
Federal Interagency Day Care Guidelines of 1968 reflect the growing mandate for parental involvement. They required specifically that:

- Parents must have the opportunity to become involved themselves in the making of decisions concerning the nature and operation of the day care facility.
- Parents must be provided with opportunities at times convenient to them to work with the program and whenever possible to observe their children in the day care facility.
- Whenever an agency provides day care for 40 or more children, there must be a Policy Advisory Committee with a set percentage of parents selected by the parents themselves. (pp. 10-11)

In the fall of 1966 a White House Task Force on Early Childhood Education was convened at the request of President Lyndon B. Johnson (Costello, 1970). This group was made up of acknowledged experts in the field of early childhood education drawn from across the country and had the assignment of reviewing the field and making recommendations. In February 1967, as a direct result of recommendations made by the White House Task Force, the President delivered a special message to Congress on Children and Youth. He requested the development of 25 comprehensive services programs for families with children under three years of age to be called the Parent and Child Centers (PCC's).

The Parent-Child Centers Program was established within Head Start in the Office of Economic Opportunity and directed by three members of the Washington Head Start Staff.
The budget provided a $10,000 planning grant and a grant of $175,000 for first year operations for each center, to serve a maximum of 100 children under three years, and their families. The following criteria, as listed by Costello in her 1970 national survey, were required of all grantees:

1. Outreach recruitment and admissions procedures which would guarantee that selected families were economically disadvantaged.

2. Comprehensive health care for children, health care and health education for parents and siblings, family planning services, and prenatal care.

3. Children's programs designed to facilitate physical, intellectual, and emotional development.

4. Parent activities designed to strengthen:
   (a) Understanding of child development,
   (b) Competence as family managers,
   (c) Skills essential to making a living, including maximum opportunities for FCC employment,
   (d) Self-confidence and self-image as parents,
   (e) Family relationships, i.e. husband-wife, parent-child,
   (f) Role of the father within the family.

5. Social services for the entire family.

6. Programs designed to increase family participation in the neighborhood and the community in terms of:
   (a) Becoming knowledgeable about its resources and taking advantage of available opportunities,
   (b) Stimulating the family to become participating, responsible, and active members of the community.

7. Training program for both professionals and para-professionals, which must include the recruitment and training of neighborhood recruits and volunteers of many age groups to work alongside the professional staff.

8. A program of research and evaluation developed in cooperation with an appropriate institution such
as a University or a Clinic and designed to
describe and measure the progress of the
programs for children, parents and other
family members; as well as program contents
and costs. It was also to produce packaged
instructional materials and handbooks on how
to operate the program. (It was expected that
each center's research and evaluation program
would be related to a comprehensive research
and evaluation subcommittee organized by OEO,
the Children's Bureau, Public Health Service,
and the Office of Education of the Department
of Health, Education and Welfare. (pp. 53-54)

As this clearly indicates, the Federal government was
going more and more in the business of parent education
and the Washington commitment did not stop with the Head
Start and Parent-Child Centers. Many research grants were
awarded to private and state systems to investigate more
effective means of parent education. Among these grants
was the Florida Parent Education Program under the direction
of Ira Gordon at the University of Florida.

This 1967 project specifically focused on the family
so that the support system for the child's intellectual
growth might endure. Results at age six showed that children
in the experimental group for all three years or for two
consecutive years were superior to the control group on
the Stanford-Binet. These differences were evident at
least three years after the termination of the project
(Gordon and Guinagh, 1976).

Other results at age six indicated that the families
had been affected by the Florida Parent Education Program.
Interviews were conducted with mothers at the time of
testing in the child's sixth year. A significantly higher
percentage of experiential mothers reported involvement in an educational program after project termination, higher educational expectations for the child, and more purchasing of toys and use of the toys in direct instruction of the child. There was also more personal activity by the mother in her use of community resources such as the library (Gordon and Guinagh, 1976).

Research continued to support these conclusions. Mayeske (1973, p. iv) showed that about 85 percent of the variation in average achievement between schools is associated with measures of the family background. Program success was enhanced in all respects when intervention strategies included efforts to actively involve and educate the parents (Gordon, 1968; Klaus and Gray, 1969; McCarthy, 1969; Weikert and Lambie, 1968; Willmon, 1969). Research also demonstrated that the influence of the home seems more critical than the quality of education the child receives at school in affecting school achievement (Coleman, 1968; Jencks, 1972; Mosteller and Moynihan, 1972). Strodtbeck (1958), Hertzberg, Birch, Thomas, and Mendez (1958) suggest that one of the more promising methods of early intervention involves assisting parents to become better teachers in day-to-day transactions with their children. Carew (1976) conceptualized the interactive intellectual experiences of the child and stated that the parent plays a critical role in the child's development as a teacher, entertainer, playmate, converser, and blender of roles. The interactor is
responsible either solely or jointly with the child for the "manifest intellectual content of the experience" (Carew, 1976, p. 12). A prototype for the coordination of parent education with compensatory education is the Florida Model of Project Follow-Through (Gordon, 1968).

Project Follow-Through and the Florida Model

Formulated primarily to service Head Start graduates, Project Follow-Through is available to children who come from other preschool programs for the disadvantaged (Evans, 1975). Eligibility is limited to children from low-income homes as defined by the poverty line index of the OEO (see Appendix A).

Follow-Through was initiated on a pilot basis in 1967 with a fiscal allocation totalling $15 million dollars, and authorized to full-scale in 1968 under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Programs were established throughout the nation with a fiscal budget of $30 million dollars which serviced over 16,000 children (Evans, 1975). According to Ms. Rose Koury of the National Follow-Through Office, Washington, D.C., the 1977-78 budget will reach approximately $54 million dollars and involve over 76,000 children and their families.

A fundamental assumption of Project Follow-Through is that further environmental planning can provide a more sustained pattern of early gains by Head Start, or at least further increase the probability of long-term benefits
(Evans, 1975). In addition, a philosophy supporting the development of educational alternatives is reflected in the subsidization of nineteen "program models," each of which emphasizes somewhat different intervention strategies. These planned variations range along continua with elements such as structure, parental involvement and cognitive activities; they include major evaluation components and move within the context of broad community social and health service involvement (Evans, 1975).

Project Follow-Through operates under the theoretical assumption that parent education may take many forms but basically involves parents in four, or five, types or levels of participation (Gordon, 1970). These include:

1) Audience; bystander-observer - Here the parent visits or observes the school, or day-care center to see what the wise, professional teacher accomplishes. This has been called "educational imperialism."

2) Teacher of the child - At this level the school normally suggests areas of change or development and recommended activities to produce this change. Here a bias of the school changing the family to meet its standards may occur.

3) Volunteer - The parent takes an active role in the school as an aide or volunteer with the goal of changing or helping the child and the parent to change skills and attitudes.

4) Trained workers - This involves varying degrees of training to develop the skills of parents to assist in teaching, counseling, and assisting in roles in and out of the school.

5) A fifth approach to parental participation and involvement is to honor the right of the parents to control the school board and the school system. Offered by Campbell in Community Control (1968), local control means that parents become decision-makers rather than recipients of a pre-determined system. (p. 53)
Grounded in this philosophy and intent upon including parents at the highest levels of participation, the 1975-76 Florida Model of Project Follow-Through operates eleven school systems in ten states (Jacksonville, Florida; Tampa, Florida; Winnsboro, South Carolina; Houston, Texas; Jonesboro, Arkansas; Chattanooga, Tennessee; Lawrenceburg, Indiana; Richmond, Virginia; Lac du Flambeau, Wisconsin; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Yakima, Washington). The Florida Model attempts to involve parents in three ways: (1) through home visits, (2) involvement in program decision making and activities; and (3) through classroom volunteering.

As established by the Florida Sponsor, home visits are conducted by two adults, usually from low-income backgrounds who are trained to work in the classroom with the teacher as a team. These adults, called "parent educators," also visit the homes of the children in the classroom weekly in order to teach an enrichment type learning activity to the child's mother, who later teaches it to the child.

Before the parent educator makes a home visit, she plans for the visit with the teacher and relays evaluative information after each visit to the teacher. Each parent educator will normally spend one half of each day in the classroom assisting the teacher and the other half in making home visits.
Parents of children involved in Follow Through participate in program decision-making through the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The PAC serves as the governing body for each program and often includes mini-PAC's for each school involved and a city-wide PAC for the larger communities. PAC members make decisions concerning program personnel selection, budgets, proposal content, evaluation and development of home learning activities, and also plan and conduct numerous educational and recreational activities. Parents are encouraged to participate in both PAC meetings and activities and are often assisted with transportation by parent educators and other interested parents.

Parents are also encouraged to participate in the classroom as parent volunteers and whenever possible are involved in instructional activities. Parent volunteers also serve, as do teachers and parent educators, in planning, clerical and general housekeeping activities.

Through the three processes the Florida Model attempts to develop a flow of communication and a system of interactions between the home and the school. The beneficiary of these interactions is not only the child, but also the parent, family, school, and community.

**Conclusions**

Research consistently provides evidence that parents influence the intellectual, affective and interaction patterns of their children by the nature of the parent-child
relationship (Grotberg, 1969). "The beliefs of parents and the effects of these beliefs on their children are inextricably woven into the learning potential" (Adkins, 1975, p. 2). Alice Honig, a leader in contemporary parent education, states that parent involvement has been an "anti-dote to professional arrogance" by dramatically spotlighting the parents' role in the development process (1975, p. ix).

Parent involvement has played a crucial role in linking the child's home-community world with his formal learning environment and has challenged educators to think critically about parents' rights to participate in decisions affecting their children (Honig, 1975). An educational system which fails to maximize the parent involvement potential can never be more than partially effective, and as Adkins (1975) says, "the boundaries which restrict the utilization of parents in the educational program are limitless. They are dependent only upon educational creativity and enthusiasm" (p. 5).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In order to answer the questions developed in Chapter I, this study has identified and selected a group of parents whose participation in a parent education program was monitored and analyzed over the period of one school year. Existing instrumentation developed by the University of Florida Project Follow-Through staff was utilized as well as existing evaluative processes. Additionally, Richmond Follow-Through staff were responsible for pre and post self-concept and locus of control test administration as well as all other data collection.

The Sample

One hundred eighty-nine parents of kindergarten and first grade children participating in Project Follow-Through, Richmond, Virginia, were administered a pre-test measure of self-concept and locus of control. Of this group, one hundred forty-six parents were newly enrolled in Project Follow-Through; forty-three parents were repeating participation in the project. For purposes of this study, only those newly enrolled parents were selected as participants. Complete data sets were obtained from sixty-one participants and were the basis for all statistical information.
Each parent was classified as a lower socio-economic member according to the 1976-77 Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) Guidelines (Appendix A) and was, therefore, representative of other Follow-Through project participants. In addition, the Richmond project has been cited as one of the most representative programs of the Florida Model of Project Follow-Through. This sample and the results of this study were, therefore, also representative of the Florida Model.

Specific measures were utilized to reduce the influence of factors jeopardizing internal and external validity. Selection biases were minimized through the use of a large sample of the total population. Instrumentation and reactive effects were reduced through the use of the same observer for both pre and post test administration. Each participant also had the knowledge that all similar project participants were tested as an integral element of the project and not as a special exercise or event. Testing threats to validity were treated in the statistical analysis package and recorded along with the final results of the study.

Data Collection

The collection of data was supervised by the Richmond project staff and monitored by this investigator, serving as the Florida Model Sponsor Assistant Evaluation Coordinator. Data were collected throughout the 1976-77 school year and occurred as follows:
1. Within the first six weeks of the 1976-77 school year, parent educators administered the HISM and SRI instruments to all participants of this study.

2. Home Visitations were recorded by parent educators on a weekly basis and forwarded to Model Sponsor for tabulation.

3. Classroom Volunteering was recorded by teachers on a weekly basis and forwarded to the Model Sponsor for tabulation.

4. PAC Meetings and Activities were recorded by PAC secretaries and forwarded as they occurred to the Model Sponsor for tabulation.

5. Within the last six weeks of the 1976-77 school year, parent educators administered the HISM and SRI instruments to all participants of this study.

Instrumentation

Data collection for this study was accomplished through the use of the following five instruments:

How I See Myself (HISM): The HISM (see Appendix B) is a modification for mothers of Gordon's HISM (1968), which has been developed and norms established on children grades three through 12. The scale is a 40-item, five-point, self-report scale with the direction of the most positive responses varying for each question. The modification of the scale for use with
mothers consisted of changing those items which said girls or boys to women or men and those having to do with a teacher to the past tense.

A refactoring of the revised HISM Scale for parents was performed on the data from 2,053 parents from the 1969-70 pretest administration. All items were correlated with each other, and various statistical operations were performed to group those items which related highest with each other. Four such groups, or factors, emerged: 1) Interpersonal Adequacy, 2) Teacher-School, 3) Personal Appearance, and 4) Competence.

An item analysis and table of comparisons of old and new factors is included in Appendix C.

Social Reaction Inventory (SRI): This scale (see Appendix D) is a self-report inventory designed to assess attitudes toward mastery of the environment (Herman, 1970). The SRI was developed by Bilker (1970) as a modification of the Rotter (1966) Internal-External Scale. A population mean and standard deviation for the Rotter I-E Scale were approximately 8.34 and 3.87, respectively. The first step in the modification of this scale was changing the language to a fourth-grade vocabulary level. A test re-test reliability for this modified self-report measure was .78, about the same level as the original Rotter version (Bilker, 1970).

Scoring instructions are included in Appendix E.
PAC Meeting/Activity Sign-In Sheet (PAC M/A): This report form (see Appendix F), a Project Follow-Through Instrument, indicates the date and type of meeting or activity conducted within each community. Parent name, child name, type of relationship and teacher name are also indicated. Type and frequency of parent participation in this program element will be determined from this record.

Parent Education Weekly Report (PEWR): This instrument (see Appendix G), developed by the Florida Model Sponsor of Project Follow-Through, reports the home visit of each parent educator on a weekly basis. For purposes of this study only the first two measures will be utilized. These indicate the number of visits scheduled (by appointment with the parent) and the number of visits completed. This index should reflect the level of parent involvement with this project element.

Classroom Volunteer Report Form (CR Vol): This instrument (see Appendix H), developed by the Florida Model Sponsor of Project Follow-Through, reports the date, length of time, and type of classroom volunteering of each parent participant. The frequency of parent participation should provide an index of parent involvement in this project element.

Data Treatment

Descriptive statistics were utilized to initially analyze pre and post HISM and SRI measures. The participation
variables were also analyzed in this manner. These operations provided base data (means, standard deviations, and range) for subsequent inferential statistical analysis.

The standard error of correlations, $SE_r = 1/\sqrt{N-1}$, and the standard error of the difference of means, $SE_{dm} = \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}^2 + \sigma_{m_2}^2 - 2r_{12}\sigma_{m_1}\sigma_{m_2}}$ ($\sigma_m =$ standard error of a mean; $r_{12} =$ correlation between the two sets of means), were derived for each variable to determine the significance of pre-post change in self-concept and locus of control scores (Guilford, 1956).

A multi-variate analysis procedure developed by Hotelling (1935, 1936) and referred to as "canonical correlation" was used in this study. Canonical correlation uses the coefficients of linear compounds to describe the dependencies between two sets of variables (Morrison, 1976). This correlation, as suggested by Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973), is a multiple regression analysis with $k$ independent variables and $m$ dependent variables. Through least squares analysis, two linear composites are formed, one for independent variables, $X_j$, and one for the dependent variables, $Y_n$. The correlation between these two composites is the canonical correlation, $R_c$. The square of the canonical correlation, $R_c^2$, is an estimate of the variance shared by the two composites.

In canonical correlation analysis, two or more variables, the dependent variables, are partitioned from the
rest of the matrix as seen in Table 3.1, the basic data matrix for canonical correlation analysis. The first subscript of each $X$ stands for rows (subjects, cases) and the second subscript for columns (variables, tests, items). The broken vertical line partitions the matrix into the $K$ independent and the $n-k$ dependent variables. The variables are intercorrelated and a correlation or $R$ matrix is formed.

Table 3.1. Basic Raw Data Matrix for Canonical Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$X_{11}$ $X_{12}$ ... $X_{1k}$</td>
<td>$X_{1(k+1)}$ ... $X_{1n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$X_{21}$ $X_{22}$ ... $X_{2k}$</td>
<td>$X_{2(k+1)}$ ... $X_{2n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$X_{N1}$ $X_{N2}$ ... $X_{Nk}$</td>
<td>$X_{N(k+1)}$ ... $X_{Nn}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N \triangleq$ number of cases; $k \triangleq$ number of independent variables; $n \triangleq$ total number of variables.


The four partitions of the correlation matrix are indicated in this way:
where $R = \text{the whole correlation matrix of the } K+(n-k) \text{ variables};
R_{11} = \text{the correlation of the } k \text{ independent variables;}
R_{22} = \text{the correlations of the } n-k \text{ dependent variables;}
R_{12} = \text{the correlations between the independent and dependent variables;}
R_{21} = \text{the transpose of } R_{12} \text{ (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973).}

The intercorrelated variables are similarly partitioned as shown in Table 3.2 and indicated by the broken lines.
The correlation between composites of independent and dependent variables is the canonical correlation. Its square $R_c^2$ represents the variance shared by the two composites.

According to Darlington, Weinberg, and Walberg (1973), canonical variate analysis answers these questions:

1. What is the minimum number of traits that would have to be controlled or partialled out in order to eliminate all important linear relations between sets X and Y?

2. What is the nature of those traits?

More than one source of common variance can be identified and analyzed. The method systematically extracts the first and largest source of variance, and the canonical
Table 3.2. Partitioned Correlation Matrix for Canonical Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>k+1...n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & r_{11} & r_{21} & \cdots & r_{1k} & r_{1(k+1)} & \cdots & r_{1n} \\
2 & r_{21} & r_{22} & \cdots & r_{2k} & r_{2(k+1)} & \cdots & r_{2n} \\
3 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
k & r_{k1} & r_{k2} & \cdots & r_{kk} & r_{k(k+1)} & \cdots & r_{kn} \\
k+1 & r_{(k+1)1} & \cdots & r_{(k+1)k} & r_{(k+1)(k+1)} & \cdots & r_{(k+1)n} \\
n & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{a}k = \text{number of independent variables; } n = \text{total number of variables.}\)

correlation coefficient is an index of the relation between the two sets of variables based on this source of variance. The next largest source of variance, independent of the first source of variance, is extracted and analyzed. The second canonical correlation coefficient, which is smaller than the first, is an index of the relation between the two sets of variables due to this second source of variance (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973). The number of nonzero canonical correlations is termed the number of canonical relations between sets X and Y. This number cannot exceed the number of variables in the smaller set (Darlington et al., 1973). The most widely used significance test on the number of canonical relations is Bartlett's (1938) chi-square approximation to the distribution of Wilk's lambda. This test, though conservative, can be regarded as highly accurate for sample sizes of N above 50 (Darlington et al., 1973).

Canonical correlation does yield weights which can be interpreted as regression weights. These weights, however, are the weakest link in the analysis process and must therefore be interpreted with great caution (Morrison, 1976).

This study used the four factor scores of the pre-HISM and a fifth measure from the pre-SRI locus of control instrument as independent variables. These five independent variables were correlated to the four participation measures which served as dependent variables. Existing significant
relationships were established and recorded. Next, the pre-HISM and pre-SRI variables and the four participation variables were held constant as independent variables. Change scores in the HISM and SRI served as dependent variables. The canonical correlation analysis was then utilized again to detect any unique variance attributable to the participation variables. This was supported through the use of an additional canonical correlation between pre-HISM and pre-SRI measures with change scores in the same measures. The results provided inferential statistical data between the testing and participation variables of this study.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the nature of the relationship between selected parent participation activities in the school system and parent self-concepts and measures of internal-external locus of control. The results presented in this chapter are addressed to the questions presented in Chapter I. Descriptive statistics were generated to answer questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. Multivariate analyses were used to examine the relationships among sets of variables and were required by questions 6 and 8.

Question 1: What is the nature of the measured self-concept and locus of control of lower socio-economic parents prior to their participation in this study?

Descriptive statistics were generated for each of the four HISM Factors as well as the SRI score. Means and standard deviations for each of these variables are provided in Table 4.1 and 4.3, with variance distributions provided in Figure 4.1.

Factor 1 of the pre-HISM self-concept scale, Interpersonal Adequacy, contained 14 questions scaled 1-5 with the most positive response being a 5. A maximum score would be 70, a minimum score, 14, and a neutral response would be 42. The mean score for Factor 1 was 56.92 with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 1 (Interpersonal Adequacy)</td>
<td>56.92</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 2 (Teacher-School)</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 3 (Personal Appearance)</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 4 (Competence)</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-SRI (Locus of Control)</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 1 (Interpersonal Adequacy)</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 2 (Teacher-School)</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 3 (Personal Appearance)</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 4 (Competence)</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-SRI (Locus of Control)</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1 Composite Profile for HISM and SRI Variable Prescores
an individual item mean score of 4.06, indicating a sample response in the upper, or most positive, quartile of possible responses. The standard deviation for Factor 1 was 9.22. Sample items for this factor included such questions as "I like to work with others" and "I feel at ease, comfortable inside myself."

Factor 2, with items such as "I liked school" and "I get along well with teachers," was labeled Teacher-School and was measured through responses to 10 questions. The score was reversed and, therefore, one became the most positive response. Since the factor consisted of the sum on ten items, a maximum score would be 10, a minimum score 50, and the neutral response score would be 30. The sample mean was 21.54 with an individual item mean of 2.15. This was a positive response in the upper-middle quartile of possible responses. The standard deviation for the 61 complete data sets was 8.46.

Pre-HISM Factor 3 contained six questions with items such as "I like the way I look." This factor labeled Personal Appearance had a maximum score of 30, a minimum score of 6, and a neutral response score of 18. The sample and individual item means were 22.51 and 3.75, respectively, and indicated a positive participant response in the upper-middle quartile of possible responses. The standard deviation for this factor was 4.90.

Factor 4 of the HISM scale, labeled Competence, reflected the parent's feelings of academic or intellectual
ability as well as general language and academic adequacy. This factor contained such items as "I'm very good at speaking before a group" and "I write well," and consisted of 6 questions on the reversed scale. The maximum score was, therefore, 6, the minimum score, 30, and the neutral response score, 18. The mean prescores for sample and individual items were 20.43 and 3.40. This lower-middle quartile response was the only negative response of premeasures on the HISM Scale. The standard deviation for this factor was 3.39.

The pre-SRI (Locus of Control) mean for 61 responses was 8.46, and the standard deviation was 3.92. Of 29 questions, 23 specific responses were tabulated with 0 indicating internal locus of control and 1 indicating external locus of control, with a possible range of 0 to 23. The neutral response score or midpoint lay between scores of 11 and 12. Participants chose between alternative statements such as "What happens to me is my own doing," or "Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the directions my life is taking."

Project participants responded in the upper quartile of possible responses for Factor 1, Interpersonal Adequacy, of the HISM self-concept scale, and upper-middle quartile for Factor 2, Teacher-School, and Factor 3, Personal Appearance. A negative response in the lower-middle quartile was exhibited on HISM Factor 4, Competence. The pre-SRI
response for these lower socio-economic parents was below the neutral response score, an internal measure of locus of control.

Question 2: Do lower socio-economic parents exhibit negative measures on each of four factors of a self-concept scale?

Responses indicated that the sample exhibited a positive attitude in the self-concept factor of Interpersonal Adequacy. The mean score of 56.92 and standard deviation of 9.22, with a possible maximum score of 70, indicated a strong positive response. A comparative pre-intervention sample of Parent Education Project mothers (Gordon, 1968) responded with a mean of 60.75 and a standard deviation of 12.8 (Table 4.2).

Project participants also responded with positive measures on Factor 2, Teacher-School. The sample mean of 21.54 lay in the upper-middle quartile of responses. The standard deviation for this factor was 8.46. Parent Education Project mothers were not scored for this factor, but a test-retest reliability group of working mothers with a sample size of 34 scored a mean of 14.94 and a standard deviation of 4.2. Follow Through parents were much less positive about their relationship with teachers and school.

Factor 3, or the Personal Appearance Factor, of the HISM scale produced a positive premeasure for the lower
## Table 4.2

Means and Standard Deviations of Pre-intervention HIS and SRI Variable Scores for the Parent Education Project, University of Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reliability Sample (N=34)</th>
<th>Parent Education Sample (N=61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISM Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Interpersonal Adequacy)</td>
<td>67.31</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISM Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Teacher-School)</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISM Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Physical Appearance)</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISM Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Competence)</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Locus of Control)</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

socio-economic parents of this study. The sample mean of 22.51 out of a maximum score of 30 was also in the upper-middle quartile of possible responses. This compared to a 25.52 sample mean for Parent Education Project matters and again indicated a less positive response for participants of this study. The reliability sample had a mean of 28.09, a very high response. The standard deviations for each group were as follows: 1) Reliability sample, 6.6; 2) Parent Education Project Sample, 7.1; and 3) Follow Through parents of this study, 4.90.

Factor 4, Competence, revealed the only negative response mean on the pre-HISM measure. The mean of 20.43 was in the lower-middle quartile of possible responses. This compared with the Parent Education sample mean of 23.57. The standard deviation of this study, 3.39, indicated less variance than the Parent Education standard deviation of 4.4.

In summary, parent participants of this study exhibited positive responses on three measures of a self-concept scale, Factor 1, Interpersonal Adequacy, Factor 2, Teacher-School, and Factor 3, Personal Appearance. The only negative response for these parents was on pre-HISM Factor 4, Competence.

Question 3: Do lower socio-economic parents exhibit an external measure on a locus of control scale?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Visits Scheduled</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visits Completed</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Home Visits Completed</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Volunteering</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC Meetings</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC Activities</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the neutral response score of 11.5 on the SRI scale, the pre-SRI mean of 8.46 for this sample indicated that project participants were internal on a measure of locus of control. This compared very favorably with the population mean of 8.34 established by Rotter (1966) in a series of nine studies with over 3000 participants. In contrast, Parent Education Project Mothers (Table 4.3) exhibited mean scores of 10.26, a more external measure.

Question 4: What is the nature of parent participation in the following four selected activities: 1) Policy Advisory Committee Meetings; 2) Policy Advisory Committee Activities; 3) Classroom Volunteering; and 4) Home Visitations?

As Table 4.3 indicates, monthly PAC meetings were attended an average of 1.64 times during the project period of nine months. The dispersion of scores indicated by the standard deviation of 2.45 was relatively small. PAC activities, though more numerous than PAC meetings, were attended at an even poorer rate of 0.80 times with a standard deviation of 2.47. Parent participation in PAC meetings and activities was not mandatory for project participation.

Classroom volunteering occurred an average of 3.93 times during the project year reflecting greater participation in this activity. The increased standard deviation of 8.26 for this variable also indicated a greater variance in the amount of parent participation in this project activity.
The mean number of visits scheduled for home visitations was 26.98 of a possible 30 visits with the number of visits completed averaging 24.61. This high percentage of completion, 91.7, was to be expected since participation in this basic program element was mandatory. The standard deviations of 3.44 and 3.96 for both visits scheduled and visits completed were relatively small.

Project participation varied greatly with the highest participation measured in the home visitation and lower participation in classroom volunteering, PAC meetings and FAC activities.

Question 5: Will parent participation be most frequent in the basic program element of Home Visits and become successively less frequent in Parent Advisory Committee Meetings, PAC activities and least frequent in Classroom Volunteering?

In this simple frequency comparison, results indicated that parent participation in the Home Visits was by far the most frequently attended activity. Classroom Volunteering, though relatively infrequent, was the second most attended activity. Parent Advisory Committee Meetings were infrequently attended with the mean participation at the very low rate of only 1.64 times. This, however, was greater than parent participation in PAC Activities which averaged less than once per person during the project period.

Question 6: What Factors of parent self-concept and measure of internal-external locus of control can individually and in combination predict the type and/or frequency of parent participation in the four selected participation activities?
In order to determine significant relationships between the measures of self-concept and locus of control with four participation variables, the multivariate analysis of canonical correlation developed by Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973) was used. The five self-concept and locus of control variables were partitioned as independent from the four dependent variables of participation. Table 4.4 lists the results of this analysis which indicated that there were no canonical correlations that reached the .05 level of significance. This process systematically extracted the first and largest source of variance, in this case, Classroom Volunteering. The canonical correlation coefficient, 0.93, was an index of the relation between the two sets of variables based on this source of variance. The largest source of variance among the dependent variables was pre-HISM Factor 3, with a coefficient of -1.20. The significance of this relationship was only 0.29; therefore, no canonical correlation reached the .05 level of significance. The relationship described above was, however, the first non-significant canonical correlation. The results of this analysis indicated an absence of a suitable attitudinal predictor for project participation from among the selected variables.

Question 7: What is the nature of the pre/post change in measures of self-concept and locus of control after participation in this study?
TABLE 4.4

CANONICAL CORRELATION I FOR PARENT PARTICIPATION,
PRE-HISM, AND PRE-SRI VARIABLE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Canonical Correlation Found at the 0.050 Level of Significance
The First (Non-Significant) Canonical Correlation is Printed Below.

COEFFICIENTS FOR CANONICAL VARIABLES OF THE FIRST SET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canvar I</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits Scheduled</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits Completed</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Completed</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Volunteer</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC Meetings</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC Activities</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEFFICIENTS FOR CANONICAL VARIABLES OF THE SECOND SET</td>
<td>Canvar I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 1</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 3</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.5

**Canonical Correlation II for Parent Participation, Pre HISM and SRI, and Post HISM and SRI Variable Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>168.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>103.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>59.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients for Canonical Variables of the First Set**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canvar 1</th>
<th>Canvar 2</th>
<th>Canvar 3</th>
<th>Canvar 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits Scheduled</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits Completed</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-3.34</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Completed</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Volunteer</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC Meetings</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC Activities</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 1</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 2</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 3</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-HISM Factor 4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-SRI</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 (continued)

COEFFICIENTS FOR CANONICAL VARIABLES OF THE SECOND SET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canvar 1</th>
<th>Canvar 2</th>
<th>Canvar 3</th>
<th>Canvar 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 2</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 3</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-HISM Factor 4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-SRI</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the number of complete data sets for project participants (N=61), the standard error of correlations (SE\(_r\) = \(1/\sqrt{N-1}\) of 1.28) was derived to determine the significance of the relationship between pre and post scores. Correlations for each change were determined and used in this discussion. Additionally, the standard error of the difference of correlated means (SE\(_{dm}\) = \(\sqrt{\sigma^2_{m1} + \sigma^2_{m2} - 2\times12\sigma_{m1}\sigma_{m2}}\)) was determined for each factor to investigate the significance of any pre-post change. Z scores were also determined for each factor (\(Z = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{SE_{dm}}\)), and any score greater than 1.96 was estimated to be significant at the .05 level (Guilford, 1956).

Project participants responded less positively on HISM Factor 1 post scores than on previous pretest scores (Table 4.1). The means changed from 56.92 to 55.79 or a difference of -1.13. The correlation of these scores, \(r = .21\), was within two standard error units from the mean and was, therefore, not significant at the .05 level. Using the formula SE\(_{dm}\) = \(\sqrt{\sigma^2_{m1} + \sigma^2_{m2}}\) to determine the standard error of these uncorrelated means, SE\(_{dm}\) was equal to 1.31 which yielded a Z score of .86. This indicated that the pre-post change for Factor 1 was not significant.

The pre-HISM Factor 2 mean was 21.54 as compared to the post score of 21.87. This less positive response on the reversed scale amounted to a difference of .33. The correlation between these two scores was .39, which indicated
that the pre-post factor relationship was significant at the .05 level. The standard error of the difference of these correlated means was 1.14 and the Z ratio was -.29. This was within 1.96 standard error units, therefore, the pre-post change of Factor 2 was not significant.

Responses on post-HISM Factor 3 were also less positive than responses on the pretest. The post score mean of 22.11 compared to 22.51, or a difference of .40. The correlation between pre-post scores was .59 which placed the relationship well within the .05 significance level. The standard error of the difference between means was .57 and the derived Z score equal to .70. This pre-post change was also not significant at the .05 level.

HISM Factor 4 was the only self-concept score to increase during the project period. The postscore mean of 19.72 increased .71 from the pretest score of 20.43. This factor also had the highest correlation of means \( r = .63 \) which meant that the pre-post factor relationship was significant at the .05 level. The pre-post change of Factor 4 was also significant. The standard error of the difference between means (SE\(_{dm}\)) was .35 and the Z ratio equal to 2.03. This Z score was greater than the 1.96 units required for significance.

Post-SRI responses also increased in internality, moving from a mean prescore of 8.85 to a postscore mean of 7.93. The difference of .92 was almost an entire point
The pre-post factor relationship was significant with the high correlation of means of .67. The standard error of the difference between means was .41 which yielded a Z score of 2.24. The pre-post change for the SRI locus of control measure was, therefore, significant at the .05 level.

In summary, there were no significant pre-post changes in HISM Factor 1, Interpersonal Adequacy, HISM Factor 2, Teacher-School, and HISM Factor 3, Personal Appearance. There were, however, significant, positive pre-post changes for HISM Factor 4, Competence, and the SRI locus of control scale.

Question 8: What is the nature of the relationship between the four selected parent participation activities and pre-post change in the measures of self-concept and locus of control?

Four of the five preattitudinal measures were significantly related to postscore change. In order to determine whether or not any of the participation activities of the project were related to this change, the canonical correlation analysis was again utilized. The participation variables were added to the preattitudinal scores and partitioned as independent from the postattitudinal or dependent variables. Table 4.5 lists the results of this analysis and indicated that four canonical correlations existed between the independent and dependent variables at the .05 level of significance. Significance was
determined through the use of Bartlett's (1938) Chi-square approximation to the distribution of the Wilk's lambda figures.

The canonical variable coefficients were listed for each of the significant correlations and indicated the largest source of variance for both independent and dependent variable sets. The first canonical correlation (Rc) determined was 0.85. As indexed in the first canonical variate list, the strongest relationship existed between pre-HISM Factor 4, 0.88 and post-HISM Factor 4, 0.79. It was important to note that the next largest independent variable source of variance was the inverse relationship indicated for Visits Completed (-0.60). The strong influence of the home visitation process was a pattern throughout the analysis.

Canonical Variable List 2 confirmed this strong source of variance with a coefficient of -3.34 for the number of Visits Completed. This was most highly related to the post-SRI variable with a coefficient of 0.94. More simply stated, the more visits completed, the lower the score on an SRI scale. Also very highly related to this variance was the number of visits scheduled with a coefficient of 2.53.

The canonical correlation analysis having removed the variance attributable to these first two relationships produced a third significant correlation (Rc = 0.68).
This third greatest variance was associated with the relationship between the number of visits completed, coefficient = -1.07, and post-HISM Factor 3 (-1.16). This indicated that a direct relationship existed between the number of home visits completed and the parent attitude toward personal appearance.

A fourth and final canonical correlation, $R_c = 0.56$, was extracted and the coefficients of canonical variables were an index of this variance. The number of home visits completed was again significantly related, -4.75, to two dependent variables, post-HISM Factor 4 (-0.24) and post-SRI (-0.25).

Through the use of the canonical correlation analysis, significant relationships were indicated between the number of home visitations and three attitudinal variables, HISM Factor 3, Personal Appearance, HISM Factor 4, Competence, and SRI, locus of control. The pre-post change, as determined for Question 8 of this study, was significant only for HISM Factor 4 and the SRI measure. Therefore, the number of home visitations was directly and significantly related to positive change in HISM Factor 4, Competence, and the SRI locus of control measure.
Summary of the Study

One hundred forty-six lower socio-economic parents of kindergarten and first grade children, newly enrolled in Project Follow-Through, Richmond, Virginia, were selected to participate in this study. Parents were measured with pre and post self-concept and locus of control instruments, and their participation in four project activities was monitored throughout the 1976-77 school year. Sixty-one complete data sets were available for data analyses. The relationships between the measured attitudinal and behavioral variables were analyzed, and the results reported in Chapter IV.

When interpreting the results of this study, certain cautions should be noted. Conclusions and generalizations should be restricted to similar socio-economic groups. The self-report nature of the self-concept and locus of control scales may not have accurately reflected the real behavior and beliefs of the project participants. Reactive and testing threats to validity may have existed due to the fact that such testing was mandatory for project participation.
Parent participation was also measured only by the programmed activities of the Florida model of Follow-Through and recorded only by the frequency of participation. More positive participation may have been exhibited in other areas significantly related to the results of this study. No attempt was made to isolate the many variables effective in the lives of these participants, conditions which would not only be relevant to any study of this nature, but would possibly be significantly related to its results. Additionally, the number of complete data sets suffered an undesirable attrition. This number, however, reached the very acceptable ratio of 4 to 1, data sets to variables.

The statistical procedures utilized in this study, in particular, the multivariate analyses of canonical correlation, were the most appropriate and effective means for analysis and interpretation of the results. Appropriate levels of significance were reached, and therefore, the conclusions drawn from this study are offered as valid interpretations.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this investigation, the following conclusions were established:

1. Project participants exhibited positive preattitudinal self-concept scores on three
factors: 1) Interpersonal Adequacy, 
2) Teacher-School, and 3) Personal Appearance.

2. Project participants exhibited negative preattitudinal self-concept scores on the Factor labeled Competence.

3. Project participation varied greatly with the individual and the activity with highest participation measured in the home visitation and lower participation in classroom volunteering, PAC meetings, and PAC activities.

4. Project participation cannot be predicted by present HISM and SRI instrumentation.

5. Pretest measures of self-concept and locus of control were significantly related to posttest scores on the same measures with the exception of HISM Factor 1, Interpersonal Adequacy.

6. Significant pre-post change of self-concept and locus of control measures occurred only for HISM Factor 4, Competence, and the SRI scale.

7. The number of home visits completed was consistently and significantly related to positive change in the posttest self-concept
Factor of Competence and in the post locus of control score.

8. Project participation was significantly related to positive change in the posttest self-concept and locus of control scores.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed to improve and further direct research in the study and evaluation of parent education and parent involvement in the school system:

1. The home visitation process, a parent participation variable determined to be significantly related to positive change in self-concept and locus of control measures, should be further developed in order to maximize its effective relationship with parent attitudinal variables.

2. Parent education programs should include additional parent participation activities which are significantly related to positive self-concept and locus of control development.

3. Parent participation variables such as classroom volunteering and parent advisory
council meetings or activities, which have been determined in this study not to be related to positive self-concept development, should be restructured or investigated to determine their relationship with other variables.

4. Further research should determine the nature of the relationship between environmental variables (i.e., age, state of employment, family membership profile, etc.) and parent self-concept development.

5. Further research should investigate the relationship between parent participation in the school system and child achievement.

6. Longitudinal studies should be developed to determine the relationship between selected parent participation activities and parent self-concept and locus of control measures.

7. Staffing and program administration of parent education projects should at all times reflect positive self-concepts and locus of control in their interaction with project participants.

8. Further research should determine the relative merit of specific components of national parent
education models and synthesize these components in order to provide the most effective model for parent involvement in the school system.
APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

June 17, 1976

Our Reference: CEP/Division of Follow Through
Administrative Memorandum #61

MEMORANDUM TO PROJECT DIRECTORS AND PAC CHAIRMEN

SUBJECT: NEW INCOME POVERTY GUIDELINES

In selecting children eligible to be included in the new group of entering children funded by Follow Through for the 1976-77 school year, you should be aware of the new income poverty guidelines, which are enclosed.

The following definitions, derived mainly from Current Population Reports, P-60 No. 91, Bureau of the Census, December 1973, have been adopted for your use with these guidelines.

For the purpose of applying the guidelines to determine eligibility:

A. INCOME - Refers to total cash receipts before taxes, from all sources. These include money wages and salaries before any deductions, but not including food or rent in lieu of wages. They include receipts from self-employment or from own farm or business after deductions for business or farm expenses. They include regular payments from public assistance, social security, unemployment, and workmen's compensation, strike benefits from union funds, veterans' benefits, training stipends, alimony, child support and military family allotments or other regular support from an absent family member of someone not living in the household; government employee pensions, private pensions and regular insurance or annuity payments; and income from dividends, interest, rents, royalties, or income from estates and trusts.
For eligibility purposes, income does not refer to the following money receipts: Any assets drawn down as withdrawals from a bank, sale of property, house or car, tax refunds, gifts, one-time insurance payments or compensation for injury; also to be disregarded is non-cash income, such as the bonus value of food and fuel produced and consumed on farms and the imputed value of rent from owner-occupied or non-farm housing.

B. A FARM RESIDENCE - Is defined as any dwelling on a place of 10 acres or more with $50 or more annual sales of farm products raised there; or any place of less than 10 acres having product sales of $250 or more.

Rosemary C. Wilson
Director, Division of Follow Through

Enclosure
### INCOME POVERTY GUIDELINES FOR CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY SIZE</th>
<th>NON-FARM FAMILY</th>
<th>FARM FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>3,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>4,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>5,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For family units with more than six members add $900 for each additional member in a non-farm family and $760 for each additional member in a farm family.

### INCOME POVERTY GUIDELINES FOR ALASKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY SIZE</th>
<th>NON-FARM FAMILY</th>
<th>FARM FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>3,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>5,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For family units with more than six members add $1,120 for each additional member in a non-farm family and $950 for each additional member in a farm family.

### INCOME POVERTY GUIDELINES FOR HAWAII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY SIZE</th>
<th>NON-FARM FAMILY</th>
<th>FARM FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,240</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>4,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>5,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td>6,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,390</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For family units with more than six members add $1,030 for each additional member in a non-farm family and $870 for each additional member in a farm family.
## APPENDIX B

### HOW I SEE MYSELF SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.E./Parent Name</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child's Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Teacher</td>
<td>Collected by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Nothing gets me too mad 1 2 3 4 5 I get mad easily and explode
2. I don't stay with things and finish them 1 2 3 4 5 I stay with something till I finish
3. I'm very good at drawing 1 2 3 4 5 I'm not much good in drawing
4. I don't like to work with others 1 2 3 4 5 I like to work with others
5. I wish I were smaller (taller) 1 2 3 4 5 I'm just the right height
6. I worry a lot 1 2 3 4 5 I don't worry much
7. I wish I could do something with my hair 1 2 3 4 5 My hair is nice-looking
8. Teachers like me 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers don't like me
9. I've lots of energy 1 2 3 4 5 I haven't much energy
10. I am ignored at parties 1 2 3 4 5 I am a hit at parties
11. I'm just the right weight 1 2 3 4 5 I wish I were heavier (lighter)
12. Women don't like me 1 2 3 4 5 Women like me a lot
13. I'm very good at speaking before a group 1 2 3 4 5 I'm not much good at speaking before a group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow Through Project</th>
<th>HOW I SEE MYSELF SCALE</th>
<th>Page 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. My face is pretty (good looking)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I wish I were prettier (good) looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I'm very good in music</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I'm not much good in music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I get along well with teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I don't get along with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I don't like teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I like teachers very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I don't feel at ease, comfortable inside myself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I feel very at ease, comfortable inside myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I don't like to try new things</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I like to try new things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I have trouble controlling my feelings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I can handle my feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I did well in school work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I didn't do well in school work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I want men to like me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I don't want men to like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I don't like the way I look</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I like the way I look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I don't want other women to like me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I want other women to like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I'm very healthy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I get sick a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I don't dance well</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I'm a very good dancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I write well</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I don't write well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I like to work alone</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I don't like to work alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I use my time well</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I don't know how to plan my time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I'm not much good at making things with my hands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>I'm very good at making things with my hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I wish I could do something about my skin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. School was never interesting to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I don't do my housework well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I'm not as smart as the others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Men like me a lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My clothes are not as I'd like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I liked school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I wish I were built like others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I don't read well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I don't learn new things easily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
REPORT ON THE REFACTORIZING OF THE HISM\textsuperscript{1}

The original factor scores had been based on the high school version of the How I See Myself Scale, and we felt that with some of the items changed, and with adults as respondents, these scores might not be the most accurate and useful. Therefore, a refactoring of the revised HISM Scale for parents was performed on the data from 2,053 parents from the 1969-70 pretest administration.

All 40 items were correlated with each other, and various statistical operations were performed to group those items which related highest with each other. Four such groups, or factors, emerged.

Factor one was the most stable. It was named \textit{Interpersonal Adequacy} and consisted of the following test items:

\begin{itemize}
\item [2] I stay with things until I finish them.
\item [4] I like to work with others.
\item [12] Women like me a lot.
\item [17] I like teachers very much.
\item [18] I feel at ease, comfortable inside myself.
\item [19] I like to try new things.
\item [20] I can handle my feelings.
\item [23] I like the way I look.
\item [24] I want other women to like me.
\item [32] Housework is very interesting.
\end{itemize}
33 I do a good job at housework.
38 I am happy with the way I am
39 I read very well
40 I learn new things easily.

With a few changes this factor is very similar to that extracted with childrens' scores.

The second factor appears to be a combination of the Teacher-School, the Physical Adequacy, and the factor which appeared for males only, Boys-Social, on the high school norms. It consists of the following:

8 People like me.
9 I've lots of energy.
16 I get along well with teachers.
21 I did well in school work.
22 I want men to like me.
25 I'm very healthy.
27 I write well.
29 I use my time well.
35 Men like me a lot.
37 I liked school.

This cluster of scores is not easily named. After inspection, it has been tentatively labeled Social-Male because of items 22 and 35. In this respect, it differs from the first factor.

Factor three is clear and stable. It is the Personal Appearance factor consisting of items:
7 My hair is nice looking.
14 My face is pretty (good looking).
23 I like the way I look.
31 My skin is nice looking.
36 My clothes are nice.
38 I'm happy with the way I am (built).

Factor four is labeled Competence. The items which load on this factor are:

13 I'm very good at speaking before a group.
15 I'm very good in music.
21 I did well in school work.
27 I write well.
34 I'm smarter than most of the others.
39 I read very well.

This factor seems to reflect the parent's feelings of academic or intellectual ability, and combines items from the previously all-male high school factor, Language Adequacy, and the general Academic Adequacy factor (items 21, 34, 39).

This factor structure seems to be sound on the face of it, and we are now going to score the 1969-70 HISM using these four factors. We will also score the 1970-71 data on these.

---

1 An interim report from Ira J. Gordon and Harris Jaffee to Florida Parent Education Follow Through and Head Start Planned Variation personnel.
APPENDIX D
SOCIAL REACTION INVENTORY

P.E./Parent Name ________________________________ City __________________
Child's Name ________________________________ Date ____________________
Child's Teacher ________________________________ Collected by _____________

I More Strongly Believe That:

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   
   b. The trouble with most children today is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   
   b. People's troubles result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the biggest reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in government.
   
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   
   b. It is the sad truth that an individual's worth often passes without being recognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is "hot air."
   
   b. Most students don't realize how much their grades are influenced by accident or chance.
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be a good and able leader.
   
b. Able people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
   
b. People who can't get others to like them, don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. What a person is born with plays the biggest part in determining what they are like.
   
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they are like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   
b. Putting trust in fate has never turned out as well for me as making a plan to take a certain course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is hardly ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    
b. Many times test questions tend to be so different from class work, that studying is really a waste of time.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
    
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government plans.
    
b. This world is run by a few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
    
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad luck anyhow.
14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
   b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by tossing a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon being able, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are pushed around by forces we can neither understand, nor control.
   b. By taking an active part in government and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the point to which their lives are controlled by accident and chance.
   b. There is really no such thing as "luck."

19. a. One should always be willing to admit his mistakes.
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are made up for by the good ones.
   b. Most troubles are the result of lack of know-how, lack of knowledge, being lazy, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can clean up dirty government.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things government leaders do in office.
23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. The harder I study, the better grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important part in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
   b. There is not much use in trying too hard to please people--if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I cannot understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Adapted by Larry M. Bilker, Institute for Development of Human Resources, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601, from Rotter I-E Scale.
APPENDIX E

S.R.I. SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

Several items in the instrument are dummy items and are not used in scoring.

For each of the below listed items, the indicated responses (either a or b) are to be considered as ones (1's) and summed to arrive at a single score for the instrument:

2 a 16 a
3 b 17 a
4 b 18 a
5 b 20 a
6 a 21 a
7 a 22 b
9 a 23 a
10 b 25 a
11 b 26 b
12 b 28 b
13 b 29 a
15 a

Total score range is from 0 to 23.
# APPENDIX F

PAC MEETING/ACTIVITY SIGN-IN SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check appropriate category and fill in appropriate blank.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. City-wide PAC meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building PAC meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PAC subcommittee meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Name of Fellow through Child (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Type of Relationship to Child</th>
<th>Title, if anyone other than a parent</th>
<th>Teacher’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Harriet Smith</td>
<td>Example: Carol Smith</td>
<td>Example: parent</td>
<td>Example: principal</td>
<td>Example: Alice Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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