

THE PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHEDULED,
SCHOOL-INITIATED, PARENT-TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Pearl Goretti Donovan

B.A., Saint Francis Xavier University

B.Ed., Saint Francis Xavier University

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ARTS (EDUCATION)

in the Faculty

of

Education

Pearl G. Donovan 1984

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

October 1984

© All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without the permission of the author.

Abstract

Name: Pearl G. Donovan
Degree: Master of Arts (Education)
Title of Thesis: Perceived Effectiveness of Scheduled,
School-Initiated Parent-Teacher Interviews
Examining Committee
Chairperson: R. W. Marx

~~M. Manley-Casimir~~
Senior Supervisor

L. Prock
Second Member

N. Robinson
Associate Professor
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University
External Examiner

Date approved 29 Oct, 1984

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Perceived Effectiveness of Scheduled, School-Initiated

Parent-Teacher Interviews

Author: _____

(signature)

Pearl G. Donovan

(name)

Oct. 29, 1984

(date)

Abstract

This study investigated the perceived effectiveness of scheduled parent-teacher interviews held in the elementary schools of the Edmonton Roman Catholic Separate School District during the 1983-84 school term. A total of 726 parents, teachers and administrators from ten randomly selected schools were involved in this study. The same questionnaire was given to each participant.

The perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews was measured by asking participants to give a general rating of the interviews held during the 1983-84 school year. The participants were also asked to rate the perceived purposes of having parent-teacher interviews and to rate the extent to which these purposes had been achieved. The list of purposes was derived from the literature. The characteristics of parent-teacher interviews which were examined included: time of year, number of times per year, period of the day, and length of time per interview. Questions dealing with parental and student involvement were also studied. A section for parents who did not attend the scheduled, school initiated parent-teacher interview was also included.

The major finding of this study was that there was a difference in the perceived purposes and the achievement of those purposes among the three groups of participants. Each

of the three groups felt that the interviews fell short of achieving the perceived purposes. There was no significant difference on the general rating of effectiveness among the participants. Of the three groups studied, only the parents expressed an interest in increasing the length of time given for each interview.

This study suggests that parent-teacher interviews are an integral and beneficial part of the reporting policy of the school district. However, an effort should be made to establish a ground of common understanding as to what can be accomplished in the interview. This will maximize the effectiveness of the communication among those involved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
List of Tables.....	vii
Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Context of the problem.....	5
The Problem and sub-problems.....	7
Measure of Perceived Effectiveness.....	8
Assumptions.....	8
Limitations of the Study.....	9
Outline of the Study.....	9
Chapter 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	11
Primary Sources.....	11
Values and Purposes for Interviews.....	14
Characteristics of Interviews.....	21
Summary.....	25
Chapter 3. RESEARCH PROCEDURES.....	27
The Population.....	27
Definition of Terms.....	27
Hypotheses.....	28
Testing of Hypotheses.....	28
The Questionnaire.....	29
Validity and reliability.....	31
Make-up of the questionnaire.....	31
Data Collection and Treatment of the Data..	31
Section I General Rating, Perceived and Achieved Purposes.....	32
Section II Characteristics of the Interview.....	34
Chapter 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	38
Questionnaire returns.....	38
Section I General Rating.....	38
Perceived Purposes.....	40
Achieved Purposes.....	54
Section II Characteristics of the Interviews.....	70
Conclusion.....	92
Chapter 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	94
Summary of the Study.....	94
Findings and Conclusions	
Section I.....	96
Section II.....	98
Suggestions for Further Research.....	99
Implications.....	101

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX A: Cover letter for questionnaire	104
B: The Questionnaire.....	105
C: Reminder Letter.....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. General Rating of the Perceived Effectiveness of Parent-Teacher Interviews.....	39
2. Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Parents' Response.....	43
3. Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Administrators' Response	45
4. Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Teachers' Response.....	47
5. Rank Order of Perceived Purposes.....	51
6. Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Parents' Response.....	56
7. Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Administrators' Response.....	58
8. Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Teachers' Response.....	61
9. Rank Order of Achieved Purposes.....	64
10. Rank Order Comparison of Perceived and Achieved Purposes.....	65
11. Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews - Group Responses.....	66
12. Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews - Group Responses.....	68
13. The Grade or Grades with which Respondents had been involved.....	71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of the relationship between parents and teachers is a topic that has received widespread attention. There are numerous books and articles dealing with the procedures for promoting cooperative involvement through parent-teacher interviews. In a National Education Association poll (1981), over 90 percent of teachers in all parts of the United States, and at all grade levels stated that more home-school interaction would be desirable. Parent-teacher interviews are an ideal way to promote this home-school interaction.

The Gallup polls of public attitudes toward education reflect a similar interest in home-school interaction, as well as approval of some more specific forms of parent participation. When asked what more the public schools should be doing, a frequent suggestion was for closer teacher-parent relationships, including more interviews and information on what parents can do at home to help children in school. Eighty percent of parents with school-age children agreed with the idea of parents attending school one evening a month to learn how to improve children's

behaviour and interest in school work (Gallup 1978).

Reviewing survey findings over a ten year period, Gallup concluded:

A joint and coordinated effort by parents and teachers is essential to dealing more successfully with problems of discipline, motivation, and the development of good work habits at home and in school.... For little added expense (which the public is willing to pay) the public schools can, by working with parents, meet educational standards impossible to reach without such cooperation. (1978, p.37)

The idea of parents assisting their children's education by working with schools has been the subject of much debate. On the one hand is the interest of educators and parents and evidence of the idea's usefulness, and on the other hand are serious barriers to its implementation.

Lightfoot (1978) suggested that home-school relations are inherently in conflict. She believed that different priorities and perceptions of families and schools, such as concern for one's own child versus responsibility for group progress, will inevitably create conflict over the means of attaining common goals. She sees collaboration largely as a one-way process with schools seldom accommodating in a significant way to family needs.

Warren (1973) suggested that schools organize public ritualistic occasions that rarely allow for real contact or criticism between parents and teachers. He also pointed out that these tend to be institutionalized ways of establishing

boundaries between insiders (teachers) and interlopers (parents) under the guise of polite conversation and mature cooperation. The sad irony according to Lightfoot (1978), was that education for the majority of children will only be successful when there is trust, accountability and responsibility shared among families, communities and schools.

A realistic appraisal of parent-teacher interviews would show that there are problems to overcome. Gertrude McPherson (1972) argued that differences between teachers and parents arise from fundamentally different ways of viewing the child; the parent has particularistic expectations; the teacher, universalistic expectations. She also pointed out that rarely do parents "...come to school to compliment the teacher," or "rarely did a teacher seek out a parent to praise a child" (1972, p. 130). She believed that teachers find parent-teacher interviews of limited value because the parents of students who are having academic or disciplinary problems attend such programs only infrequently. Parents who want to hear about their child may be afraid that what they hear will be an indictment of their own competence.

Parent-Teacher interviews should be a productive, worthwhile experience for all involved. Parents can learn about classroom programs and the teacher can gain valuable insights into a child's relationships with parents and about

home conditions. The teacher and parent must be willing to listen to one another in order to seek and understand the reasons behind a child's behaviour and attitude.

Seeley (1982) suggested that:

The participants in effective partnerships may be strikingly different, each contributing to the common enterprise particular talents, experiences, and perspectives and sometimes having different status within the relationship and control over aspects of the work to be done. (1982, p.42)

The chief characteristic of partnership here is the common effort towards common goals. He suggested that partners share an enterprise, though their mutuality does not imply or require equality or similarity.

Hymes (1974) stated that there is no fundamental conflict between the wishes of parents and those of the teacher. However, it is the lack of communication that gets into the way of understanding. He suggested that there is support, in the life experiences of parents for the goals of the school. Parents can become strong allies if the effort is made to include them. "It is a good thing when parents know what is going on at school. It is markedly better when parents feel that they have helped to make the school the way it is." (p. 99) He also suggested that there is no better way to live and to teach than in an atmosphere of trust and approval, of understanding, support and agreement. It is communication and cooperation which brings these assets.

Rutherford and Edgar (1979) suggested that many

interpersonal conflicts between teacher and parents arise because they do not clearly understand each other's values concerning the goals of the educational process or the techniques used to achieve them. Both teachers and parents need to understand how their own values relate to the entire school process.

They should understand how their values relate to the selection of goals, the determination of techniques for achieving these goals, and the specification of teacher and parent roles. (p.40)

These authors believed that by systematically examining their values about schooling, teachers and parents can become more capable of effective, productive interactions.

Context of the Problem

The province of Alberta is establishing a teacher evaluation system and the deans of Alberta's four education faculties suggested parents might play a role in this process. Sass (1984) reported that Alberta's Education Minister, Dave King, was an advocate of this idea. King suggested that the Alberta Teachers' Association should be looking at ways to involve parents in the system, and not to lock them out. He brought forward the notion that parents have a role in the educational system in doing personal evaluations of the system and of the teachers in it.

While there is nothing in provincial policy that has suggested that parents will play a part on evaluation boards, it was suggested by Art Cowley, president of the Alberta

Teachers' Association, that parents' informal evaluations of their children's teachers should not be ignored or disparaged. It seems that in the past parents have tried to add input into the education system, but that these attempts fell on barren ground. There has been conflict, as King pointed out:

The argument is being made that we have no interest in nor responsibility to explain to parents what we're doing and why... or if we explain it they're not smart enough to understand it. (King, 1984, p. B1)

The relationship between parent and teacher has not promoted cooperation. However, King felt that we can help erase any adversarial relationship between parents and teacher by keeping parents informed about what is going on in the classroom. He suggested that:

If parents were better prepared for parent-teacher interviews, then indeed they could use the outcome of the interview as one part of a process of contributing to the evaluation of teachers. (King, 1984, p. B1)

This indicated quite another purpose for parent-teacher interviews and raises a number of questions. Would the exchange of information about the child become subordinate to the evaluation of the teacher? Would a cooperative relationship develop if the evaluation of the teacher by the parent, particularly at the parent-teacher interview, held influence? Who would be responsible for preparing parents for parent-teacher interviews? Would parents want this

responsibility? What is the main purpose for participating in parent-teacher interviews?

The importance of parent-teacher interviews is not negated, but why they are important is of interest. The purpose of this study was to examine parent-teacher interviews to determine if the participants give credence to the same purposes for holding the parent-teacher interviews. Two other aspects examined were how the participants rated the interviews and some of the characteristics perceived to promote the effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews.

The Edmonton Catholic School Board supports scheduled interviews and recommends that they be held twice a year. The first interview is held in conjunction with the first report card. The second interview may be held either in the second or third reporting period. The choice of reporting period for this second interview is left to the discretion of the administrators in each school. For the scheduled interviews the School Board allows students to be dismissed to accommodate an afternoon interview on the two occasions.

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to measure the perceived effectiveness of the scheduled parent-teacher interviews in use in the elementary schools in the Edmonton Catholic School District. There has been no previous study in this school district on parent-teacher interviews.

Sub-problems

1. To compare the measurements of the perceived effectiveness of the three groups of participants in order to test for significant differences between groups.

2. To examine some of the characteristics of the interview to identify those which may promote effective parent-teacher interviews.

The measure of perceived effectiveness

The main problem, that of measuring the perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews, was approached in two ways:

i) by asking the participants of the interviews to give a general rating of the perceived effectiveness of such interviews on a five-point Likert scale;

ii) by establishing which purposes were perceived by the participants to be important and to what extent; and then by measuring the extent to which the established purposes had been achieved.

The questionnaire in this study was adapted from Cuyler (1970).

Assumptions

A number of assumptions were made in connection with this study. It was assumed that the results would provide a better understanding of parent-teacher interviews in the Edmonton Roman Catholic Separate School District. It was

also assumed that regardless of how favourable parent-teacher interviews prove to be, there is always room for improvement. It was further assumed that parent-teacher interviews are effective if they are perceived to be so by the participants and if they achieved the purposes for which they are held.

Limitations of the Study

This study was based on the opinions of a sample of parents, administrators and teachers taken from a random sample of elementary schools within the Edmonton Roman Catholic Separate School District. It was confined to the opinions of those parents, administrators and teachers who returned completed questionnaires in May 1984.

The concern of this study was with the perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews and how these related to the achievement of the stated purposes. This study did not allow for consideration of all of the variables which might conceivably relate to the effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews.

Not all members of the sample returned the questionnaire. It is difficult to predict the effect of incomplete returns, but this also must be recognized as a limitation on the results.

Outline of the Study

The study was conducted in four parts following the

plan suggested by the problem and sub-problems. Section I dealt with the general rating of the perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews; with the perceived purposes of parent-teacher interviews; with the extent to which the purposes were achieved; the first three parts were examined for between group differences. Section II dealt with the characteristics which may promote more effective parent-teacher interviews.

A review of related literature, the research procedures, a presentation of the research findings and the conclusion and recommendations, follow.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In common with many of our educational practices, the use of parent-teacher interviews for reporting pupil progress developed in the United States and spread to Canada. Within a ten-year period from 1945 to 1955, this plan spread rapidly and widely in the United States. Martin (1964) related that in the early 1950's the use of the interview plan for reporting pupil progress spread to different parts of Alberta and many schools began to experiment with the use of parent-teacher interviews. She has traced the history of these interviews in Alberta from their beginning in the 1930's, through the 1940's and 1950's. Her thesis laid the foundation for this current study.

Primary Sources

Martin's survey of the County of Ponoka, Alberta in 1964 provided a detailed summary of the literature on parent-teacher interviews to that date. Even at that time she was able to refer to a great many general textbooks in elementary school administration, reference books dealing specifically with parent-teacher interviews or other parent-teacher relationships and articles from periodicals which gave

information on the topic.

She noted that the value of parent-teacher interviews for creating improved home-school relationships was promoted by many authorities. While a number of authors suggested that the prime use of interviews was to supplement the report card, one or two authors at that time were advocating the replacement of report cards completely with parent-teacher interviews.

Martin found that much had been written about the various characteristics of these interviews. One or two interviews per year were suggested by many as being the optimum number. Suggestions regarding the length of the interviews varied from fifteen minutes to forty-five minutes each. A "break" between interviews was thought to be of benefit to the teacher. At that time there was agreement that interviews should not be relegated to after-school hours, except for evening interviews which might be necessary to accommodate some parents.

Since Martin's research dealt extensively with the roles of the principal, teacher and parent, her summary of the literature included many ideas regarding the roles of these participants. Her review also contained the suggestion that parents who were unable to attend interviews could be contacted by visiting the home, by telephone or by personal letter.

Martin (1964) summarized an article by Maves (1958) in which the differentiation between "high-level" and "low-level" performances in interviews was shown. The former are characterized by good rapport, a positive beginning, use of illustrations, plans for helping the child, use of commendation and a free exchange of information. Low level performances are characterized by domination by the teacher or parent, rigid adherence to a guide sheet, lack of common planning, lack of illustrations of the child's work and one or both parties being on the defensive. This was an early attempt to understand the factors promoting or inhibiting effective parent-teacher interviews.

The period since Martin's thesis has seen a continuation of interest in parent-teacher interviews. Much of what has been written repeats those basic ideas which had received general agreement in the early 1960's (Auten, 1981; Canady and Seyforth, 1979; Lawrence and Hunter 1978). However, the literature does indicate the constant attempt to improve the effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews (Henderson, 1981; Friedman, 1980).

Another study that is worthy of note regarding the effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews is Cuyler's (1970) research. He attempted to measure the effectiveness of the interview system in use in the Edmonton Public School District. When he conducted his research approximately three

quarters of the elementary schools in the Edmonton Public School System were using a scheduled interview program. During the preceding year experimental report card forms were being employed. He suggested that because of the reduced amount of information which could be given on the new report cards, the schedule of parent-teacher interviews held greater significance.

In Cuyler's review of the literature he referred to Wayne L. Herman's (1966) statement that at an interview there can be a mutual exchange of important information, both positive and negative, which would not be put into writing. In the interview process, questions can be asked, explanations made and misunderstandings can be cleared up. Cuyler suggested that such a statement points to the fact that the reporting of pupil progress is not the only purpose of such interviews. Since Cuyler's study however, is the most recent research on this topic to date for the Edmonton area it is of special importance to this study.

Values and Purposes For Parent-Teacher Interviews

Simpson(1982) suggested that there has been an increased belief in the value of education and specialization has accompanied the technological advances of the past decades. Notwithstanding frequent criticism of schools, western society has increasingly become committed to the idea that individuals undertaking any task should have specialized

training. He noted that in keeping with this position, educators have managed to convince parents that professional educators, not parents and families, are best qualified to train and educate children and youth. Keniston (1977) stated that parents lose control and authority over their children's lives and are forced to assume the role of highly skilled entrepreneurs, negotiating among the several institutions that provide needed services and resources.

McAfee and Vergason (1979) observed that educators have been able to "convince parents that the values and expertise of the educational system is more desirable and more effective than anything the parents have to offer." As a result, parents have gradually allowed educators increased levels of responsibility for educating their children. Topics that were once considered to be clearly within the domain of parents and the family, for example sex education, values and family planning, are now part of the curriculum.

Lasch (1977) suggested that teachers, psychiatrists, welfare workers, and priests all rob the family of its privacy and autonomy and make it overly dependent on "expert" wisdom. As a result of the increased responsibility placed on the schools, parents have been systematically eliminated as legitimate educators of their own children. Seeley suggested that:

The family's role is seen as little more than that of producing children and feeding, housing and clothing

them so they can go to school. Educational policy has been school policy; families might be the concern of social workers or priests, but not of educators. (1981, p. 40)

He also pointed out that many habits of both mind and practice must change before educational policy can fully incorporate an understanding of the family as an important participant in education.

Education can best be achieved when parents, community and schools all work together. Educators must and will continue to play a prominent role in the lives of parents, families and children. However, the need to improve this relationship is vital. The family should be seen as a resourceful, primary partner in the educational process. Isakson (1979, p.79) suggested that educators must "recognize the strengths in families and capitalize on those so that they can get on with the business they were trained for - teaching."

Lawrence and Hunter (1978) expressed the view that parents and teachers share in one of the most important human enterprises - the education and socialization of youth. Therefore, communication with parents is an important adjunct to teaching. They held that there are a number of positive effects attributable to this parent-teacher interaction. The first effect is a clear understanding of the student so that a more effective learning environment can be created. Second, school and home can become a team so that similar values and

expectations are reinforced. Third, teachers can help parents in learning how to help their child acquire a new behaviour, additional knowledge, increase skills or to practice new learnings outside of school. In a statement on the value of parent-teacher interviews Lawrence and Hunter suggested that:

In addition to academic information parents need to know (and the school wants them to know) how their child makes and keeps friends, relates to adults, fares under stress, bounces back from adversity, approaches a new task, and presents him/herself to the world. (1978, p. 3)

These authors believed that this type of information is best conveyed when parent and teachers talk together.

Johnson (1966, p.48) agreed that the general intent of parent-teacher interviews is for the teachers and parents "to share their knowledge of the total child and thereby gain a better understanding of the child's needs and interests." He proposed that "specific purposes" should vary from interview to interview to suit the problems or needs and the growth and development of the particular child.

Cramer (1978) suggested that in the parent-teacher interview the parent brings his own special understanding of the child at home, and the teacher provides the parent with an insight into the child at school. The benefits according to Cramer are two fold: they provide for cooperative planning and they generate understanding and respect for the teacher and the school.

Gorman (1965) evaluated a course on parent-teacher interviews given to teacher education students. She found that building rapport and a sound working relationship with parents is of great importance in a successful interview; that learning what the parent's values and interests are is of importance to the teacher as she works with the child; and that it is important for the teacher to appear confident and well-poised in order for the parents to feel at ease and that this requires careful preparation by the teacher.

LeFevre (1967) stated that the main purpose in the face-to-face communication between parent and teacher is that each may aid in the child's development. The teacher can teach more effectively when made aware of special interests, abilities, anxieties, problems and circumstances of each child. The teacher can also know the child much better after meeting the parents. The parents in their turn can cooperate with the school's effort if they know and have confidence in their child's teacher.

The most common teacher-parent interaction is an exchange of information about the child's classroom performance. Rutherford and Edgar (1979) suggested that parents want to know what skills their children are learning, how well they are doing, what activities they are engaged in, who the teacher is, and what the general policies of the school are. These authors defined teacher-parent cooperation

as:

a process whereby teachers and parents work together for the ultimate benefit of the child. The process involves setting goals, finding solutions, and implementing and evaluating them as well as trust between teachers and parents (the belief that they should work together) and a set of behaviors (communication, negotiation, and sharing). (Rutherford and Edgar, 1979, p. 19)

They also pointed out that most cooperative efforts between teachers and parents begin with an interview. This is a time for parents and teachers to discuss a specific issue and to arrive at mutual solutions.

Parent-teacher interviews are personal opportunities for two-way communication between parents and teachers, or three-way communication among parents, teacher and student. Parents as well as teachers, recognize the interview as an excellent opportunity for clarifying issues, searching for answers, deciding on goals, determining mutual strategies and forming a team in the education of the student (Berger, 1981). This author, using an informal questionnaire, found that parents chose the parent-teacher interview as the most important opportunity for parent-teacher communication.

Cramer suggested that parent-teacher interviews provide specific opportunities to:

1. Permit the teacher to become better acquainted with the relationship between parent and child;
2. Assist the teacher in interpreting to parents their child's growth and progress in his school work;
3. Encourage the teacher to actively engage in and analyze realistic goals and purposes for the

- student;
4. Increase the objectivity of the teacher and parent in evaluating the student's progress, capabilities and needs;
 5. Enable the teacher to establish a positive home-school working relationship with parents to best meet the needs of that particular child.
- (1978, p. 8-9)

Herman (1968) proposed that a teacher may request a parent-teacher interview to: a) become better acquainted with the parents; b) learn about the child's background and interests; c) obtain information about social problems at home; d) discuss the child's academic achievement as well as his personality, behaviour or relationships with his peers. The parents on the other hand have the opportunity to a) learn about the child's progress in school; b) help the child at home and c) become better acquainted with the teacher and the total school program.

Murk (1965) presents nine values and goals for parent-teacher interviews. These show the general agreement which exist in the literature regarding the purposes of having parent-teacher interviews. These are:

1. ...the teacher is more likely to receive parental support and understanding which will enhance pupil achievement;
2. ...opportunity to compare ideas on the direction and progress of a child's capacities, interests and adjustment;
3. ...helps a teacher become more aware of the child's home environment and developing personality;
4. ...the teacher's opportunity to learn about the child's reaction to school, family adjustment, leisure activities, health history and home responsibilities;

5. ...parents get to know the teacher as a human being and not see her as an institutional fixture;
6. ...an opportunity for the teacher to funnel parental energy into constructive educational avenues;
7. ...to help parents understand that they alone can provide for effective home study;
8. ...answering questions and concerns pertaining to curriculum, grading, teaching materials, grouping, class projects, field trips and school rules;
9. ...the most meaningful conference goal is that of enhancing the relationship between parents and children. (Murk, 1965, p. 302)

Berger (1981) agreed with the purposes listed above. It is important for each interview to have specific purposes. Some of the purposes may be universal (dealing with promoting cooperation), while others may be more specific (dealing with special concerns).

Characteristics of Interviews

Much has been written regarding the carrying out of parent-teacher interviews. There are numerous books and articles on the procedures for developing effective partnerships (Canady, 1979; Seeley, 1981). However, there is limited research delineating effectiveness or the scheduling of such interviews.

Pre-planning has been emphasized by many (notably Lawrence and Hunter 1978; Friedman 1980; Waugh 1978) as being the responsibility of both the administrator and the teacher. This aspect is noted as one of the many roles these participants have in the parent-teacher interview. Herman (1966) and Cooper (1977) suggested that the principal's role

includes creating favourable attitudes, defining purposes, preparing teachers for interviews and being available to help with difficult interviews. One of the roles of the teacher is to gather samples of the student's work. It is also suggested that the teacher develop skills for the interview, such as observing, listening and questioning.

Creaser (1966) examined the circumstances under which parents and teachers meet. She found that "...in nine cases out of ten, parent-teacher contact meant mother-teacher contact," and that "almost sixty percent of the interviews lasted over fifteen minutes." (p. 2309A-2310A)

An insightful chapter from Lightfoot (1978) titled "The Other Woman: Mothers and Teachers" suggested subtle competition between these women (the majority of elementary teachers are women). She pointed out however, that schools have been one of the most acceptable forms of involvement for mothers outside the home. Schools are viewed as being legitimately within the mother's sphere of influence and responsible parenting. "Although fathers may be present at public, ritualistic school events, mothers tend to be responsible for the daily interactions with teachers." (p. 75).

Manning's article "The Involved Father: A New Challenge in Parent Conferences" suggested that changes are occurring - fathers are more involved, concerned and willing

to accept more active responsibility.

Changing cultural definitions of fathering and masculinity, increasing single-father families, the rising divorce and separation rate, changing child custody laws, and fathers' heightened demands for recognition and participation in child rearing responsibilities are changing the parent conference from a visiting mother to either a visiting mother and father or a visiting father alone. (Manning, 1983, p. 17)

This author also suggested that school personnel, working in a professional capacity, are responsible for the effectiveness of the interview.

Jones (1965) attempted to determine the relationship between success of parent-teacher interviews and a variety of factors. He found that there appeared to be no relationship between success and which parent attended the interview, or even if both did. He also found that parents preferred a January reporting period whereas teachers were evenly divided between November and January. Both teachers and parents in this study reported that parent-teacher interviews were effective for improving communication.

Mathias (1967) mentioned the case of allowing a child to be present at the parent-teacher interview. He stated that interviews were held four times a year and that while the students were a little nervous at first, they soon entered in and participated actively, sometimes diagnosing and verbalizing some of their own concerns and problems.

Similarly, Lightfoot (1981, p. 103) analysed the

tensions that arise between parents and teachers during interviews and saw the need to involve students in interviews regarding their future "in an unknown society". She also suggested that educators should "listen for the child's voice," even to the point of including them in the interview process. The family - school relationship should be a triangular one involving the experiences and perspectives of parents, teachers and children. Lightfoot argued that when adults begin to focus on their reason for coming together, the best interest of the child is emphasized, defensiveness fades and territorial lines erode.

West (1966) reported that teachers were ill-prepared for interviews which were held at the end of the school day. Teachers in his school were given five successive Thursday afternoons for interviews; the children were dismissed at noon so the teachers would be completely free for the interviews. Berger (1981) suggested that most school systems have worked out procedures for scheduling interview periods. Release time is usually granted teachers. She noted that with the increase in the number of working parents and single-parent families, plus the increasing number of fathers who are interested in their children's education, many schools are scheduling more evening interviews and retaining some afternoon interview times.

The common practice within the Edmonton Catholic

School System is to have one noon hour dismissal, at each of the two interview periods, to free the teachers for afternoon interviews. An evening is set aside as well for these scheduled interviews during the two chosen reporting periods.

Summary

These past twenty years, the period since Martin's (1964) thesis, have seen a continual increase in interest in Alberta, for the parent-teacher interview. The literature does indicate an attempt to improve the communication among those involved.

A survey of the literature revealed that most of what is written falls into two categories. The first concerned the values and purposes of parent-teacher interviews, and contains information that is applicable to this present study. The second category included the rather large amount written about planning for and executing such interviews. This is a very useful area for those engaged in parent-teacher interviews. However, much of it falls outside the limits of this study which deals with the value and purpose of parent-teacher interviews and their perceived effectiveness.

The importance of having parent-teacher interviews has been noted. Most of the school districts across Canada have scheduled interviews as part of their reporting policy. The literature indicated that parent-teacher interviews give

additional information to all participants.

Siebert (1979) reported the findings of a parent survey used to assess parent evaluation of home-school communication and parent preferences in such communication. When parents received information from report cards, telephone calls, parent-teacher interviews and school open houses (respectively), they rated the effectiveness of this communication as follows: first, parent-teacher interviews; second, open houses; third, report cards and teacher notes. Siebert reiterated that parents need specific communication concerning the school's educational prescription for their child and the student's strengths and weaknesses, and information and procedures about what they can do to help.

CHAPTER III
RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The Population

The population selected for this study consisted of the administrators, classroom teachers and the parents of pupils enrolled in the elementary schools in the Edmonton Roman Catholic School District. All of the principals and vice-principals of ten randomly selected elementary or elementary/junior high schools were asked to respond to the questionnaire. The questionnaire was received by twenty-one administrators. All of the elementary teachers of the ten schools were requested to respond to the questionnaire. The questionnaire was given to 117 elementary teachers. The parents in this study were randomly selected. A percentage of parents from each of the ten schools were involved. This percentage was taken from the population of each school. The fact that the participating schools ranged from enrollments of under one hundred to nearly five hundred indicated the need for a percentage from each of the ten schools. The questionnaire was given to 588 parents.

Definition of terms

Parent-Teacher Interview. This is a meeting between the parent or parents of a student and his/her

classroom teacher, scheduled so that every parent is given an opportunity to meet face-to-face with their child's teacher.

Hypotheses

Null hypotheses were developed to test for significant between-group differences in the measurement of perceived effectiveness. This approach was considered to be exploratory, so that the rejection of any one of the null hypotheses would be taken as reason to explore further. The hypotheses formulated are as followed:

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference between a) administrators and teachers, b) administrators and parents and c) teachers and parents, in their general rating of perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between a) administrators and teachers, b) administrators and parents and c) teachers and parents, in their ratings of perceived importance of the purposes of parent-teacher interviews.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference between a) administrators and teachers, b) administrators and parents and c) teachers and parents, in their ratings of the achievement of purposes of parent-teacher interviews.

Testing these hypotheses

These hypotheses were tested using the Scheffé Procedure Multiple Range Test. Computations for this statistical test were effected using the SPSS package, at the

University of Alberta. An alpha level of .10 was designated as indicating a significant difference.

Concern may attach to the fact that the Scheffe procedure is more rigorous than other procedures, and will lead to fewer significant results. Because this is so, the investigator may choose to employ a less rigorous significance level in using the Scheffe procedure; that is, the .10 level may be used instead of the .05 level. This is Scheffe's recommendation. (Ferguson, 1971, p. 271)

The Questionnaire

The shortcomings of the questionnaire method of obtaining data is understood, questions may be misinterpreted and respondents have an inclination to answer by avoiding extremes. However, this method was used because it seemed to be the most practical way of obtaining the data required and it seemed that it would yield sufficiently reliable data to serve the purposes of this study.

Following the survey of the literature on parent-teacher interviews, it was noted that there continues to be a number of purposes that reoccur. In his study Cuyler (1970) has pointed to these succinctly. His list was used, first to establish which purposes were perceived by the participants to be important, and to what extent. Then the same list was used again to measure the extent to which the established purposes had been achieved. For each purpose, responses were made on a five-point Likert scale. This is the list of purposes which was provided.

(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or

- lack of it.
- (b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour, background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.
 - (c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.
 - (d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony between the school and the community.
 - (e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.
 - (f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.
 - (g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with the other children and the teacher while at school. (Cuyler, 1970, p. 19)

The last part of the questionnaire asked for information on the number of interviews per year, the periods of the year used for interviews, the length of the interview, and the parts of the day used. This information was used in order to identify those characteristics which were thought to be related to effectiveness. Additional questions in this section checked the grade involvement of the participants; asked which parent or parents attended the interviews; asked administrators and teachers what percentage of parents and students participated in the interview and questioned those parents who did not attend.

The questionnaire was given to parents, administrators, teachers and a graduate class in Educational Administration for comment. Suggestions for the improvement of the questionnaire were obtained, and revisions were made accordingly. This "test" sample was independent of actual respondents.

Validity and reliability. The items of the questionnaire were considered to have face validity. However, the validity of the list of purposes of parent-teacher interviews was tested further by the presence of blank spaces which allowed the respondents to add any other purposes they considered to be important. The space provided at the end of the questionnaire for other suggestions regarding the effectiveness of the interviews acted as a check on the validity of the study generally. The reliability of the instrument was not tested.

Make-up of the questionnaire. The same questionnaire (adapted from Cuyler) was used for parents, administrators and teachers; but some questions regarding the characteristics of interviews were to be used by only one of these three groups. (See Appendix B.)

Data Collection

Ten elementary schools were randomly selected. Questionnaires for the administrator, together with sufficient questionnaires for each elementary teacher under his/her jurisdiction, plus questionnaires for parents were taken to each of the ten selected schools.

The distribution of questionnaires was straight forward for the administrator and teacher groups. They all received a questionnaire. However, because of the large number of parents, a random sample from each school was chosen. This was done by obtaining a list of the children in

each school (grades one to six); assigning a number to each child and using a table of random numbers (Tuckman, 1973). This number code was also employed for the distribution of the follow-up letter.

The randomly selected children each received a questionnaire to take home to their parent(s). A cover letter was included, as well as a self-addressed envelope. (See Appendix A.) These questionnaires were returned sealed to the school offices. Anonymity was assured as the questionnaires had no respondent identification other than that of principal, vice-principal, teacher or parent. Two weeks after initial contact had been made, a follow-up letter was sent to encourage those who had not completed the form to do so. (See Appendix C.)

Treatment of the Data

Section I

General Rating of Perceived Effectiveness (Part C of the questionnaire). In this section, data treatment was carried out separately for each of the three groups of participants. Scores from one to five were assigned to each of the five responses. A percentage frequency distribution of the responses on the one-to-five scale was tabulated. On the same table a mean score was listed for each of the three groups of participants. This mean score was provided to indicate the general tendency of the responses. An analysis of variance was run on the data to determine whether the

responses of the three groups were significantly different.

Perceived Purposes (Part A of the questionnaire).

The respondents' ratings on the Likert scale were used as the scores of perceived importance of each of the listed purposes. For each group of participants, separately, the results were tabulated on a percentage frequency basis. A mean score was calculated for each purpose, as an indication of its relative importance. Other purposes, which were listed by respondents in the spaces provided on the questionnaire, were examined and listed. These were given consideration as an indication of the validity of the original list of purposes. The rank order for each of the responses, from each of the groups was included to illustrate the group differences. An analysis of variance was run on the data to determine whether the responses of the three groups were significantly different.

Purposes Achieved (Part B of the questionnaire).

The respondent's rating on the Likert scale were used as scores indicating the extent of the achievement of purposes. For each group of participants, separately, the results were tabulated on a percentage frequency basis. A mean score was tabulated for each purpose, as an indication of the achievement of purposes. These results were considered to be one of the two indicators of the perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews. The rank order for each of the responses, from each of the groups is included to illustrate

the group differences. An analysis of variance was run on the data to determine whether the responses of the three groups were significantly different.

Section II

Characteristics of Interviews

Question 1. This question asked which grade or grades the respondent participated in during the 1983-1984 school year. The responses were tabulated as a percentage frequency distribution. The results were examined in order to check the degree of involvement with each of the grades of the three groups of participants.

Question 2. The three parts of this question, dealing with the number of interviews per year, were used to arrive at an indication of the optimum number of interviews. For those who were satisfied with the number (1, 2, 3, 4 or more) of interviews they had experienced, these results were reported. For those who were dissatisfied, the percentage was reported, along with their preferences for the number of interviews per year. The frequencies were converted to percentage frequencies for tabulation. A comparison was made between the three groups of participants - parents, administrators and teachers.

Question 3. The three parts of this question, dealing with the periods of the year employed, were used to arrive at an indication of the optimum time(s) of year to hold parent-teacher interviews. For those who were satisfied

with the periods they had experienced, these results were reported. The percentage of dissatisfied participants were reported. Of those who were dissatisfied, their preference for periods of the year was reported. The frequencies were converted to percentage frequencies for tabulation. A comparison was made between the three groups of participants.

Question 4. The three parts of this question, dealing with the length of time per interview, were used to arrive at an indication of the optimum length of time for an interview. For those who were satisfied with the length of the interview(s) they had experienced, these results were reported. The percentage of dissatisfied were also reported, with their preference for length of the interview. The frequencies were converted to percentage frequencies for tabulation. A comparison was made between the three groups of participants.

Question 5. The three parts of this question, dealing with the parts of the day used for interviews, were used to arrive at an indication of the parts of the day most convenient for the participants. For those who were satisfied with the parts of the day employed, these results were reported. The percentage of participants who were dissatisfied were given, along with their preferences. The frequencies were converted to percentage frequencies for tabulation. A comparison was made between the three groups, parents, administrators and teachers.

Question 6. This question was answered by parents only. It dealt with which parent (mother only, father only, mother and father separately, mother and father together and those parents who did not attend) may have been involved with the scheduled interview program. It was reported as a frequency distribution. The results of this question was viewed in relation to recent ideas from the literature on parental involvement.

Question 7. This question was answered by administrators and teachers only. The results of this question, which asked for the percentage of parental involvement for these scheduled interviews, was reported as a frequency distribution.

Question 8. This question was answered by administrators and teachers only. The results of this question, which dealt with student involvement in the interview process, served as a check to compare views advocated in the literature with practices in the schools.

Question 9. This question was answered by parents who did not attend the scheduled parent-teacher interviews. This exploratory item was included to glean from parents their reasons for not participating in this program. These reasons were reported.

Question 10. All respondents were asked to list any other suggestions they wished to make for the improvement of parent-teacher interviews. The results of this

exploratory item were listed and considered as a check on the validity of this study.

CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Questionnaire Returns

Parents. Of the 588 questionnaires sent to parents, four hundred, or sixty-eight percent were returned. Fourteen were from parents who did not attend any of the scheduled interviews held during the 1983-1984 school term but who did complete parts of the questionnaire. Four others were from parents who had given reasons for not completing the questionnaire such as "no english", or a similar statement dealing with a language deficiency. A total of sixty-seven percent were from parents who had completed usable questionnaires.

Administrators. Twenty one principals and vice-principals were given questionnaires. Eighteen were returned. This was a return of eighty-six percent.

Teachers. Of the 117 questionnaires given to teachers, eighty-nine, or seventy-six percent were returned.

SECTION I

The General Rating of the Perceived Effectiveness

Percentage frequency distribution. Table 1 shows the percentage frequency distribution of the responses of the

Table 1

The General Rating of the Perceived Effectiveness of Parent-Teacher Interviews

Score	Percentage Frequency Distribution					Mean Score
	Exceedingly Valuable	Very Valuable	Valuable	Of some Value	Of little Value	
1		2	3	4	5	
Parents	28.3	39.8	22.7	6.4	2.7	2.15
Administrators	14.3	42.9	42.9	0.0	0.0	2.28
Teachers	25.6	42.3	26.9	3.8	1.3	2.12

three groups of participants on the general rating of perceived effectiveness. The range of scores was from 1, "exceedingly valuable"; to 5, "of little value"; with a midpoint at 3, "valuable". The pronounced weight for the administrators and teachers was on categories 2, "very valuable" and 3, "valuable". The parents tended toward the categories of 2, "very valuable" and 1, "exceedingly valuable".

Mean scores. The mean scores of 2.15 for parents, 2.28 for administrators and 2.12 for teachers (right column of Table 1) indicate that these groups feel that parent- teacher interviews are very valuable but not exceedingly so.

Between group analysis of variance on the general rating of perceived effectiveness yielded an F ratio of .1564 which was not significant at the .10 level. This was cause for acceptance of the null hypotheses of no significant difference between groups on the rating of perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews.

Perceived Purposes

Percentage frequency distribution and mean score.

Tables 2, 3 and 4 show the percentage frequency distributions of the responses regarding scores of perceived importance of each of the listed purposes, for each of the groups of participants respectively. The range of scores was

from 5, "extremely important", to 1, "unimportant", with a mid-point at 3, "important".

A mean score for each purpose, appearing in the right column of each of the three tables, is an indication of the average opinion of the particular group of participants regarding the perceived importance of that purpose.

Parents. Table 2 shows that the responses of the parents regarding scores of the perceived importance of purposes were largely in the top category "extremely important" (purposes a, b, e and f). For purpose (c) and (g) the parents rated these in the category "very important". Purpose (d) however was not rated as highly. The majority of responses fell into the category of "important".

The mean score of 4.68 indicates that parents rate purpose (a), "to inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it" extremely important. The mean scores for this group ranged from 3.27 to 4.68 for the seven purposes listed. These were considered to be largely on the side of being important. Table 5, indicates the rank (by mean score) accorded to each of the listed perceived purposes for each group.

Administrators. Table 3 shows that the responses of principals and vice-principals were largely in the top two categories. There were two exceptions. For purpose (d), "to interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony

between the school and the community" the responses were mainly distributed between categories 5, "extremely important" and 3, "important". For purpose (g), "to allow parents to find out about the child's relationships with other children and the teacher while at school", the larger percentage of responses fell into categories 4, "very important" and 3 "important".

The mean scores indicate that the administrators rated purpose(a) as the most important purpose listed. The mean scores for this group ranged from 3.61 to 4.77. The majority tended towards the categories of "very important" to "extremely important".

Teachers. Table 4 shows that the responses of teachers regarding scores of perceived importance of the listed purposes were also largely in the top two categories, with one exception. For purpose (d), "to interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony between the school and the community", the larger percentage of responses were in categories 4 and 3, "very important" and "important" respectively.

The mean scores indicate that teachers rated purpose (a) as the most important purpose listed. The mean scores, for teachers, for the seven listed purposes ranged from 3.34 to 4.44. The majority of teacher responses tended towards the category of "very important".

Table 2

Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews--Parent's Responses

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely important	Very important	Important	Somewhat important	Not important	Mean score
5	4	3	2	1		
	73.6	22.2	3.8	0.5	0.0	4.68
	45.0	33.3	18.3	2.3	1.0	4.19
	27.6	34.4	29.3	6.9	1.8	3.79
	14.6	23.5	42.5	13.8	5.6	3.27

Purpose:

(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it.

(b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.

(c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.

(d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.

Table 2 (continued)

Percentage frequency distribution

score	5	4	3	2	1	Mean score
	Extremely important	Very important	Important	Somewhat important	Not important	
(e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.	53.7	32.6	10.9	2.8	0.0	4.37
(f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.	52.8	30.1	13.8	1.8	1.5	4.30
(g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.	31.6	34.9	26.0	6.1	1.5	3.88

Table 3

Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews--Administrator's Responses

Percentage frequency distribution

	Extremely important	Very important	Important	Somewhat important	Not important	Mean score
score	5	4	3	2	1	
Purpose:						
(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it.	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.77
(b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.	55.6	33.3	5.6	5.6	0.0	4.38
(c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.	61.1	33.3	15.6	0.0	0.0	4.55
(d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.	44.4	11.1	44.4	0.0	0.0	4.00

Table 3 (continued)

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely important	Very important	Important	Somewhat important	Not important	Mean score
5		4	3	2	1	
	44.4	44.4	5.6	5.6	0.0	4.27
	61.1	27.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	4.50
	16.7	38.9	33.3	11.1	0.0	3.61

Purpose:

- (e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.
- (f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.
- (g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.

Table 4

Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews--Teacher Responses

Percentage frequency distribution

	Extremely important	Very important	Important	Somewhat important	Not important	Mean score
score	5	4	3	2	1	
Purpose:						
(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it.	67.0	19.3	8.0	2.3	3.4	4.44
(b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.	53.9	30.3	13.5	2.2	0.0	4.35
(c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.	36.4	36.4	21.6	3.4	2.3	4.01
(d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.	12.6	31.0	37.9	3.4	3.4	3.34

Table 4 (continued)

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely important	Very important	Important	Somewhat important	Not important	Mean score
5		4	3	2	1	
	39.8	28.4	21.4	9.1	1.1	3.96
Purpose: (e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.						
	48.9	33.0	15.9	1.1	1.1	4.27
(f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.						
	29.5	36.4	27.3	3.4	3.4	3.85
(g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.						

In an examination of the analysis of variance, of the responses of the three groups to the perceived purposes, it was found that for:

Purpose (a) Parents were significantly different from teachers.

(b) No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.

(c) The administrators were significantly different than parents and teachers.

(d) The administrators were significantly different than parents and teachers.

(e) Parents were significantly different than teachers.

(f) and (g) No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.

Table 11 and 12 list the means scores of each group by purpose. These tables include the F-ratio and probabilities which were yielded by the Scheffé Procedure Analysis of Variance. It should be noted that this procedure takes into consideration the population size in determining significance and probability of given scores. For example, in purpose (a) although the mean score for administrators is slightly higher than that of teachers, due to a calculation which considers "N", administrator responses were not found to be significant.

Rank order of Perceived Purposes

Table 5 shows that all three groups stressed the first purpose (a) "to inform parents of their child's progress or lack of it" as most important. The second ranking was different for all three groups. Parents chose purpose (e) "to allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development". The administrators chose purpose (c) "to allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship". The teachers chose purpose (b) "to increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behavior, background attitudes, etc. through information given by the parents." The three participant groups seemed to all reflect their individual group perspectives. The third ranking for all three groups was purpose (f) "to discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher".

Other Perceived Purposes

The other important perceived purposes listed by respondents in the spaces provided were considered as a test of the validity of the list of purposes provided. Following are lists of those which appeared on the questionnaires.

Those listed by parents. Each of the following "other purposes" appeared on the questionnaires returned by parents:

Table 5

Rank Order of Perceived Purposes

by mean scores

Rank	Parent	Administrator	Teacher
1	(a) 4.68	(a) 4.77	(a) 4.44
2	(e) 4.37	(c) 4.55	(b) 4.35
3	(f) 4.30	(f) 4.50	(f) 4.27
4	(b) 4.19	(b) 4.38	(c) 4.01
5	(g) 3.88	(e) 4.27	(e) 3.96
6	(c) 3.79	(d) 4.00	(g) 3.85
7	(d) 3.27	(g) 3.61	(d) 3.34

1. To discuss why certain (low) marks were given to a student.
2. To discuss the work habits of the child and to help him/her improve.
3. Interviews are for teachers to let the parents know how a child is progressing.
4. To discuss weak and strong areas of the child.
5. If the child does have any major problem, teacher and parent should work together to solve them.
6. To continue already established cooperative relationship between teacher and parent.
7. To allow the parent more say in the teacher-school situation.
8. To involve parents in the school - help them become interested insiders, not outsiders.
9. To discuss field trips (Science class).
10. To discuss ways I can help my child improve and assist in home studies.
11. To make the teacher aware of the child's health problems.
12. To insure there was extra homework when a problem in some subject was obvious.
13. To let your child know you are interested and care enough to go to visit his/her teacher.
14. To clarify whether the child is judged in terms

of present academic achievement or perceived abilities to perform.

15. To allow parents to analyse the teacher.

16. To "observe" the learning environment.

17. To allow parents to find out if the teacher has a positive attitude in teaching the child.

18. Allows the parent to find out if the teacher is using the proper approach in bringing the curriculum program to the children. (Assigning the lesson first and explaining after, or explaining first and assigning later.)

19. To explain why the child is not baptised.

20. To allow parents to know what their children are learning.

21. To learn about the child's attitude towards work and school.

Those listed by administrators. Each of the following appeared on the questionnaires returned by the principals or vice-principals:

1. To allow the parent to see what was used to determine the mark.

2. To really understand parental and school objectives.

3. To learn about social habits and attitudes.

Those listed by teachers. Each of the

following appeared on the questionnaires returned by teachers:

1. To discuss a child's behaviour and how it affects work and peers.
2. Inform parents of ways they can help the child.
3. To establish contact with all parents.
4. To establish an understanding about the classroom routines, expectations and homework.
5. To discuss care and management of supplies.
6. To inform parents about the program of studies (the curriculum) and any changes to it.

Conclusion regarding validity

It was felt that the basic ideas of many of these "other purposes" were included in the ideas presented by the list of purposes provided, or that the "other purpose" was in many cases an extension of the purposes provided. The results of this section provided no real challenge to the validity of the list provided.

Purposes Achieved

Percentage Frequency Distribution and Mean Score

Tables 6, 7, and 8 show the percentage frequency distribution of the responses. These responses were regarded as scores indicating the extent of the achievement of each of the listed purposes. They are given for each of the three groups of participants respectively. The range of scores was

from 5, "exceedingly successful" to 1, "not very successful" with a mid-point at 3, "successful".

A mean score for each purpose, appearing in the right column of each of the three tables, is an indication of the average opinion of the particular group of participants regarding the achievement of that purpose.

Parents. Table 6 shows that the responses of parents regarding scores of achievement of the listed purposes were largely in category 3, "successful". Two exceptions were purpose (a) and (f). Here parents rated the achievement of these purposes as "very successful".

The mean scores indicated that parents rated purpose (a) as being the most highly achieved of the listed purposes. The mean scores for the achievement of purposes ranged from 2.92 to 3.90. The majority tended toward the category of "successful", which is on average one category lower than the perceived purpose rating. Table 9 indicates the rank (by mean score) accorded to each of the listed achieved purposes, for each group of participants.

Administrators Table 7 shows the responses of principals and vice-principals regarding scores of achievement of purposes, were largely in category 3, "successful". Again there were exceptions. For purpose (a) administrator responses were clearly on categories 4 and 5, "very successful" and "extremely successful". For purpose

Table 6

Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews--Parent's Responses

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely successful	Very successful	Successful	Fairly successful	Not very successful	Mean score
5	33.9	34.7	21.5	7.5	2.0	3.90
4	18.7	30.9	36.1	9.8	4.5	3.49
3	14.3	29.6	36.6	15.1	4.4	3.34
2	7.7	18.4	43.1	19.9	10.9	2.92
1						

Purpose:

(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it

(b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.

(c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.

(d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.

Table 6 (continued)

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely successful	Very successful	Successful	Fairly successful	Not very successful	Mean score
5	21.1	24.5	27.2	15.9	11.2	3.28
4	20.2	32.3	30.2	12.1	5.2	3.50
3	16.9	25.5	38.0	14.8	4.7	3.35

Purpose:

- (e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.
- (f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.
- (g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.

Table 7

Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews--Administrators Responses

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely successful	Very successful	Successful	Fairly successful	Not very successful	Mean score
5	38.8	38.9	16.7	5.6	0.0	4.11
4						
3						
2						
1						
	16.7	22.2	33.3	27.8	0.0	3.27
	22.2	22.2	38.9	16.7	0.0	3.50
	5.6	22.2	44.4	27.8	0.0	3.05

Purpose:

(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it.

(b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.

(c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.

(d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.

Table 7 (continued)

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely successful	Very successful	Successful	Fairly successful	Not very successful	Mean score
5		4	3	2	1	
	5.6	16.7	33.3	44.4	0.0	2.83
	22.2	38.9	22.2	11.1	5.6	3.61
	5.6	27.8	44.4	16.7	5.6	3.11

Purpose:

(e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.

(f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.

(g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.

(e), "to allow the parent and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development", the largest percentage of responses were in category 2, "fairly successful". The bulk of support for this purpose was clearly not on the side of successful achievement of purpose. For purposes (f), "to discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher", the largest percentage of responses was in category 4, "very successful".

The mean scores indicated that the administrators rated purpose (a) as being the most highly achieved of the list of purposes. The mean scores for the achievement of purposes ranged from 2.83 to 4.11. The majority tended towards the category of "successful". This is generally one or two categories lower than the perceived purpose rating.

Teachers Table 8 shows that the responses of teachers regarding scores of achievement of purposes were largely in category 3, "successful". However, for purpose (d) and (e) the responses tended towards the category of "fairly successful" achievement. The bulk of support was clearly not on the side of successful achievement for these two purposes.

The mean scores indicate that teachers rated purpose (a) as being the most highly achieved of the listed purposes. The mean scores for the achievement of purposes ranged from 2.86 to 3.63. The majority tended towards the middle

Table 8

Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews--Teacher Responses

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely successful	Very successful	Successful	Fairly successful	Not very successful	Mean score
5		4	3	2	1	
	20.2	36.9	31.0	9.5	2.4	3.63
	16.5	32.9	35.3	15.3	0.0	3.50
	15.5	29.8	33.3	17.9	3.6	3.35
	2.4	20.5	42.2	31.3	3.6	2.86

Purpose:

(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it.

(b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.

(c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.

(d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.

Table 8 (continued)

Percentage frequency distribution

score	Extremely successful	Very successful	Successful	Fairly successful	Not very successful	Mean score
5		4	3	2	1	
	8.4	22.9	34.9	26.5	7.2	2.98
	19.0	32.1	35.7	13.1	0.0	3.57
	6.0	34.9	41.0	15.7	2.4	3.26

Purpose:

(e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.

(f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.

(g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.

category of "successful" achievement of purposes, which is on average one category lower than the perceived purposes.

In an examination of the analysis of variance of the responses of the three groups to the achieved purposes, it was found that there was no significant difference for any of the listed purposes, except for purpose (a). Here the parents differed significantly from teacher responses.

Rank Order of Achieved Purposes

Table 9 shows that all three groups, parents, administrator and teachers all stressed that the first purpose (a) was the most highly achieved. The second ranking for all groups was purpose (f) "to discuss special concerns of the parent and/or teacher". Both parents and teachers ranked purpose (b) as third in the achievement of purposes. This was "to increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour, background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents." The administrators chose purpose (c) "to allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship", as third on the list of achievement of purposes.

Rank Order Comparison of Perceived and Achieved Purposes

Table 10 shows that purpose (a), "to inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it", was rated as first on both the perceived and achieved purposes, by all of

Table 9
 Rank Order of Achieved Purposes
 by mean scores

Rank	Parent	Administrator	Teacher
1	(a) 3.90	(a) 4.11	(a) 3.63
2	(f) 3.50	(f) 3.61	(f) 3.57
3	(b) 3.49	(c) 3.50	(b) 3.50
4	(g) 3.35	(b) 3.27	(c) 3.35
5	(c) 3.34	(g) 3.11	(g) 3.26
6	(e) 3.28	(d) 3.05	(e) 2.98
7	(d) 2.92	(e) 2.83	(d) 2.86

Table 10

Rank Order Comparison
of Perceived and Achieved Purposes
by Mean Scores

Rank	Rank Order Perceived Purposes			Teacher	Rank	Rank Order Achieved Purposes		
	Parent	Administrator	Teacher			Parent	Administrator	Teacher
1	(a) 4.68	(a) 4.77	(a) 4.44	1	(a) 3.90	(a) 4.11	(a) 3.63	
2	(e) 4.37	(c) 4.55	(b) 4.35	2	(f) 3.50	(f) 3.61	(f) 3.57	
3	(f) 4.30	(f) 4.50	(f) 4.27	3	(b) 3.49	(c) 3.50	(b) 3.50	
4	(b) 4.19	(b) 4.38	(c) 4.01	4	(g) 3.35	(b) 3.27	(c) 3.35	
5	(g) 3.88	(e) 4.27	(e) 3.96	5	(c) 3.34	(g) 3.11	(g) 3.26	
6	(c) 3.79	(d) 4.00	(g) 3.85	6	(e) 3.28	(d) 3.05	(e) 2.98	
7	(d) 3.27	(g) 3.61	(d) 3.34	7	(d) 2.92	(e) 2.83	(d) 2.86	

Table 11

Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Group Responses

Number	Parent	Administrator	Teacher	F-ratio	Probability
	397	18	88		
		Mean Scores			

Purpose:

- (a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it.
 Parents were significantly different than teachers.
 4.68 4.77 4.44 5.3938 .0048
- (b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.
 No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.
 4.19 4.38 4.35 1.6870 .1861
- (c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.
 Administrators were significantly different than parents and teachers.
 3.79 4.55 4.01 6.7155 .0013
- (d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.
 Administrators were significantly different than parents and teachers.
 3.27 4.00 3.34 4.2074 .0154

Table 11 (continued)

Perceived Importance of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Group Responses

Number	Parents	Administrators	Teachers	Mean Scores	F-ratio	Probability
	397	18	88			
Purpose:						
(e)	To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.					
	4.37	4.27	3.96	8.3792	.0003	
Parents were significantly different than teachers.						
(f)	To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.					
	4.30	4.50	4.27	.5063	.6030	
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						
(g)	To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.					
	3.88	3.61	3.85	.7142	.4901	
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						

Note: In the analysis of variance the Scheffé procedure takes into consideration the population size in determining significance and probability of given scores. For example, in purpose (a) although the mean score for administrators is slightly higher than that of teachers, due to the calculation which considers "N", administrators' responses were not found to be significant.

Table 12

Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Group Responses

Number	Parent	Administrator	Teacher	Mean Scores	F-ratio	Probability
	397	18	88			
Purpose:						
(a) To inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it.						
	3.90	4.11	3.63	3.0304	.0492	
Parents were significantly different than teachers.						
(b) To increase the teacher's understanding of the pupil's behaviour background, attitudes, etc., through information given by the parents.						
	3.49	3.27	3.50	.3991	.6711	
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						
(c) To allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship.						
	3.34	3.50	3.35	.1969	.8214	
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						
(d) To interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony.						
	2.92	3.05	2.86	.2640	.7681	
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						

Table 12 (continued)

Achievement of Purposes of Parent-Teacher Interviews -- Group Responses

Number	Parents	Administrators	Teachers	Mean Scores	F-ratio	Probability
397	18	88				
Purpose:						
(e) To allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development.						
3.28	2.82	2.98		2.8941		.0563
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						
(f) To discuss special concerns of the parents and/or teacher.						
3.50	3.61	3.57		.2158		.8060
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						
(g) To allow parents to find out about the child's relationship with other children and the teacher while at school.						
3.35	3.11	3.26		.6443		.5255
No two groups were significantly different at the .10 level of significance.						

the participants. Purpose (e), "to allow parent and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his maximum development", was rated in second place by the parents in the list of perceived purposes. Teachers however rated this purpose as fifth in perceived importance of the seven.

If one believes that the parent-teacher interview is a dialogue which requires the cooperation of both parent and teacher, it would seem very unlikely that in this case the parents could achieve their expectations. This is born out in the rating for the achievement of purposes as parents feel that purpose (e) is poorly achieved. On the ranking of achievement, it was sixth.

SECTION II

Characteristic of Interviews

Question 1

The results from this question, which asked which grade or grades the respondent had participated in for the parent-teacher interviews held during the 1983-1984 school year, are given as percentage frequencies in Table 11. These percentage frequencies were calculated on the basis of the number of respondents in each group; not the number of responses. Any individual respondent could have responded for only one of the grades, or for any number of grades up to

Table 13

The Grade or Grades with which Respondents
Had Been Involved

Grades	Percentage Frequencies*					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Parents	24.5	23.7	25.5	25.0	21.2	19.2
Administrators	66.7	66.7	77.8	66.7	77.8	94.4
Teachers	24.7	23.6	28.1	29.2	23.6	23.6

*Any individual could have responded for only one of the grades, or for any number of grades up to the total of six. Each percentage is to be read as a percentage of the total number of respondents.

the maximum of six. This meant that any of the percentage frequencies of Table 13 could be read as that percentage of the total number of responses.

Parents. Table 13 shows that the percentage frequencies for parents, who could have been involved with one or two grades for the most part ranged from 19.2 percent to 25.5 percent. This served as an indication that the parents of this sample were, as much as could be expected, a representative group for all the six elementary grades.

Administrators. Table 13 shows that the percentage frequencies for principals and vice-principals, by grades, were all above 66.7 percent. However, as a group they tended to be more involved in grade six (94.4%).

Teachers Table 13 shows that the percentage frequencies for teachers, who would each probably be involved with one or two grades, ranged from 23.6 to 29.2 percent. This served as an indication that the teachers were a representative group of all the six elementary grades.

Question 2

The three parts of this question, dealing with the number of interviews per year, was used to arrive at a preferred number of interviews per year.

Parents. For those parents who had attended parent-teacher interviews 12 percent had one, 49.7 percent had two, 33.1 percent had three and 5.2 percent had 4 or more

interviews. Of the parents who attended, 95 or 24.7 percent were unhappy with the number of interviews held per year. Of those who were unhappy, 1 percent wanted one interview, 10.4 percent wanted two, 53.1 percent wanted three, and 35.4 percent wanted 4 or more. The majority of parents indicated that two interviews per year was satisfactory. However, a trend worthy of note was that a large number (approximately 170 of 400) would prefer three interviews per year.

Administrators. For the administrators 88.9 percent participated in two scheduled interviews, 11.1 percent had three. Of the administrators only 3 or 16.7 percent were unhappy with the number of interviews per year. All of those who were unhappy preferred to have three interviews per year.

Teachers. For teachers, 7 percent had one interview, 72.1 percent had two, 19.8 percent had three and 1.2 percent had 4 or more. Of the teachers, 9 or 10.1 percent, were unhappy with the number of interviews. Of these 22.2 percent wanted one, 11.1 percent wanted two, 44.4 percent wanted three and 22.2 wanted 4 or more.

Question 3

The three parts of this question, dealing with the periods of the year for holding interviews, were used to arrive at preferred periods.

Parents. Of the parents, 27.5 percent had

interviews in the September-October period, 63.7 percent had interviews in November-December, 50.5 percent had interviews in January-February, 39 percent had interviews in March-April and 3.2 percent had interviews in May-June. Of all the parents 24.6 percent were unhappy with the periods of year used. 11.5 percent of this group wanted September-October, 13 percent wanted November-December, 14 percent wanted January-February, 16 percent wanted March-April and 5.7 percent wanted May-June.

Administrators. Of the administrators, 11.1 percent suggested that parent-teacher interviews were scheduled in September-October, 94.4 percent were held in November-December, 66.6 percent were held in January-February, 44.4 percent were held in March-April and none were held in the last period of May-June. Only 11.1 percent of the administrators were dissatisfied with the periods provided for interviews. Of those 5.6 percent wanted September-October, 5.6 wanted November-December, 11.1 wanted January-February and 16.7 percent wanted March-April.

Teachers. Of the teachers, 28.1 percent suggested that parent-teacher interviews were scheduled in September-October, 66.3 percent were held in November-December, 59.6 percent were held in January-February, 36 percent were held in March-April and 4.5 percent were held in May-June. 24.4 percent of the teachers were dissatisfied with the periods

employed for parent-teacher interviews. Of the dissatisfied teachers, 6.7 percent chose September-October, 19.1 percent chose November-December, 9 percent chose January-February, 12.4 percent chose March-April and 1.1 percent chose May-June.

Question 4

The three parts of this question, dealing with the amount of time per interview, were used to arrive at a preferred amount of time.

Parents. Of the parents, 41 percent stated that they had 10 minutes or less for their interview(s), 54.3 percent had 11-20 minutes, 3.9 percent had 21-30 minutes and only .8 percent had 30 or more minutes for an interview. 28.7 percent of the parents were dissatisfied with the amount of time scheduled. Of those who were dissatisfied 62.4 percent wanted 11-20 minutes, 35.8 percent wanted 21-30 minutes and 1.8 percent wanted 30 or more minutes.

Administrators. Of the administrators, 61.1 percent stated that the interviews lasted 10 minutes or less, 38.9 percent had interviews of 11-20 minutes. 44.4 percent of the administrators were dissatisfied with the amount of time for the interviews. Those dissatisfied administrators wanted 11-20 minutes (87.5 percent) and 21-30 minutes (12.5 percent).

Teachers. Of the teachers, 54 percent had

interviews of 10 minutes or less, 43.7 percent had 11-20 minute interviews and 2.3 percent had interviews lasting 21-30 minutes. 19.8 percent of the teachers were unhappy with what they had experienced. Those dissatisfied wanted interviews lasting 11-20 minutes (94.1 percent) or 21-30 minutes (5.9 percent).

Question 5

The three parts of this question, dealing with the parts of the day used for interviews, checked the participants preference.

Parents. Of the parents, 1.5 percent had interviews in the early morning (before school), 5.7 percent had interviews in the morning, 40.7 percent had interviews in the afternoon, 32 percent had late afternoon appointments and 54.2 percent went in the evening. Only 3.4 percent of the parents were dissatisfied with the period of the day used for their interviews. Of these .5 percent wanted early morning, 1.7 percent wanted late afternoon and 3 percent wanted evenings.

Administrators. Of the administrators, 83.3 percent had early afternoon interviews, 77.8 percent had late afternoon interviews and 100 percent had evening interviews. 5.6 percent were not satisfied with what they had. These administrators wanted late afternoon interviews (5.6 percent) and evening interviews (5.6 percent).

Teachers. Of the teachers, 1.1 percent had early morning interviews, 2.2 percent had morning, 82 percent had early afternoon interviews, 66.3 percent had late afternoon and 86.5 percent had evening interviews. Only 2.3 percent of the teachers were unhappy about the part of the day used. For those who were dissatisfied, they chose morning, early afternoon, late afternoon and evening equally (2.2 percent).

Question 6

This question asked only parents to respond. It dealt with who may have participated in the scheduled parent-teacher interview. The percentage frequencies for the participants are listed:

Mother only	63.0
Father only	6.3
Mother and Father separately	5.2
Mother and Father together	26.2
Parent(s) did not attend	4.5

Eighty-nine point two percent of the interviews were attended by mothers; 32.5 percent were attended by fathers. The last percentage, the parents who did not attend, will be discussed further in Question 9.

Question 7

This question, answered by administrators and teachers only, asked what percentage of parents had participated in the scheduled parent-teacher interview. The

results are given as percent frequencies in the following list:

Percentage of parent participation	Administrators responses	Teachers responses
0 to 25 percent	5.5	3.4
26 to 50 percent	5.5	5.7
51 to 75 percent	11.1	16.1
76 to 100 percent	27.7	51.7

The percentage of responses for the last item, along with the other results, indicate a strong degree of involvement.

Question 8

Only the administrators and teachers were asked to answer this question as well. It asked what percentage of the pupils were involved in the interview program. The following percentage frequencies indicate the results that were obtained.

Percentage of student participation	Administrators responses	Teachers responses
0 to 25 percent	44.4	56.3
26 to 50 percent	0.0	1.1
51 to 75 percent	0.0	5.7
76 to 100 percent	5.5	9.2

These results indicate that it is a minority of the interviews that the students attend.

Question 9

This question asked for those parents who did not

attend the scheduled interviews, to respond with a reason why they could not or did not participate. The following lists the parent responses to this question:

1. First of all my speaking language is Portuguese. I do not speak or understand English. In order to ask someone else to go with me would be a bother. (A similar statement was made on three other questionnaires.)
2. Quite a few years ago I attended parent-teacher interviews for one of my kids and I didn't get a satisfactory response from the teacher. I just wasted my time coming in because he/she didn't say how my child was progressing in school, or what things my child needed to improve - that would have been a valuable evaluation to report to me!
3. With no big problem this year I believe in letting the teacher and child work out their problems between themselves.
4. This is one of the rare years that I did not attend an interview. The reason was because of my work commitment for that particular evening. I never asked for one at a later date because I follow my children's work carefully all through the year and I felt one was not necessary.
5. Working six days a week. Job requires me there

more now than last year due to management purposes.

6. I had an interview appointment set up, but it had to be cancelled due to work pressure.

7. Both parents work evenings.

8. My child's marks were very good and the comments from the teacher, which are quite important, did not suggest an interview was needed.

9. Child had no problem (good grades).

10. Children's progress did not necessitate an interview.

11. I did not attend any of the interviews because I had a baby in December and I have a pre-schooler at home as well. My child has been doing well in school.

12. Because of baby sitting. I have no one to look after my small ones at home.

13. My child was sick at the time of the parent-teacher interviews.

14. Out of town at the time of the interviews.

These remarks suggest that parents who do not attend parent-teacher interviews, do not participate generally because of practical reasons. These reasons tend to fall into the categories of work commitments, satisfaction with the child's progress, responsibilities for child care at home or language deficiencies.

There were a number of responses from parents where there were reasons given for why only one parent attended the scheduled parent-teacher interview. These responses were:

1. My husband attended. I see the teacher regularly as I drive my son to school so I thought it would be good for my husband to get acquainted with the teacher.
2. I had to work. At that time I had a night shift job so the father attended.
3. I attended parent-teacher interviews for my son last year while he was in kindergarten. We just rotate. Our son wanted his father this year. This of course didn't stop me from knowing what's going on.
4. Father did not attend because of his own interviews as a teacher. We both attend when it is convenient.
5. Father at work away from the city so only I went.
6. Father happened to be working, I went.

The majority of these focused on work commitment as the reason for one parent not being able to attend the interviews.

A number of parents also listed reasons why they had participated in only one of the scheduled interviews held this 1983-1984 school year. These appear below:

1. One parent-teacher interview I did not attend because I was sick. (one other parent responded with the same reasoning.)
2. I didn't attend the second interview, just because my child is doing well in school. The decision was made in cooperation with the teacher on the phone, that there was no reason to come.
3. I never attended the second interview because my children were doing very well in school. I did not think it was necessary. I am at the school a lot and the teachers usually tell me if there are any concerns to be discussed.
4. We did not attend every scheduled interview as our child is doing very well. The opportunity was there if we wanted one however. That is important.
5. The child's performance - academic and social - did not require consultations at one scheduled interview. The teachers have been available for talks whenever the occasion demanded.
6. Some interviews were when I was working. Being a single parent some interviews I could not attend.
7. I only received one parent-teacher interview this year.
8. I thought that only when the teacher requested an interview that I was required to go. I only missed

one interview.

9. Last parent teacher interview was scheduled too early for me to attend.

The bulk of these responses suggest that parents did not participate in a second scheduled interview because their child or children were "doing well".

Question 10

Respondents of all three groups were asked to list any other suggestion they wished to make for the improvement of parent-teacher interviews. The result listed here include the ideas that appeared on questionnaires, but in some cases these ideas have been paraphrased or shortened.

Parents. A total of 52 parents, or 13.6 percent responded to this question. The largest percentage of these (4.5 percent) dealt with some aspect of time and/or scheduling. The suggestions included:

1. I think more time should be available for the parents and teachers of a struggling child. An honour roll student speaks for itself, unless the child is having other problems (one interview at mid term would be O.K.)
2. My only complaint is that some parents exceeded their allotted time, causing a delay for those who were on time and possibly had a second and/or third interview to go to.

3. The interviews at our school are only 10 minutes long. This is not long enough. At the first interview the teacher gives the parent the report card, then you have exactly 10 minutes to look at the card and talk to the teacher. One feels very rushed.

4. Depending on the area, there should be two evenings for interviews. Only one evening is set aside for parent-teacher interviews at this time. Because of the large number of families with both parents working, scheduling is tight and interviews are cramped into 10 minute lengths.

5. My only concern was in the length of time that was allowed (10 min.) but this is understandable in the evening - afterall, teacher's are trying to interview a lot of people in one evening. It may be better to do it in two evenings.

6. Appointments were scheduled too close together when two children attending (different grades).

7. It has been our observation that after 5-7 minutes the teacher is very concerned with the time, consequently you get the feeling of being rushed, thus you sometimes do not have enough time to voice all your opinions or concerns. I think the interview should be taken more seriously by some teachers and

not just a duty.

8. I think that if working parents could come in on their days off or whenever possible it would be more efficient for everyone.

9. Teachers should call for them more often. Children tend to feel uncomfortable when parents call for interviews. When the school calls the parent, and it's more than one, it is easier for both parent, teacher and pupil to feel relaxed.

10. The interviews were very effective for my family, however if a student were having trouble in school I feel more time should be allotted.

11. I feel interviews should be longer and deal more with social attitudes other than academic.

12. I think there should be some flexibility. Not all parents, children or teachers require interviews each time. The opportunity should be there. For working parents it may be one of the few times to see the teacher and 10 minutes may not be enough.

13. I think there should be interviews whenever the need arises at the convenience of parents and teachers.

14. The time allotted always seems to extend into someone else's appointment time.

15. As a parent I found the teacher very cooperative

in all areas. Time is important. I feel short interviews (10 minutes) would not allow all questions and/or answers to be completely covered.

16. I think the interviews should be scheduled for the second and third report, not the first, because the relationship between the child and teacher is not close enough yet. They hardly know each other, plus it's mostly a review of the previous year. It's very hard to judge the level of the child by then.

17. I don't feel interviews should be in the afternoon. The children should be at school at that time. The time for interviews should only be in the evenings.

The majority of parental suggestions pointed to displeasure regarding short (10 minute) interview times, however these are in agreement with responses to Question 4.

The next suggestions offered by parents outline approaches which can be implemented by the teacher to make the interview more effective. These included:

1. The teacher can put together a package of sample work to send home with the report card. This way I could look it over and see what it was that may be causing a problem. Then we could talk about specifics during the interview.

2. I feel the teacher should have an outline of the

child's progress and list some of the problems so there's a starting point for the discussion.

3. The teacher should be better prepared for each parent who is scheduled at a particular time. Workbooks, test and exams should be made available at this time.

5. Teachers should be better prepared for each student, not just the ones they are having trouble with.

6. Have something there so that the teachers can help the parents understand the school work better. So in turn the parents can help the children.

7. It may be a good idea to have a guide that could include: an explanation of the evaluation system; an explanation of academic expectations for each grade; intellectual and emotional functions of the student in relation with class.

The next suggestions dealt with the importance of the teachers' attitude in relation to parent-teacher interviews.

These were:

1. The teacher should listen for information given by parents about the child. Each has their own personality and has to be taught in a fashion reasonable to that particular person. I find children respond certain ways to teachers and if that

response is not a good one the child tends to lose interest in school subjects.

2. I have found with my experience with teachers that those teachers who are genuinely concerned about the child that the purposes listed can be achieved (with or without scheduled interviews). With those teachers who are not willing to accept what parents have to say, parent-teacher interviews accomplish little.

3. I feel the teachers don't give a damn about the child or the parents' suggestions as they run things their way - right or wrong.

4. Parent-teacher interviews are a waste of time if the teacher has a closed/set mind. It certainly doesn't aid the student.

5. Interviews are very effective when parents and teacher share views. The child is more interested in school work.

Three parents have noted the importance of being informed of the child's problems as soon as possible, not waiting for the interview period to discuss this concern.

Three parents felt that teachers should take into consideration more of the factors which affect the students outlook towards other children. More emphasis should be placed on interdependence and cooperation with peers.

Three parents suggested that the student must also be involved in parent-teacher interviews. The child can contribute to the interview, and if the child is involved and in agreement with the plans these plans may have a higher degree of success.

Three parents mentioned that if the student is having difficulty in a subject not taught by the homeroom teacher the interview should be with the subject teacher.

Two parents mentioned a need for referral services to other childhood specialists. If a serious problem has been identified references should be made available so that parents can be helped to solve the problem.

Each of the following has been mentioned only once:

1. It would be nice to hear positive remarks once in awhile, instead of hearing what the child is doing wrong.
2. Have student's work on display outside the classroom so that parents can look at it while waiting for the interview.
3. Would love to have teachers of your children visit at home, at least once during October, if possible. It would help both the student and teacher understand each other a lot better.
4. Whatever is discussed between parent and teacher is followed through between pupil and teacher.

5. The half day spent observing the class was most informative! I got a clearer picture of what my children were experiencing.

6. It has been a sad reflection on our responsibilities to realize that for years parents felt awkward in school. It is high time parents took over an active interest in children's education and expanded that responsibility with teachers, not merely abdicating the responsibility to teachers.

Administrators. Principals and vice-principals suggested the following:

1. More release time during school hours is required for the interview times. The present two half days in insufficient.

2. The parent-teacher interviews are an absolutely essential part of our program, of any school program in my mind.

3. In order for parent-teacher interviews to be as effective as possible for a school there must be full cooperation from all teachers and administrators, to promote and encourage parents to come to the school for the interview.

4. Personally student, parent and teacher should be together at least for a part of the interview.

5. There should be a different length of time for

each individual case. For example a 20 minute interview for a child's parents if more concerns must be discussed than an average or superior student whose interview might only be 5 minutes

Teachers. A total of 9 teachers, or 10.3 percent responded to this question. The largest percentage of the suggestions (6.9 percent) dealt with some aspect of the time allotted for interviews. The teachers comments follow:

1. Having the opportunity to do some of the interviews in the afternoon was very important to me. More parents were able to come and I was not as tired.

2. Our central administration deems parent-teacher interviews to be an integral part of the evaluation process. Yet they do not allow for the required amount of instructional time to be used for this.

3. Teachers should be given a day off for the two evenings that are put in for interviews. If this is part of my job I should be given time off or extra pay.

4. The allotted time is much too short for any in depth communication to take place. I find I have to provide much more of my own time for interviews, plus make lots of use of the telephone. This becomes very difficult, though, with large enrollments.

5. With increased class sizes, I feel that more time is needed for interviews and would therefore like to have morning times made available to parents. The afternoon and evening does not allow enough time to do effective interviews when you are getting 100 percent responses.

6. They should not take place on one day. The time is too short and the teacher is pressured. They would be better at about two per week, allowing an in-depth sharing, or even according to the needs. Teachers become very fatigued seeing 20-30 parents in an afternoon and evening. The interaction is restricted to a routine kind of sharing.

Other suggestions made by teachers included:

1. Better instructions for teachers.
2. Students should attend with the parents.
3. Interviews give the opportunity to have concerns cleared. It is good for the students that their parents and teachers meet. Teachers can let parents know how great or special their kids are and this is passed on to the kids and positive results always come about!

Conclusion. Many of these comments by respondents were in many cases included in the structure of this study. Some of them are in agreement with ideas which appeared in

the current literature mentioned in Chapter II. However, there were a number of suggestions which were largely outside the scope of this study. These may provide ideas for consideration in later studies, as well as offering suggestions which may promote effectiveness for those engaged in the practice of parent-teacher interviews.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

This study attempted to measure the perceived effectiveness of the scheduled parent-teacher interviews, which were in use in the elementary schools of the Edmonton Roman Catholic School District, during the 1983-1984 school term.

The respondents included parents, administrators and teachers of ten randomly selected schools. Of the ten schools selected, the total population of administrators and teachers was canvassed. A random sample of parents was chosen to answer the questionnaire.

Section I Two methods were used to measure the perceived effectiveness of the interviews. The first was relatively simple. A questionnaire was given to parents, administrators and teachers. These respondents were simply asked to rate the interviews they had experienced as being effective or ineffective, on a one-to-five scale. The second method was more involved. A list of purposes of parent-teacher interviews derived from the literature was presented to each of the participants in order to have each purpose

rated as to its importance on a Likert scale. Blank spaces at the bottom of the list were used as an indication of the validity and completeness of the list. Then using the same list of purposes, respondents were asked to give a rating of the extent of achievement of these purposes on a Likert scale. In this way the perceived effectiveness was measured as achievement of the previously established purposes.

The measurement of perceived effectiveness of the three different groups of participants was tested for significant differences between groups. Null hypotheses were formulated stating that there would be no significant difference between groups, on the general rating of effectiveness, on the perceived purposes or on the achievement of purposes. These hypotheses were tested using the Scheffé Procedure Multiple Range Test. An alpha level of .10 was designated as indicating a significant difference.

Section II. The characteristics of parent-teacher interviews were employed to complement the measurements of perceived effectiveness. The characteristics included the number of interviews per year, the period of year used, the length of the interview and the period of day. The responses of the participants were viewed to determine the characteristics which may promote effectiveness. Additional questions in this section checked the grade participation of the respondents, determined who attended the interview(s),

measured the percentage of involvement of the parents and of the students. An attempt was also made to discover the reason(s) why parents did not attend the scheduled parent-teacher interviews. At the end of the questionnaire a space was provided for other suggestions regarding the improvement of the effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews. The responses in these two sections supported the judgement that the information derived through this study had some validity. The Findings and Conclusions Derived from them.

Section I

General Rating of Perceived Effectiveness. The results of the general rating of perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews suggests that all three groups feel that there is room for improvement in the scheduled interview program. The participants consider these interviews to be very valuable but were not rated as highly as they could possibly be rated.

Perceived Purposes. For the perceived purposes the administrators rated purpose (c), "to allow parents and the teacher to become acquainted with each other so as to establish a cooperative relationship", and (d), "to interpret the school to the parents, so as to create harmony between the school and the community", as significantly more important than either parents or teachers. The original hypothesis failed to predict this. A reasonable explanation

for this discrepancy would seem to be that these two particular purposes emphasize the relationship of the school to the community at large (particularly purpose (d)). Viewed from the perspective of an administrator this may carry more weight.

Parent responses were significantly different from teacher responses for purposes (a), "to inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it," and (e), "to allow parents and teacher to plan together to help the child reach his/her maximum development". For purpose (a) parents felt that it was extremely important to be informed about their child's progress. Teachers also felt it was important but not to the exclusion of other purposes. The parents tended to identify parent-teacher interviews with this particular purpose. For purpose (e), parents seemed to want more involvement and wanted to plan with the teacher strategies to help the child(ren) reach optimal learning levels.

Achievement of Purposes. Parents differed significantly from teachers on the rating of the achievement of purpose (a), "to inform parents about their child's progress or lack of it". Parents rated the achievement of this purpose higher than the teachers. One explanation may be that teachers generally control the flow of information about the child and the school environment. One of the main reasons parents attend parent-teacher interviews is to hear

from the teacher how the child is doing in school. Teachers do not value this purpose quite to the same degree.

There was no significant difference in any of the other achievement of purpose responses. Except for purpose (a) all purposes involved some form of mutual interaction (give and take). If there is to be a mutual exchange of ideas to achieve purposes, the values of the participants will determine the success of this interaction. If the interaction is subdued by one of the participants because that purpose is not highly valued it would be difficult to rank the meeting as highly achieved.

Difference between perceived purposes and achieved purposes. The ideological stance, the perceived purposes, is consistently higher than what the respondents rated as achieved. All groups point to the fact that in practice parent-teacher interviews can be improved.

Section II

Characteristics of Interviews. The respondents were a representative group for all six grade levels. However, the fact that administrators are highly involved (94.4 percent) with the interviews at the Grade Six level is worthy of note. Possibly it is because parents may require information from the administrators regarding academic requirements or information about other schools, as these students prepare for junior high.

Of the characteristics that were studied, the number of interviews per year, the times of the year, the length of the interview and the time of day, all were achieved to a satisfactory degree and did not inhibit the success of the interview. At the outset it seemed that these would have been factors in determining the effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews. The one area where there were numerous suggestions especially from parents was on the length of the interview.

This section on characteristics seems to indicate that where parent-teacher interviews were not successful we can rule out those features associated with the management of interviews. We must look deeper for the solution, perhaps toward our underlying assumptions or our expectations as parents, administrators or teachers in the interview situation.

Suggestions for Further Research

The first suggestion for further research in this area resulted from one of the limitations of this study; namely that the present study did not allow for consideration of many of the variables which might possibly relate to the perceived effectiveness of scheduled parent-teacher interviews. The socio-economic status of parents, teacher experience or organizational climate of the school may be variables to be considered.

Future research might also consider who responded to the questionnaire, taking in different perceptions reflected by either mothers or fathers. Another possibility could include why parents participated. This could include information by grade level.

A further study could possibly investigate changes in the degree of perceived effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews related to (1) a program designed to encourage fathers to participate at the interview, (2) training of teachers in interview techniques, (3) the presence of the student at the interview, or (4) training the parents in ways to seek information, etc., in an interview.

Since this study suggested that the organizational aspects of managing parent-teacher interviews were adequate, further studies should look elsewhere in seeking ways to improve parent-teacher interviews.

This study has also provided preliminary indications that the perceived effectiveness of various purposes may be better understood if added emphasis is placed on the perspective of each group. It may be important to question whether the child is the sole, most important or focussing reason behind the interviews.

The obvious recommendation resulting from this study would be to continue and extend the use of those practices which have appeared to reach a high degree of perceived

effectiveness. However, many ideas which were largely outside the limits of this study have come from the responses of participants and from the literature. These suggest matters which could materially affect the perceived effectiveness of the interviews. Improvement of the level of communication between participants, inclusion of the student at interviews, and in-service assistance for teachers, and assistance for parents in seeking information, are ideas which are worthy of due consideration and experimentation by those engaged in the practice of parent-teacher interviews.

Implications

Staff training and orientation in relations with culturally different people, interviewing techniques and other aspects of dealing with parents are at present largely absent. Clear specifications and communication of parent and teacher roles are needed to make expectations explicit and commonly understood. One of the administrator's roles for parent - teacher interviews is to make the purposes of parent-teacher interviews clear to all those involved.

Meeting can be arranged where parents and teachers can discuss their expectations, and where they can prioritize the purposes. Parents who rank academic progress above all other types of information in importance are likely to feel disappointed when a teacher discusses a child's social adjustment and ignores academic progress. The problem arises

because neither party verbalizes to the other the assumptions it holds about the nature of education and the purpose of parent-teacher interviews.

School boards can prepare a policy that will foster parental involvement at parent-teacher interviews, and increase parents' and teachers' understanding of the purposes of having interviews. Helping parents become more knowledgeable, with regards to expectations and the methods of reporting their concerns, possibly through an information resource center may ameliorate the school community relationship.

Placing teachers and parents in the same room to discuss a child does not automatically make the experience fruitful. Many teachers (as well as parents) find themselves participating in an interview with no specific training or experience about how to proceed. Inappropriate procedures and inadequate skills and knowledge can create greater problems than may have existed before the meeting. Teachers must develop the necessary skills; planning, listening, explaining, exploring and evaluating, as well as tact and diplomacy. Knowledge of techniques of conducting a successful interview will enhance a teacher's confidence, and improve a teacher's attitude toward the value of the entire experience.

In any discussion of parent-teacher interviews, the

inadvisability of one solution for everyone must be noted. However, many of the aspects of this meeting can be anticipated and channeled in a productive manner, to accommodate the hopes of both the teachers and the parents.

A step towards reaching these goals might be to develop a guide of teachers expectations for parental assistance. The converse of this is also necessary. Determining just what the parents hope their child will learn after ten months with (usually) the same teacher would almost guarantee that the child would not be pulled in different directions, trying to appease both teachers and parents. This is especially important if the parents and teachers values are particularly divergent.

APPENDIX A: Cover letter for questionnaire.

1007 Galbraith House,
Michener Park,
Edmonton, Alberta,
T6H 5B5
May 4, 1984.

Dear Parent, Teacher or Administrator:

This study, as a part of my Masters degree, focusses on parent-teacher interviews. It is my hope that the results will serve as the basis for improving parent-teacher interviews which are employed in the Elementary Schools of the Edmonton Roman Catholic Separate School District.

You are being contracted as one of the parents, teachers or administrators who may have been involved in the scheduled parent-teacher interviews held this school year (1983-1984). I would appreciate it very much if you would take the time and trouble to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience. Please seal the envelope and return it to the school.

This study has the approval of the Central Office of the Edmonton Catholic Separate School Board.

It is anticipated that the processing of the information collected from this questionnaire will begin May 18, 1984. A high response is essential to the success of this study. Your participation can make the difference.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely yours,

Pearl G. Donovan.

APPENDIX B: The Questionnaire

Please check one:

Principal _____

Vice-principal _____

Teacher _____

Parent _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

The Perceived Effectiveness of Scheduled, School
Initiated, Parent-Teacher InterviewsIntroduction

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information regarding the program of scheduled parent-teacher interviews held this school year.

It is designed for use by principals, vice-principals, teachers and parents of the elementary schools of the Edmonton Roman Catholic Separate School Board. The results will be used in such a way that no specific reference will be made to any particular school, principal, vice-principal, teacher or parent. (You will notice, in fact, that the questionnaire contains no identification other than the above designation as "Principal", "Vice-principal", "Teacher", or "Parent".)

Hopefully, the analysis of this information will result in some recommendations for future interview programs which will contribute to increased effectiveness.

Special instructions

1. For parents who did not attend a parent-teacher interview this year (1983-84) please omit those questions that are inappropriate.
2. The term "parent" includes guardians, where this applies.
3. School principals and vice-principals should interpret questions in terms of the practices of their schools generally.

WHAT ARE THE MAIN PURPOSES OF HAVING PARENT-TEACHER INTERVIEWS?

Please indicate how important you consider each of these purposes to be by circling one number after each one.

	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	FAIRLY IMPORTANT	NOT VERY IMPORTANT
(a) To INFORM PARENTS about their CHILD'S PROGRESS or lack of it.	5	4	3	2	1
(b) To INCREASE THE TEACHER'S UNDERSTANDING of the pupil's behavior, background, attitudes, etc., through INFORMATION GIVEN BY THE PARENTS.	5	4	3	2	1
(c) To allow parents and the teacher to BECOME ACQUAINTED with each other so as to establish a COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIP.	5	4	3	2	1
(d) To INTERPRET THE SCHOOL to the parents, so as to create harmony between the SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY.	5	4	3	2	1
(e) To allow parents and teacher to PLAN TOGETHER to help the child reach his/her maximum development.	5	4	3	2	1
(f) To discuss SPECIAL CONCERNS of the parent and/or teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
(g) To allow parents to find out about the CHILD'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER CHILDREN AND THE TEACHER while at school.	5	4	3	2	1

PLEASE LIST ANY OTHER PURPOSES YOU CONSIDER TO BE IMPORTANT, AND RATE THEM IN THE SAME MANNER.

(h) _____ 5 4 3 2 1

(i) _____ 5 4 3 2 1

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE PURPOSES OF PARENT-TEACHER INTERVIEWS BEING ACHIEVED?

Below is the list of purposes used before. Please indicate the extent to which you consider each of these was achieved by the parent-teacher interview(s) you have been involved with this year by circling one number after each one.

	EXTREMELY SUCCESSFUL	VERY SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL	FAIRLY SUCCESSFUL	NOT VERY SUCCESSFUL
(a) To INFORM PARENTS about their CHILD'S PROGRESS or lack of it.	5	4	3	2	1
(b) To INCREASE THE TEACHER'S UNDERSTANDING of the pupil's behavior, background, attitudes, etc., through INFORMATION GIVEN BY THE PARENTS.	5	4	3	2	1
(c) To allow parents and the teacher to BECOME ACQUAINTED with each other so as to establish a COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIP.	5	4	3	2	1
(d) To INTERPRET THE SCHOOL to the parents, so as to create harmony between the SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY.	5	4	3	2	1
(e) To allow parents and teacher to PLAN TOGETHER to help the child reach his/her maximum development.	5	4	3	2	1
(f) To discuss SPECIAL CONCERNS of the parent and/or teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
(g) To allow parents to find out about the CHILD'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER CHILDREN AND THE TEACHER while at school.	5	4	3	2	1

PLEASE LIST ANY OTHER PURPOSES YOU CONSIDER TO BE IMPORTANT, AND RATE THEM IN THE SAME MANNER.

(h) _____	5	4	3	2	1

(i) _____	5	4	3	2	1

PART C GENERAL RATING OF THE PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF PARENT-TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Based on your experience this school year (1983-84), how would you rate scheduled parent-teacher interviews for elementary schools? (Please circle one of the following.)

- 1 Exceedingly valuable
- 2 Very valuable
- 3 Valuable
- 4 Of some value
- 5 Of little value

PART D CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEWS

(Please circle to indicate your responses to the following questions.)

1. With which grade or grades have you as a parent or teacher participated in scheduled parent-teacher interviews this year? (School principals/vice-principals should indicate which grades in their school have been included in the program.)

- | | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| 1 Grade One | 4 Grade Four |
| 2 Grade Two | 5 Grade Five |
| 3 Grade Three | 6 Grade Six |

2. (a) How many times during the year has the opportunity for scheduled interviews been provided?

- | | |
|----------|-------------------|
| 1 one | 3 three |
| 2 two | 4 four or more |

(b) In your opinion, was this the best number of times?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

(c) If not, what would the best number of times be?

- | | |
|----------|-------------------|
| 1 one | 3 three |
| 2 two | 4 four or more |

3. (a) During which of the following periods was the opportunity for scheduled parent-teacher interviews provided? (Circle one for each interview period, please.)

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | September-October | 4 | March-April |
| 2 | November-December | 5 | May-June |
| 3 | January-February | | |

(b) In your opinion, were these periods placed at the best times during the year for maximum effectiveness?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

(c) If not, during which periods would you like to have interviews? (You may include those mentioned in part "a" of this question.)

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | September-October | 4 | March-April |
| 2 | November-December | 5 | May-June |
| 3 | January-February | | |

4. (a) Kindly indicate the approximate average length of time of your interview(s).

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|------------------|
| 1 | 10 minutes or less | 3 | 21 to 30 minutes |
| 2 | 11 to 20 minutes | 4 | over 30 minutes |

(b) In your opinion, was the allotted time sufficient to allow for a satisfactory interview?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

(c) If not, how much time should be allotted for each interview?

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|------------------|
| 1 | 10 minutes or less | 3 | 21 to 30 minutes |
| 2 | 11 to 20 minutes | 4 | over 30 minutes |

5. (a) What parts of the day were used for your interview(s)? (Circle any number of spaces.)

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| 1 | early morning (before school) | | |
| 2 | morning | 4 | late afternoon |
| 3 | early afternoon | 5 | evening |

(b) In your opinion, were the times of day which were made available convenient for parents?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

(c) If not, what times of day should be made available for the convenience of parents? (Include those mentioned in part "a" of this question if you wish.)

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|----------------|
| 1 | early morning (before school) | | |
| 2 | morning | 4 | late afternoon |
| 3 | early afternoon | 5 | evening |

6. (THIS QUESTION FOR PARENTS ONLY)

Which parent attended the interview or interviews?

- 1 mother only
- 2 father only
- 3 mother and father separately
- 4 mother and father together
- 5 parent(s) did not attend

7. (THESE QUESTIONS FOR TEACHERS ONLY)

Approximately what percentage of the pupils involved in your interview program have been represented by at least one parent?

- 1 0 to 25 per cent
- 2 26 to 50 per cent
- 3 51 to 75 per cent
- 4 76 to 100 per cent

8. Approximately what percentage of the pupils were involved in your interview program?

- 1 0 to 25 per cent
- 2 26 to 50 per cent
- 3 51 to 75 per cent
- 4 76 to 100 per cent

9. (THIS QUESTION FOR PARENTS WHO DID NOT ATTEND)

It would be beneficial to this study if you would list your reason(s) for not attending the program of scheduled parent-teacher interviews this year (83-84).

10. Please list any other suggestions you wish to make for improving the effectiveness of parent-teacher interviews.

Your time and effort to complete this questionnaire is very much appreciated !

THANK YOU

APPENDIX C: Reminder letter

Dear Parent/Teacher,

Remember that questionnaire about The Effectiveness of Parent-Teacher Interviews you received awhile ago? Perhaps you have returned it. If so, please disregard this reminder and thank you!

This study is being done as part of a graduate degree. You are under no obligation to return the questionnaire. However, for this study to be useful THERE MUST BE A LARGE NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED... more than have now been received.

Your opinions as one closely involved are most valuable. It would be appreciated if you would return it soon. The processing of information is awaiting the receipt of more questionnaires.

Remember your name does not appear on the questionnaire. If you have further questions, or need another questionnaire, please phone me at 435-8166.

Yours sincerely,

Pearl G. Donovan

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Auten, A. Effective parent-teacher conferences. Reading Teacher. ERIC/RCS, vol. 35, Dec. 1981.
- Berger, E.H. Parents as Partners in Education. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Company, 1981.
- Bond, G. Parent-Teacher Partnerships. London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1973.
- Bynner, J.M. Parents' Attitudes to Education. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.
- Canady, R. L. and Seyfarth, J.T. How Parent-Teacher Conferences Build Partnerships. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979.
- Casavis, J.N. Principal's Guidelines for Action in Parent Conferences. New York: Parker Publishing, 1970.
- Cooper, J.E. Elementary School Principalships. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1967.
- Cramer, W. How to Conduct an Effective Parent-Teacher Conference. Maine: J. Weston Walch, 1978.
- Creaser, M.C. Parent-Teacher contacts as related to school size, number of bussed pupils and organizational climate. Dissertation Abstracts. 27, 1966-67, 2309A-2310A.
- Cuyler, J.D.P. The Effectiveness of Parent-Teacher Interviews in Edmonton Public Elementary Schools. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1971.
- Fredericks, A. et. al. How to talk to parents and get the message home. Instructor. Nov./Dec. 1983, 64-69.
- Friedman, P.G. Communicating in conferences: parent-teacher student interaction. Reading Teacher, 35 Dec. 81, 359.
- Gallup, G.H. The 10th annual gallup poll of the public's attitude towards the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 1978, 33-45.

- Gorman, V.P. An appraisal of a course in parent-teacher conferences designed for students in teacher education. Dissertation Abstracts, 26, 1965-66, 892.
- Henderson, A. Parent Participation - Student Achievement: The Evidence Grows. Md.: National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1981.
- Herman, W.L. The Principal's Guide to Teacher Personnel Problems in the Elementary School. New York: Parker Publishing, 1966.
- Hymes, J.I. Jr. Effective Home-School Relations. California: Southern California Association for the Education of Young Children, 1974.
- Isakson, R.L. Whatever happened to the Waltons? Instructor. 1977, Sept., 77-79.
- Johanson, R.D. A Study of Parental Perceptions of School Communications in School District No. 24 (Kamloops). Vancouver: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, 1981.
- Johnson, W.R. Parent-Teacher conferences. The National Elementary Principal. 1966, May XLV, 48-50.
- Jones, J.R. Parent-Teacher conferences as a reporting technique. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965-66, 26, 5758-5788.
- Keniston, K. et. al. All Our Children. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch, 1977.
- King, D. Don't Shut Out Parents. Edmonton Journal. 15 June 1984, B1.
- Kroth, R.L. and Simpson, R.L. Parent Conferences as a Teaching Strategy. Denver: Love Publishing, 1977.
- Lasch, C. Haven in a Heartless World. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Langdon, G. and Stout, I.W. Parent-Teacher Interviews. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Lawrence, G. and Hunter, M. Parent-Teacher Conferences. California: TIP Publications, 1978.
- LeFevre, C. Face to face in the parent-teacher conference. Elementary School Journal, 1967, Oct., 1-8.

- Lightfoot, S.L. Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978.
- Lightfoot, S.L. Towards conflict and resolution: relationships between families and schools. Theory Into Practice. vol. 20, Spring 81, 97-104.
- Losen, S.M. and Diament, B. Parent Conferences in the schools: Procedures for Developing Effective Partnerships. Boston: Allyn and Beacon, 1978.
- Lynch, J. and Bimlott, J. Parents and Teachers. London: MacMillan Education, 1976.
- Manning, M.L. The Involved father: a new challenge in parent conferences. The Clearing House. Sept. 1983, vol 57, 17-19.
- Martin, J.M. A Study of Parent-Teacher Conferences in the County of Ponoka. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.
- Mathias, D. Parent-teacher conferences: there is a better way. Grade Teacher. 85, Oct. 19967, 86-87.
- Maves, H.J. Contrasting levels of performance in parent-teacher conferences. Elementary School Journal. Jan. 1958, 219-224.
- McAfee, J.K. and Vergason, G.A. Parent involvement in the process of special education: establishing a new partnership. Focus on Exceptional Children. 1979, 11(2), 1-15.
- McPherson, G. Small Town Teacher. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- McSweeney, J.P. Five Guidelines for Parent-Teacher Conferences. The Clearing House. March, 1984, 319-320.
- Moles, O. Synthesis of recent research on parent participation in children's education. Educational Leadership, vol. 40, Nov. 1982, 44-48.
- Murk, V. Parent conferences supplement teaching. Illinois Education, vol. 53, March 1965, 302-304.
- Nationwide Teacher Opinion Poll. Washington, D.C.: National Education Research Memo, 1981.

- Rutherford, R.B. and Edgar, E. Teachers and Parents: A Guide to Interaction and Cooperation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979.
- Sass, B. Don't shut out parents. Edmonton Journal. 15 June 1984, B1.
- Seeley, D.S. Education through partnership. Educational Leadership. vol. 40 #2, Nov. 1982, 42-43.
- Siebert, J.B. et al. Emerging trends in parent-school communications. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, 29th Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas, 1979.
- Simpson, R.L. Conferencing Parents of Exceptional Children. London: Aspen, 1982.
- Stevens, A. Techniques for Handling Problem Parents. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Tuckman, B.W. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch, 1972.
- Warren, R. The classroom as a sanctuary for teachers. American Anthropologist. 75, Feb.-June 1973, 280-291.
- Waugh, K.W. Person to person: communication skills for school, home and everywhere. Reading Teacher, vol. 35, Dec. 1981, 360.
- West, J.T. We found a better way to have parent-teacher conferences. The Instructor, 1966, Oct., 25.