

Introduction: Families and the Schools

Nancy Feyl Chaukin

The demographic and economic profile of our country is dramatically changing. The United States Census Bureau (1988) projects that 33 percent of the school-age population will consist of minorities by the year 2000; at that time, the minority children of the 1980s will become the majority adult population in at least five of our nation's states—Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1987). Concurrent with the growth in minority population, the economic gaps between minority and majority groups are widening. The American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the States (1988) suggest that the United States is moving backward in its efforts to achieve full minority participation in American life. They cite the most recent government figures, which indicate that 13.6 percent of Americans in 1986 were officially counted as poor—a significant increase from the 11.4 percent counted eight years earlier. Their report, *One-Third of a Nation*, reveals that minorities suffer disproportionately from inadequate education, unemployment, and other social and economic handicaps. The report concludes with a call for a renewed commitment to the education of minorities.

Unfortunately, the educational system has been less successful in educating this growing minority population than it has the majority population, and this situation should be recognized as a problem requiring urgent attention. The Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA, 1988) reports that Hispanics, Native Americans, and African Americans are more likely to be undereducated than whites and that the educational situation of Hispanics is especially grim. In fact, Hispanic youth are more than twice as likely to be undereducated than all groups combined. Fewer than three in five undereducated Hispanic youth have a ninth-grade education, while more than 80 percent of undereducated African Americans, Native Americans, and whites complete at least a ninth-grade education.

An inadequately educated minority population will eventually have catastrophic consequences for the entire country. An inadequately educated labor force will be unable to utilize the complex technology of the twenty-first century, whereupon our nation will be unable to compete effectively in the global marketplace. *One-Third of a Nation* (1988) suggests that in such an instance the domestic economy will falter, social conflict will intensify, and national security will be endangered. The report predicts that the alarming disparities in the educational achievement of minorities will lead to a compromised quality of life and a lower standard of living not just for the minority population but also for the majority population. It is imperative, therefore, to find better ways to educate minority children.

One promising method that research has shown to be efficacious is increased parent involvement in education, and the research findings on the positive relationship between parent involvement and student achievement document a specific need for more minority-parent involvement. There is little doubt that parent involvement in education is directly related to significant increases in student achievement (Bloom, 1985; Bronfenbrenner, 1974, 1979; Clark, 1983; Dornbusch & Ritter, 1988; Henderson, 1987; Kagan, 1985).

University of Illinois researcher Herbert Walberg (1984) reviewed twenty-nine controlled studies on school-parent programs and found that family participation in education was twice as predictive of academic learning as family socioeconomic status. Walberg also found that some parent-involvement programs had effects ten times as large as socioeconomic status and benefited both older and younger students.

Furthermore, there are other important benefits of family participation in the schools. Rich (1985) and Sattes (1985) found that parent involvement in education helped produce increases in student attendance, decreases in the dropout rate, positive parent-child communication, improvement of student attitudes and behavior, and more parent-community support of the school. Swap (1987) discussed the benefits that both parents and teachers reap from collaboration. She reported that collaboration broadens both parents' and educators' perspectives and brings additional resources to both groups. Nardine (1990) discusses the reciprocal benefits for parents who are involved in their children's education. He cites specific examples of the mutually reinforcing effect that parents and children have on each other's educational outcomes and suggests that involving low-income minority parents in the educational process is an asset.

The research has demonstrated that all children benefit from family involvement in education, but minority children and children

from low-income homes have the most to gain (Henderson, 1987). An interesting study by Catherine Snow and her colleagues (1991) examined both home and school factors influencing the literacy development of low-income children and found that it was a complex set of interactions between the two that influenced literacy development. Their study challenges assumptions that low-income parents don't care about their children's education.

Educators support parent involvement in education. In fact, the Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher (Harris, 1987) found that 69 percent of teachers thought it would be valuable for schools to provide parents with information and materials that support what is being taught at school. Teachers also supported parent involvement in volunteer work and fund-raising. Similarly, Williams and Chavkin (1985) found that more than 90 percent of the 3,498 teachers, principals, superintendents, school-board presidents, and state education agency officials in the southwestern United States that they surveyed were interested in parents performing roles of school-program supporter, home tutor, and audience. More than 95 percent of the teachers and 99 percent of the principals believed that it was the teacher's responsibility to give parents ideas about helping their children with school.

In addition to establishing that teachers and principals solidly support parent involvement in education, Williams and Chavkin (1985) found that 99 percent of all parents in their survey ($N = 3,103$) supported the idea. Moreover, the Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher (Harris, 1987) found that inner-city parents' desire to communicate with their children's teachers was even greater than that of wealthier suburban parents. In her report on Hispanic dropouts in the Dallas Independent School District, Robledo (1989) found that there were no differences in parents' desires for more parent meetings and school programs between parents of children who left school and parents of children who remained in school; parents wanted to be involved in their children's education. In short, these studies indicate both majority and minority parents do care about their children's education.

As Oliver Moles points out in Part I, the concept of parent involvement is not new. In fact, education in the United States has always occurred within a social context that was influenced by the home environments of students (Hobbs, 1979). In colonial times, parents were the educators of children, and even with the advent of formal education, schools were seen as extensions of the home. Teachers came from the community and knew children's parents personally, and thus the school reinforced parental and community values. In the nineteenth century, largely as the result of industrial and urban development, schools were

located farther away from homes, and the relationship between parents and schools became more impersonal. At the beginning of the twentieth century, this separation of schools and families increased. Immigration resulted in a new task for education—to educate and transform foreigners into Americans. Because of the differences in culture, teachers and immigrant parents often viewed each other with wariness or distrust. Gradually education moved farther away from the home; professionalism for teachers meant that education was a job for trained specialists and not for amateurs such as poorly educated parents. Schools were asked to operate under the role of *in loco parentis*, and teachers assumed many of the parental roles; for example, values education, sex education, safety education, and career development (Banks, 1989).

Today, researchers, educators, and parents cite the rich history of families and schools working together and call for more parent involvement in education. Because of parent involvement's history and the fact that these three groups all agree on the importance of parent involvement in education, it seems logical that increased parent involvement should take place now, but these home-school relationships are often filled with conflict (Lightfoot, 1978). The link between home and school that has remained standard for white middle-class families has not been the case for all children.

Although she does not examine minority parent involvement in education, Lareau (1989) examines the issue of social class as it relates to parent involvement in education. She challenges the position that social class is of only indirect significance in children's schooling by citing examples of parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences. Middle-class parents attend in much higher numbers than lower-class parents. In fact, middle-class parents take a more active role than working-class and lower-class parents in many areas of schooling—reading, volunteering, field trips, summer programs.

Toomey (1986) reports that typical parent-involvement programs tend to increase educational inequality because educators favor parents who are already involved in their children's education. The programs offering home visits were more successful in involving disadvantaged parents than programs requiring parents to visit the school, but the programs requiring parents to visit the school produced higher gains in reading. Toomey suggests that there may be educator bias in favor of parents who are willing to come to school.

Other critics of parent involvement programs suggest what Lareau (1989) calls "the dark side of parent involvement" as the reason parent involvement has not occurred. There are negative intrusions into family

lives and costs to children, families, educators, and the school organization. Lareau provides examples from case studies of excessive stress on children whose parents were overly involved with their education. She discusses the particularistic concerns of parents and the universalistic concerns of teachers as centers of ongoing conflict.

The reason for the infrequency of minority parent involvement is not clear, but it may be the result of a stereotypical view of minority parents and the erroneous assumption that they don't care about their children's education (Chavkin, 1989). Unfortunately, minority parents are often typecast as indifferent to parent involvement when the parents do not participate in traditional parent-school activities.

According to James Comer (1986), minority parents' lack of participation in traditional parent-school activities should not be misinterpreted as a lack of interest in their children's education. He points out that many minority parents don't participate in traditional parent-school activities such as PTA meetings because they feel uncomfortable at the school. Comer's work with the New Haven schools reveals that minority parents often lack of knowledge about school protocol, have had past negative experiences with schools, and feel unwelcome at a middle-class institution. Because of racial, income, and educational differences, parents are reluctant to become involved in the schools.

Comer suggests that just inviting parents to school is not enough; parents need clear mechanisms for involvement, and programs must be restructured to attract parents who have been reluctant to involve themselves in the school. Comer (1988, p. 42) concludes: "Schools must win the support of parents and learn to respond flexibly and creatively to students' needs."

Rationale for Studying Minority Parents and Schools

All students could benefit prodigiously from effective approaches to parent involvement in education, but this book focuses on minority-parent involvement because minority students are lagging behind majority students in educational achievement and thus need special attention (IDRA, 1988). The Quality Education for Minorities (QEM) Project (1990) cites the "educational neglect" of American minority students as the chief reason for this lag in educational achievement. The QEM Project criticizes the "trickle down effect—where people say improve education for everyone and minorities will be helped" (Magner, 1990, p. A35), and proposes that first the nation must solve the toughest problems (such as dropouts and undereducation) that involve dispro-

portionate numbers of minority students. The group suggests that the educational system will be better for everyone if the nation focuses on improving education for minority students and their families.

Statistics support the notion that minority students and their families need help. Stanford researcher Henry Levin (1987) reported on a study of illiteracy that indicated 56 percent of the Hispanics and 44 percent of the African Americans were functionally illiterate. Dropout summaries also paint a dismal picture of the education of minority children in this country. Although the national dropout rate is estimated at 25 percent, the dropout estimates for Native-American, Hispanic, and African-American youth range from 36 to 85 percent (Boyer 1987; Hahn, 1987; National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1986; Rhodes & McMillan, 1987). For each student who drops out this year the estimated cost to society over a lifetime will be \$200,000 in welfare benefits and lost tax revenues (National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1986).

It is not appropriate to place the blame for illiteracy and dropouts solely on the home or solely on the school. As Davies, Seeley, and I discuss in later chapters, the solution to these educational problems requires collaboration among a wide range of community entities with families and schools as the central partners in the process of education. Community organizations, businesses, health-care institutions, and social-service agencies are all important in the educational process, and a positive relationship between parents and schools is essential if students are to be successful learners.

Because the home and the school so strongly influence the development of children, Diane Scott-Jones (1988) advocates the concept of "mutual support," which she defines as parents and educators working together. She suggests that the educational system should be restructured to allow for maximum parental participation and that parents should be given choices about family-involvement programs and activities. The Metropolitan Life Survey (Harris, 1987) reveals support for parental choice that extends beyond choice of family involvement programs to choice of school. In fact, one-quarter of the parents surveyed said that if they had a choice, they would consider choosing a different school from the one that their children were attending. Choice in selecting your child's school, as discussed by Patricia Bauch in Chapter 6, is the ultimate form of parent power because it means a family can abandon a school perceived as unresponsive and enroll the child in a better educational institution.

Ascher (1987) suggests that several factors have brought the issue of minority-parent involvement in education to the forefront. She cites

the low reading and mathematics scores of urban children, the Coleman and Hoffer research (1987) that the home environment may account for nearly 50 percent of the variance in student achievement, the long-term success of preschool programs that had extensive parental involvement (Berreuta-Clement et al., 1984; McKey et al., 1985), and recent Department of Education reports. To support her view, she quotes from the U.S. Department of Education publication *What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning* (1986, p. 7), which concludes: "Parents are their children's first and most influential teachers. What parents do to help their children learn is more important to academic success than how well-off the family is."

Purpose of the Book

If educators hope to facilitate more minority-parent involvement, it is essential that educators become more knowledgeable about both research and practice findings on this issue. Currently, the research and practice perspectives about parent involvement are not well integrated. Kagan (1985) states that the fragmented research and practice milieu that has surrounded parent involvement in education has existed since colonial times. Indeed, ambiguity about the goals and tasks of the parent-school relationship has clouded both research and practice. Perhaps the most appropriate word for parent involvement is *individuality*. Parent involvement differs dramatically from school to school, from community to community, from parent to parent.

Parent involvement is the central theme of this book. The case examples for the research and practice sections involve minority parents. Although some chapters in the book focus on a particular minority group, the book is not organized by ethnic groups because the emphasis is on the general concept of parent involvement with minority families. The aim of this book is to present lessons from the research and practice about minority parents that will enable educators to develop future plans and programs that will improve the education of minority children, though the lessons will also be relevant to children of the majority population and will thus improve the education of all children.

Research and programmatic efforts with minority parents point to the need for educators at every level of schooling from preschool to college to find ways to increase the involvement of minority parents in the education of their children. Although minority parents want to be involved, appropriate structures and strategies do not always exist for involving them. All too often, communication between parents and teachers does not occur. Many teachers have not been prepared to work

with parents and do not understand the crucial importance of establishing a partnership with parents that would allow teachers and parents to collaborate on children's education. Minority-parent involvement in education is essential, but it will require a concerted effort on the part of educators first to gain a clear understanding about minority parents and their relationship to schools and then to develop specific plans that will help minority families.

This book is a collection of many different voices held together by a common theme: Parent involvement in education is important. In Part II, the voices are clearly research-focused. The authors present specific research studies on current parent involvement issues. In Part III, teachers, parents, college professors, social workers—each from a different conceptual framework—present their ideas on effective practice. The first two chapters, by Yao and Sipes, present general strategies for specific parent populations. The next four chapters provide both general strategies and specific case examples about effective programs. In Part IV, the recommendations for the future are derived from experience in research, practice, and the political world. Although some will question the wisdom of such diversity within one book, I have deliberately chosen to include these different voices and different styles of writing because of the paucity of information about minority-parent involvement in education. Future books will need to focus on single areas of interest.

Overview of the Book

Part I provides a historical look at the general topic of parent involvement in education. This overview is followed by three longer sections: Part II, Current Research; Part III, Practice Perspectives; and Part IV, Opportunities Ahead. Using a broad definition of *minorities* that includes racial and ethnic minorities, low socioeconomic status, and limited proficiency in English, the authors present diverse perspectives on minority-parent involvement research and practice.

Readers should note that there is no body of research or practice literature that is specifically labeled "minority parent involvement." This fact reflects the confusion in both research and practice about what the term *minority parents* means. For example, some people interpret the term to mean only poor ethnic and racial groups, while others interpret it more broadly, using it to refer to any group differing from the majority population. An additional problem with the term according to some critics is that the word *minority* is no longer numerically accurate in describing the racial-ethnic composition of school districts in California,

Texas, New York, Illinois, the District of Columbia, and many other areas of the country. Furthermore, some people believe the term is derogatory because it has connotations of inferiority.

In this book the various authors have differing definitions of minority parents. For example, Oliver Moles uses the term *disadvantaged parents* to encompass all those who experience social or economic limitations in American society. Susan Dauber and Joyce Epstein report on inner-city parents who live in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods. Philip Ritter, Randy Mont-Reynaud, and Sanford Dornbusch describe minority parents by ethnic group and level of parental education. Andrea Bermudez refers to limited English proficient parents. Others, like Esther Yao and Dolores Bigfoot Sipes, describe specific ethnic groups of parents such as Asian immigrant parents and Native-American parents, respectively.

In Chapter 1, Oliver Moles presents a historical overview of educators' past and current efforts to work with racial and ethnic minority-group members such as African Americans and Hispanics, low-income families, poorly educated parents, and those who speak languages other than English. Moles examines these parents' recent levels of involvement in education, and he explores factors that may account for low levels of contact with the schools. Finally, he describes promising programs and opportunities for reducing psychological and cultural barriers.

Part II presents significant new research on minority parents and the schools from some of the leading research centers in the United States—The Center for the Study of Families, Children and Youth; The Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning; the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory; and the National Catholic Education Association. Beginning with analyses of elementary and middle school parents, the section also contains two chapters on high school parent involvement—a critical topic that is rarely researched.

Susan Dauber and Joyce Epstein use data from 2,317 inner-city parents in Baltimore to examine how parents in economically disadvantaged communities say they are involved, or want to be involved, in their children's education. Dauber and Epstein also compare elementary parent involvement with middle-school parent involvement. Most significant for policy and practice, they find that the parents' level of involvement is directly linked to the specific educator practices that encourage involvement at school and that guide parents in how to help at home. In determining whether inner-city parents stay involved with their children's education through the middle grades, school practices

that inform and involve parents are more important than parent education, family size, marital status, and even grade level.

David Williams and I discuss our research findings on elementary-school parents and the schools. Based on the results from 1,188 African-American and Hispanic parents, the exploratory study investigates the attitudes and practices of minority parents in the southwestern United States about involvement in their children's education. The chapter examines attitudes about involvement with the schools, parent involvement roles, interest in school decisions, actual participation in parent-involvement activities, suggestions to improve parent involvement, and reasons why parents become less involved at the high school level. After a presentation of the research findings, we offer recommendations for effective practice.

Building on his pioneering work *Family Life and School Achievement: Why Poor Black Children Succeed*, Reginald Clark reports on his current work in Los Angeles, California. He discusses his findings on the homework practices of parents of third-grade students from four ethnic groups (African Americans, whites, Hispanics, and Asians). His discussion presents indispensable information on how schools and families in multiethnic community are working together to utilize the "social capital" of the home and the community. Clark's conclusions represent important new findings about the parenting practices of high and low achievers from each of the four ethnic groups.

Philip Ritter, Randy Mont-Reynaud, and Sanford Dornbusch examine the assumption that minority parents of high school students, especially of the lower class, are not concerned with their children's education. Their multiethnic sample includes 7,836 adolescents and a subsample of 2,955 parents. Using control variables of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and school performance, the study analyzes measures of parent attitudes and involvement—parents' emphasis on working hard in school, parents' reactions to grades, involvement, participation in programs for parents, and attendance at the children's school activities. The results clearly refute the stereotype that minority parents are not concerned with their children's education and also point out some important differences among minority groups.

Under the auspices of the National Catholic Education Association, Patricia Bauch has conducted extensive research on minority parents with children in inner-city Catholic high schools. She compares the attitudes and behaviors of whites, Hispanics, and African Americans to determine the kinds of factors such as location-safety, discipline, religion-values, child's choice, and academic curriculum that influence parent involvement and to determine the reasons for each group's choice

of schools. The multiethnic sample includes more than one thousand parents and offers insights about groups of parents who are frequently omitted in the research literature on school choice.

In Part III, other parent-involvement professionals (Esther Lee Yao, Dolores Bigfoot Sipes, Andrea Bermudez, Carmen Simich-Dudgeon, Don Davies) and I describe current practice on parent involvement in education. Through diverse case examples, we delineate the current strategies that work best for involving minority parents in the education of their children. These multicultural practices should be of interest to educators who will be working with minority families at all levels of schooling.

The reader will observe one noticeable omission in Part III—the lack of strong evaluation data. Parent-involvement programs have not yet been funded well enough or long enough for practitioners to undertake the extensive evaluation that these successful programs deserve. When available, the authors have reported the details of their evaluations. As Scott-Jones recommends in Part IV, much more work needs to be done in this area.

In Chapter 7, Esther Lee Yao discusses the diversity within Asian immigrant families and the importance of the school's reaching out to these parents. More than 1.2 million Asians have immigrated to the United States since 1981; more than 500,000 are estimated to arrive each year. As the largest and most culturally diverse group to enter the United States since the early 1970s, Asian immigrants defy stereotyping. Through the use of poignant examples, she argues for a clear understanding of the many cultures of Asian Americans. She describes barriers to communication and provides specific strategies for working with Asian immigrant families.

Based upon her extensive work developing a parent-education curriculum for American-Indian families, Dolores Bigfoot Sipes provides useful information for educators who want to involve these families in their children's education. She explains how the traditional customs of American Indians such as "honoring children," the "medicine wheel," storytelling, "talking circle," "principle of proper living," and "vision quest" relate to working with the American-Indian family. Focusing on cultural and ethical issues, she presents a rarely heard insider's view on understanding American Indian families.

Focusing on school-age limited-English-proficient (LEP) students, Andrea Bermudez discusses the inadequacies of services to families. After reviewing the rationale for parent involvement in the education of the LEP students, she examines the barriers that exist between homes and schools and offers suggestions to secure and strengthen the home-

school partnership. To promote parent involvement, she suggests training programs for both minority and majority teachers, such as the one at the University of Houston–Clear Lake. In addition, she provides a sample of a family literacy program that includes topics on English for survival and general parent-education programs.

Based on her research with the Trinity-Arlington Project, Carmen Simich-Dudgeon presents an innovative cross-cultural approach for connecting limited-English-proficient (LEP) and non-English-proficient (NEP) families and schools. Simich-Dudgeon's project trained parents from four language groups (Spanish, Vietnamese, Khmer, and Lao) in tutoring strategies to use at home. Although the project was implemented at the elementary, intermediate, and secondary levels, her chapter focuses specifically on the secondary level because so few parent-involvement programs focus on older students and their parents. Simich-Dudgeon discusses the three major components of the project (teacher training on parent involvement techniques, parent training, and curriculum) and offers suggestions for continued work with LEP and NEP families.

Don Davies also utilizes a cross-cultural approach to develop recommendations for parent-involvement programs with low-income minority students. Based on his work with colleagues in Portugal, England, and the United States, he analyzes the results of in-depth interviews with low-income parents. These interviews provide rich data about the link between poverty and social and academic failure in the schools. Davies has used these findings in the Boston and New York Schools Reaching Out Project, a parent-involvement project that is a model of a research-based intervention with minority parents.

In Chapter 12, I describe an effective coalition for quality education where school social workers take the lead in building strong community collaboration. The approach goes beyond parent and teacher involvement in children's education and extends the concept to the whole community. It is a "joining of forces," a collaborative effort that is necessary to make education work. A multiethnic community project funded by the United States Department of Education to focus on dropout prevention, Coalition for PRIDE (positive, responsible individuals desiring an education) is used as the case example to illustrate the interrelationships among small units of a system and how the school can be the broker and advocate for multiethnic students and their families. Vignettes describe the referral system, case management, and educator consultation as well as examples of working with parents, using community resources, cross-age tutoring, and building self-esteem.

Part IV examines the opportunities ahead for parent involvement, and the authors make recommendations for changes in practice, policy, and research. David Seeley argues for a new model for parent-involvement in education. Dorothy Rich suggests the need for a new infrastructure for parent involvement policy. Diane Scott-Jones discusses the need for new directions in research on minority families, education, and schooling.

David Seeley uses case examples from two poverty-affected, largely minority schools in California that chose to participate in the Accelerated Schools Project to argue for a new paradigm for parent involvement. Seeley, the author of *Education Through Partnership* (1981), believes that there must be a fundamental shift away from the delegation model in public education. He suggests that basic structures, roles, relationships, attitudes, and assumptions must be changed if parent involvement is going to be successful. Seeley provides examples of schools where these changes are being implemented and contends that the shift to a collaborative model will empower all the players and produce higher levels of academic achievement.

Dorothy Rich analyzes the current practice scene for minority-parent involvement and sees the lack of an infrastructure as the major shortcoming in parent-involvement efforts. Rich begins with the conviction that we must unite the forces of home, school, and community. Believing that education is a community responsibility, not just the function of the school, she describes what is necessary to build effective home-school partnerships. Her partnership for excellence is based on a three-part design: (1) set the stage with an information campaign on the importance of parents as educators; (2) establish a parent-education delivery system; (3) provide learning activities that families and others can use with children. Rich sees the school as the chief facilitator in this process and offers specific suggestions to educators on how to build an infrastructure.

Diane Scott-Jones discusses the major problems in past research efforts with minority families. She examines the relationships among race, socioeconomic status, family structure, and parent involvement in education. Scott-Jones also looks at how parent involvement changes during the course of the child's and parents' lives. Emphasizing the need for more culturally relevant family-process variables, she reviews the literature and presents many useful criticisms of the field. She offers cogent suggestions to researchers that will aid our efforts to understand families in our pluralistic society.

For those researchers and practitioners who are interested in ways to involve minority parents in the schools, the Appendix contains useful

information about current multicultural practice and research. The Appendix lists the names, addresses, and phone numbers of agencies and organizations that are concerned with minority-parent participation in the schools.

Summary

If demographic predictions are accurate, educators will serve a growing minority population (which in some areas will become the majority population) well into the twenty-first century. Certainly more information about minority families is urgently needed. Not only will this book fill a significant gap in the research about minority-parent involvement in education, but it will also be valuable in providing practice perspectives.

This book provides an introduction to the diverse research and practice perspectives about minority-parent involvement in education. The contributors hope the book will not only increase the readers' knowledge about working with minority parents but also increase their understanding about the similarities and difference among and within the various ethnic groups.

This book has been a collaborative effort that would not have been possible without much assistance from educators all over the country. It is our collective vision that this initial effort will be followed by many more contributions to both research and practice on families and schools in a pluralistic society.

References

- American Council on Education and Education Commission of the States. (1988). *One-third of a nation: A report of the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American life*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Ascher, C. (1987). *Trends and issues in urban and minority education, 1987*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Banks, C. A. M. (1989). Parents and teachers: Partners in multicultural education. In J. A. Banks and C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berreuta-Clement, J. J., Schweinhart, L. J., Barnett, W.S., Epstein, A. S., and Weikart, D. P. (1984). *Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 19*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

- Bloom, B. S. (1985). *Developing talent in young people*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). Early schooling and the nation's future. *Educational Leadership*, 44, 4-6.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). *Is early intervention effective: A report on longitudinal evaluations of preschool programs*. Volume 2. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- . (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chavkin, N. F. (1989). Debunking the myth about minority parents and the school. *Educational Horizons*, 67, 119-123.
- Clark, R. M. (1983). *Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed or fail*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Coleman, J. S., and Hoffer, T. (1987). *Public and private high schools: The impact of communities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Comer, J. P. (1986). Parent participation in the schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67, 442-446.
- . (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American*, 259, 42-48.
- Dornbusch, S. M., and Ritter, P. L. (1988). Parents of high school students: A neglected resource. *Educational Horizons*, 66, 75-77.
- Hahn, A. (1987). Reaching out to America's dropouts: What to do? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68, 256-263.
- Harris, L., and Associates, Inc. (1987). *The Metropolitan Life survey of the American teacher 1987—Strengthening links between home and school*. New York: author.
- Henderson, A. (Ed.). (1987). *The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves student achievement*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.
- Hobbs, N. (1979). Families, schools, and communities: An ecosystem for children. In H. J. Leichter (Ed.), *Families and communities as educators*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Intercultural Development Research Association. (1988). *The undereducation of American youth*. San Antonio, TX: author.
- Kagan, S. L. (1985). *Parent involvement research: A field in search of itself*. Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education.
- Lareau, A. (1989). *Home advantage: Social class and parental involvement in elementary education*. London: Falmer Press.

- Levin, H. M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership*, 44, 19-21.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). *Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools*. New York: Basic Books.
- Magner, D. K. (1990). Panel calls for radical changes in schools to improve education for minority groups. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36, A1, A35-A38.
- McKey, R. H., Condeli, L., Ganson, H., Barrett, B. J., McConkey, C., and Plantz, M. C. (1985). *The impact of Head Start on children, families and communities*. Final report of the Head Start Evaluation, Synthesis and Utilization Project. Washington, DC: GSR.
- Nardine, F. E. (1990). The changing role of low-income minority parents in their children's schooling. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 48, 67-80.
- National Committee for Citizens in Education. (1986, May). Drawing a larger circle: Including parents in dropout prevention. *Network: The Paper for Parents*, 1-2, 4-5.
- Quality Education for Minorities Project. (1990). *Education that works: An action plan for the education of minorities*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Rhodes, D. C., and McMillan, S. J., Jr. (1987). *Refocusing schools for dropout prevention: With implications for teacher education* (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education). Arlington, VA: ERIC (Document No. ED 277698).
- Rich, D. (1985). *The forgotten factor in school success: The family*. Washington, DC: Home and School Insitute.
- Robledo, M. (1989). *The answer: Valuing youth in schools and families*. A report on Hispanic dropouts in the Dallas Independent School District. San Antonio, TX: Intercultural Development Research Association.
- Sattes, B. D. (1985). *Parent involvement: A review of the literature*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.
- Scott-Jones, D. (1988). Families as educators: The transition from informal to formal school learning. *Educational Horizons*, 66, 66-69.
- Seeley, D. S. (1981). *Education through partnership*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Snow, C. E., Barnes, W. S., Chandler, J., Goodman, J. F., and Hemphill, L. (1991). *Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Swap, S. M. (1987). *Enhancing parent involvement in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Toomey, D. (1986). Home-school relations and inequality in education. Address to Conference on Education and the Family, Brigham Young University.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1986). *What works: Research about teaching and learning*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education.
- U. S. Census Bureau. (1988). *Current populations reports* (series p-25, No. 1022). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Walberg, H. J. (1984). Improving the productivity of America's schools. *Educational Leadership*, 41, 19-27.
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (1987). *From minority to majority: Education and the future of the southwest region*. Boulder, CO: author.
- Williams, D. L., Jr., and Chavkin, N. F. (1985). *Final report of the parent involvement in education project* (project No. p-2, grant NIE-400-83-0007). Washington, DC: Department of Education.