

**PUNISHING PARENTS: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE, SECURITY, AND
PARENTAL OUTCOMES IN U.S. PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

by

Thomas James Mowen

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology

Spring 2015

© 2015 Thomas Mowen
All Rights Reserved

ProQuest Number: 3718362

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 3718362

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

**PUNISHING PARENTS: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE, SECURITY, AND
PARENTAL OUTCOMES IN U.S. PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

by

Thomas James Mowen

Approved: _____
Kirk R. Williams, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice

Approved: _____
George H. Watson, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____
James G. Richards, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Signed:

Aaron C. Kupchik, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of the dissertation

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Signed:

Karen F. Parker, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Signed:

Anthony A. Peguero, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Signed:

Christy A. Visser, PhD.
Member of dissertation committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT.....	xi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1.Current Project	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE, SECURITY, AND YOUTH AND PARENTAL OUTCOMES	8
2.1. School Discipline and School Security.....	8
2.1.1. Contemporary School Disciplinary Discourse.....	10
2.1.2. Notable Trends in Discipline and Security	13
2.1.3. Collateral Consequences of Punishment.....	16
2.2. Parents and Schools	19
2.2.1. Individual-Level Factors	22
2.2.1.1.Race and Ethnicity	22
2.2.1.2. Socioeconomic Status	24
2.2.1.3.Race and Class Interactions	26
2.2.2. School-Level Factors	29
2.2.2.1.School Size.....	29
2.2.2.2. School Socioeconomic Status	30
2.2.2.3. Racial and Ethnic School Composition	31
2.3.School Discipline and Parents...a Missing Link?	33
2.4.Social Capital and Social Status	36
2.4.1. Social Capital, Status, and Schools.....	41

2.5.Collateral Consequences, Social Capital, and School Discipline	45
2.6.Current Project	48
3. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES.....	49
3.1.Quantitative Data and Sample.....	49
3.1.1. School Security Variables	52
3.1.2. School Discipline and Delinquency Variables.....	56
3.1.3. Parental Involvement	57
3.1.4. Individual Level Control Variables	59
3.1.4.1. Parent and Family Measures	59
3.1.4.2.Student Measures	61
3.1.5. School Level Control Variables	62
3.1.6. Missing Data	63
3.2.Analytic Strategy	64
3.2.1. Multi-Level Model.....	64
3.2.2. Propensity Score Matching.....	65
3.3.Qualitative Data	67
3.3.1. Sample	67
3.3.2. Qualitative Data Analysis	69
4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS ONE AND TWO: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: QUANTATIVE FINDINGS	72
4.1.Research Question 1	72
4.2.Results	74
4.2.1. Formal Parental Involvement	74
4.2.2. Academic Parental Involvement	74
4.2.3. Problem Behavior Involvement	75
4.3.Summary of Models	75
4.4.Research Question 2.....	77
4.5.Formal Parental Involvement.....	79
4.5.1. Model Selection.....	79

4.5.2. Results	80
4.5.2.1.Level 1	80
4.5.2.2.Level 2	83
4.6.Academic Involvement	84
4.6.1. Model Selection.....	86
4.6.2. Results	86
4.6.2.1.Level 1	86
4.6.2.2.Level 2	87
4.7.Problem Behavior Involvement.....	87
4.7.1. Model Selection.....	90
4.7.2. Results	90
4.7.2.1.Level 1	90
4.7.2.2.Level 2	91
4.8.Summary of Findings	92
5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS THREE AND FOUR: PAENTAL SOCIAL CAPITA.L, STATUS, AND SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.....	97
5.1.Research Question 3.....	98
5.2.Quantitative Results	100
5.2.1. Formal Parental Involvement	103
5.2.1.1.Individual-Level by Individual-Level Interactions.....	103
5.2.1.2.School-Level by School-Level Interactions	106
5.2.1.3.Cross-Level Interactions	106
5.2.2. Academic Involvement.....	107
5.2.2.1.Individual by Individual-Level Interactions	110
5.2.3. Behavioral Involvement	111
5.2.3.1.Individual by Individual-Level Interactions	113
5.2.4. Summary of Findings from Interaction Effects	113

5.3. Qualitative Results.....	117
5.3.1. Research Question Four	119
5.3.1.1. Ignored and Unwelcomed	119
5.3.1.2. Cheated	123
5.3.1.3. Attacked.....	124
5.3.1.4. Frustrated.....	127
5.3.2. The Role of Social Status and Social Capital.....	130
5.3.2.1. Race.....	130
5.3.2.2. Social Class	134
5.3.2.3. Marital Status and Support	135
5.3.3. Summary of Findings	137
6. RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE: COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.....	143
6.1. Research Question Five	144
6.1.1. Financial Consequences	146
6.1.2. Physical Consequences.....	150
6.1.3. Family and Family-Emotional Consequences.....	151
6.1.4. Anticipated Future Consequences.....	155
6.2. Summary of Findings	159
7. CONCLUSION.....	166
7.1. Discussion.....	169
7.2. Importance	176
7.3. Policy Implications.....	180
7.4. Limitations.....	183
7.5. Directions for Future Research	186
7.6. Conclusion	188
REFERENCES	189
Appendix	
A. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON SCALE CREATION.....	205

B. LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	208
C. FULL MODELS WITH INTERACTION TERMS	210

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Quantitative Sample Characteristics	54
Table 3.2: Rotated Factor Analysis.....	59
Table 3.3: Qualitative Sample Characteristics	68
Table 4.1: Average Treatment Effect by Parental Involvement Type	74
Table 4.2: Formal Parental Involvement.....	81
Table 4.3: Academic Parental Involvement.....	84
Table 4.4: Behavioral Parental Involvement	88
Table 4.5: Statistically Significant Variables in the Models	93
Table 5.1: Formal Parental Involvement Interactions	101
Table 5.2: Academic Parental Involvement Interactions	108
Table 5.3: Behavioral Parental Involvement Interactions.....	111
Table C.1: Formal Parental Involvement A.....	210
Table C.2: Formal Parental Involvement B	212
Table C.3: Formal Parental Involvement C	214
Table C.4: Formal Parental Involvement D.....	216
Table C.5: Formal Parental Involvement E	218
Table C.6: Formal Parental Involvement F	220
Table C.7: Formal Parental Involvement G.....	222

Table C.8: Formal Parental Involvement H.....	224
Table C.9: Formal Parental Involvement I	226
Table C.10: Formal Parental Involvement J	228
Table C.11: Formal Parental Involvement K	230
Table C.12: Formal Parental Involvement L.....	232
Table C.13: Academic Parental Involvement A	234
Table C.14: Academic Parental Involvement B.....	236
Table C.15: Behavioral Parental Involvement A.....	238
Table C.16: Behavioral Parental Involvement B	240
Table C.17: Behavioral Parental Involvement C	242

ABSTRACT

Although crime and delinquency in U.S. public schools are near historic lows, concern over unwanted behavior remains a high priority among school officials and policy makers. As a result, harsh school discipline and security practices have increased in the hallways of schools over the past few decades. The effect of these changes on student outcomes has been well documented, but there has been little attention given to understanding the consequences of these trends on parents. Using data from the Educational Longitudinal Study (2002), and qualitative interviews collected in 2012 and 2013, I explore the effect of school discipline on parents and the collateral consequences on families. Results indicate parents are less likely to be formally involved, but are more likely to be negatively involved in schools with high levels of school discipline and security. A series of multi-level models show that dimensions of social capital and social status help explain these trends. Qualitative narratives demonstrate that parents—primarily working-class, single, Black mothers—feel frustrated, cheated, attacked, and betrayed by school officials. Parents also reported negative financial, physical, and emotional consequences, and a decrease in future aspirations for their child caused by school discipline and security.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Although school crime and delinquency have been steadily decreasing in recent years and are near historic lows (Robers, 2013), academic research shows public schools in the United States continue to adopt harsh punishment and disciplinary practices to deal with student misbehavior and school safety (Coon, 2007; Fuentes, 2011). The use of strict discipline and security measures within the educational system has led some scholars to assert schools are entering into a paradigm of the “New American School” where the focus of education—for some—is centered on discipline and control (Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). The New American School represents a system whereby some schools exhibit an undemocratic atmosphere (Lyons & Drew, 2006) characterized by centralized and impersonal rules. A number of academics have become interested in understanding how these strategies and policies impact outcomes for students (Kupchik & Ellis, 2008; Evans & Lester, 2012; Nolan, 2011; Peguero & Shekarkhar, 2011; Reyes, 2006; Phaneuf, 2009; Skiba et al., 2000; Townsend, 2000), yet little research has sought to explore the impact of these measures and policies on parents, including parental involvement and parental mental and physical wellbeing.

This noticeable gap in the literature is important as parents overwhelmingly cite involvement in the schooling of their child as among one of the most important and

rewarding functions of parenthood (Coleman, 1998; LaRocque et al., 2011; Warner, 2010). Previous research has shown many individual- and school-level factors contribute to a parent's ability to engage with the schooling of his/her child. Race and ethnicity (Crosnoe, 2001; Lareau & Horvat, 1999), socioeconomic status (Bower & Griffin, 2011; Lareau, 2003; Schnieder & Coleman, 1993), gender (LaRoque et al., 2011), family structure (Shriner et al., 2010; Wadsby & Svedin, 1996), and parental familiarity with the educational system (Koonce & Harper, 2005) have all been found to play an important role in predicting a parent's ability to become involved. School-level factors such as school size (Dee et al., 2007; Walsh, 2010) and racial and ethnic composition (Kerbow & Bernhardt, 1993; Steinberg et al., 1996; Smith et al., 2009) have also been shown to relate to parental involvement.

Although many differences in parental involvement have been well documented, one school-level trait that has been noticeably overlooked within the current literature is the relationship between school discipline and security, and parents. This is especially important given the rise in school disciplinary policies and security measures over the past two decades. What remains unclear is the relationship between school discipline and security and parental involvement; how school-level and individual-level characteristics of the child and parent relate to parental involvement in the school; how social capital of the parent influences a parent's ability to engage and impact outcomes within the disciplinary processes; and, what impact disciplinary processes have on parents. As I outline in greater detail in the subsequent chapter, to address this gap in the literature, I examine how parents

interact with schools in the disciplinary process, and how the disciplinary process can impact parents and families.

The concepts of social capital and social status are central to understanding how school discipline impacts parents and families. Social capital refers to the networks and relationships individuals have that assist them in achieving their goals (Schuller et al., 2000). Examples of social capital often include levels of education, political connections, and social networks. A closely related construct, social status often overlaps with social capital, but generally refers to ascribed characteristics of the individual such as marital status, race, and social class. Previous research has found that social capital and social status often relate to a parent's ability to successfully advocate for his or her child in the school (Noguera, 2003; Hampden-Thompson & Pong, 2005; Shiller et al., 2010). Racial and ethnic minorities, members of the working-class, and other individuals who lack social capital and/or social status often find it more difficult to become involved in the school compared to their middle- upper-class White counterparts (Lareau, 1989). Disadvantaged parents are often excluded from the school, and requests made on behalf of their child are more likely to be ignored (Noguera, 2003).

I suggest parents who lack social capital or social status may be less able to become involved with the school broadly, but that school discipline and security may also disproportionately impact these parents. Parents who lack social capital and social status may be further impacted by disciplinary proceedings through emotional or financial strain, and these negative outcomes may also negatively affect the family. For example, a parent who misses work to engage in disciplinary proceedings may face a loss in wages, or may

even lose their job. In turn, this might have consequences for the family. These types of outcomes may also influence parents' aspirations for their other children which could, in turn, decrease the parents' effort to become involved in the schooling of their other children.

1.1 Current Project

Given the increase in harsh disciplinary practices and school security measures over the previous decades, it becomes important to investigate how these policies impact parents. While we know a great deal about how these disciplinary policies effect students, and that lower-income and racial and ethnic minority students are disproportionately impacted, we do not yet understand how parents are impacted. To answer the following research question, I use a propensity score model.

Research Question 1: Do school security measures and school discipline affect parental involvement within the school?

Although exploring the extent to which school security and discipline relate to parental involvement is a central component of this study, I seek to place this finding within a broader context by then exploring what other factors contribute to this relationship as well. Therefore, given the important findings on the role of social capital and status on parental involvement outlined in the literature review, I then seek to explore how social capital and status relates to parental involvement when taking school discipline and security into account, and how social capital and status relates to discipline and security. To explore this research question, I use a hierarchical modeling (HLM) strategy.

Research Question 2: What school-level and individual-level characteristics of parents and students relate to parental involvement in schools?

I then seek to understand how joint influences of differing forms of social capital and social status influence parental involvement when school discipline and security are considered. Introducing interaction terms into the previously used multi-level model between key variables identified by the literature such as race and socioeconomic status, marital status, and school security and discipline will demonstrate how social capital may relate to school discipline/security and parental involvement within the school.

Research Question 3: How does parental status shape school discipline? Does parental social capital interact with other measures of parental social status (e.g., race) and school characteristics (e.g., school size, security practices) in shaping school discipline?

While it is important to explore the role social capital and social status play in this process, first-hand narratives will allow me to explore the contextual dynamics of disciplinary processes on parents. Based on a review of the literature, I expect that parents who lack social capital may face barriers limiting their ability to impact outcomes of disciplinary processes in their favor. To explore this research question further, I rely on data collected from in-depth interviews.

Research Question 4: What do parents experience during school disciplinary processes, and are these experiences conditioned by social capital and social status? How does this relate to outcomes of the meetings/proceedings?

Finally, given the literature on the school-to-prison pipeline as well as other findings on collateral consequences of punishment, I seek to explore collateral consequences of school punishment on parents and families through analysis of qualitative interviews. To answer this research question, I use the previously identified qualitative data collected from interviews.

Research Question 5: What effect does involvement in disciplinary processes within the school (such as meetings with administrators, teachers, members of law enforcement, security personnel) and outcomes (such as taking time off work) have on parents and families? What are the collateral consequences of these interactions?

Following this introduction, I provide an overview of the contemporary research findings on school discipline and school security in Chapter 2. Within the same chapter, I continue by exploring current trends in parental involvement in schools including an exploration of the factors identified by contemporary research that encourage or dissuade involvement, with specific attention given to the roles of social capital and social status in these processes. Finally, I demonstrate how an understanding of the role school discipline and security may play in parental involvement is paramount to moving our understanding of these dynamics forward.

In Chapter 3, I describe the qualitative and quantitative data I use in this project. I also outline the specific methods I use to address each research question, and describe the specific analytic strategies I use in this project. Chapter 4 addresses the findings for the first and second research questions by exploring the extent to which school discipline and security impact parental involvement in the school using the quantitative data. In addition,

I also explore other factors contribute to parental involvement in the school. In Chapter 5, I provide a response to research questions three and four by outlining how social capital and social status relate to parental involvement and discipline, first using the quantitative data. Then, I use narratives from the qualitative data to contextualize these findings. Continuing in Chapter 6, I address research question five by outlining collateral consequences experienced by parents and families as an outcome of disciplinary processes, and demonstrate how social capital and status allows us to understand parents' experiences in school discipline. Finally, in Chapter 7, I provide a conclusion including policy implications, overall importance of this project, limitations, and directions for future research.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE, SECURITY, AND YOUTH AND PARENTAL OUTCOMES

In this chapter, I provide an overview of school security and discipline, and parental involvement in schools. First, I explore prior literature on school discipline and school security including current trends in discipline, and consequences of discipline. Then, I provide an overview of the role that parents play in schools including a discussion of how parents use social capital and social status to become involved in the schooling of their child. Next, I demonstrate how developing an understanding of how school discipline and security may impact parents is paramount given the rise in punitive school disciplinary policies in recent decades. Finally, using prior research on parents, social capital and social status, and school discipline, I posit that parents may be impacted by discipline, and that these effects may have additional consequences for children, parents, and the family.

2.1 School Discipline and School Security

Schools in the United States have experienced a significant increase in the use of harsh disciplinary policy and security measures over the past three decades (Casella, 2006). The growth in school security measures and discipline did not grow out of increased rates of violence in the school systems (Rocque, 2012). Rates of delinquency

have largely experienced a decline (Roberts et al., 2013) while harsh discipline and security have increased (Casella, 2006). As Kupchik and Monahan (2006) demonstrate, the increase in discipline and security in schools has largely been due to the wider effects of the post-industrial labor market and neoliberal state. Their general argument is that the rise in punitive school disciplinary measures has coincided with the broader rise in mass incarceration and neo-liberal accountability mechanisms throughout society, and poor students have been criminalized as a means to justify social inequalities (Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). Harsh discipline and invasive security in schools serves as a means to achieve this goal, and school discipline should be understood as a microcosm of broader trends in punishment in society. This explanation has largely been accepted among criminologists and sociologists who study school discipline and security (see also Hirschfield, 2008; Spring, 2010).

Scholars have noted that although the general public expected problem behavior in urban schools (Devine, 1996; Ferguson, 2001; Newman, 2004; Nolan, 2011), the late 1990s saw a number of highly publicized school shootings that occurred in unexpected venues of predominately White, middle-class suburbia (Phaneuf, 2009; Rocque, 2012). Around the same time, concern over terrorist attacks against the United States following the events of September 11th, 2001, prompted greater fear that schools may become future targets (Altheide, 2009). These events brought the issue of school safety to the forefront of public awareness (Addington, 2009; Newman, 2004; Rocque, 2012), and became the face of the movement in increasing school discipline and security (Rocque, 2012). The rise in public awareness directly relates to the increasing call for greater

security within the hallways of American schools by parents, teachers, policy-makers, and students (Addington, 2009; Casella, 2003). Taken together, school shootings have become the general public's justification (Addington, 2009; Rocque, 2012) for what was already occurring and has been described in the literature as the New American School (Kupchik & Monahan, 2008), or the criminalization of schools in the United States (Hirschfield, 2008).

2.1.1 Contemporary School Disciplinary Discourse

Coinciding with the increase of public attention (see Addington, 2009 for an overview) given to school behavioral issues and school safety, Federal, local, and state governments implemented numerous policies geared towards protecting America's youth in the school system. As many researchers have argued, the focus on punitive discipline has resulted in a shift in the way school disciplinary measures are used (see Casella, 2003; Coon, 2007; Lynch, 2010). Contemporary security measures and harsh disciplinary practices are typified by invasive techniques and are now generally geared around zero tolerance and uniformly-strict implementation of rules and sanctions in many schools. Skiba and Noam (2001) suggest that zero tolerance policies are "...intended primarily as a method of sending a message that certain behaviors will not be tolerated, by punishing all offenses severely, no matter how minor" (p. 20). The use of zero tolerance policies quickly spread over into the American education system and by 1990 at least some level of zero tolerance aimed at reducing school violence was in effect in around 80 percent of all schools in the United States (Skiba & Noam, 2001; Phaneuf,

2009). Since then, this orientation to punishment and security has spread and continues to be used (Kahtka, 2011; Morris, 2013).

It is important to highlight that the body of literature on school discipline also shows that fair and consistent punishment is necessary in order to protect students (see Arum and Velez, 2012; Arum et al., 2012). When rules and punishment are applied fairly and uniformly irrespective of race, class, or gender, students do benefit. Yet, the use of harsh disciplinary tactics in response to relatively minor offenses have resulted in some seemingly unintended consequences. Stories of students being suspended or expelled for infractions such as the possession of a steak knife in a lunch box, a boy scout with a multipurpose tool in his pocket, students sharing a cough drop, and the possession of toy weapons, occur with striking regularity (Skiba & Noam, 2001). Other anecdotal stories have emerged showing many students suffer at the hands of harsh discipline for minor behavior such as play fighting, arriving late to school or class, and failing to adhere to the school dress codes (Fuentes, 2011). Suspensions are even used when a student fails to tuck in her shirt properly (Morris, 2013). Prior to the shift to centralized control and uniformly enforced punishment, these issues were generally corrected through family resources and parent-teacher intervention. (Kaftka, 2011). The “New American School” (Kupchik & Monahan, 2006) has led to many of these seemingly harmless or accidental infractions being punished more severely.

School discipline and school security are two distinct components of school practice, but together they represent the constellation of school responses to student misbehavior and control (Casella, 2006; Fuentes, 2011; Harber, 2004; Kupchik, 2010).

Not coincidentally, studies have found increased use of security practices in virtually all levels of secondary education over the past three decades. As of 2011, nearly 92 percent of all secondary schools required visitors to sign-in upon entering the school (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2013); nearly 81 percent of all secondary schools reported a closed campus for lunch; 12 percent reported using metal detectors; 69 percent reported random drug sweeps; 61 percent reported security camera use; and finally, nearly 55 percent of all secondary schools reported using a police or school resource officer each day on campus, which is up nearly 25 percent since 1997 (U.S. Department of Education, 2012; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2013). These rates have increased each year since the U.S. Department of Education began tracking security measure use and disciplinary strategies (Robers, 2014; see also Casella, 2006 for trends up to 2005). In addition, 77 percent of all students report observing the use of one or more security cameras in their schools, which is a seven percent increase from 2009, and a 38 percent increase since 2001 (BJS, 2013, p. viii).

Documenting these changes is important to understand as it relates to an overall change in the disciplinary strategies of schools. Casella (2006) argues schools now resemble a pseudo-branch of national security as they use many of the same “weapons” as police departments and branches of the military to maintain a safe environment. Armed personnel, metal detectors, x-ray machines, surveillance equipment, and the use of canines are all representative of high security environments and policing/military strategies. This body of research demonstrates this change in orientation within the school system generally views students as subjects—and some scholars have even go so

far as to suggest that students are more analogous to inmates (see Fuentes, 2011)—as opposed to invested participants within the educational system.

2.1.2 Notable Trends in Discipline and Security

As discussed at length above, researchers have argued this increase in disciplinary policy and security has increased the punitive tendency of schools in the United States (Fabelo et al., 2011; Fuentes, 2011; Insley, 2001; Muschert & Peguero, 2010). There are also notable trends in the disproportionate impact of these policies and measures along important demographic lines. Previous studies have found that Black students, compared to White and Latino/a students, are more likely to view disciplinary policies as unfair (Kupchik & Ellis, 2008), and other studies have found that Black and Hispanic students are far more likely to receive school punishment than their white counterparts for identical offenses, all else equal (Jung, 2007; Reyes, 2006; Townsend, 2000). Similar findings have been found along socioeconomic lines with poor and working-class students more likely to receive harsh punishment compared to middle- and upper-class youth (Morris, 2013; Verdugo, 2002).

Researchers have long documented that urban schools, with large proportions of disadvantaged minority youth, in the United States are more punitive in nature than middle-class, predominately White schools even when controlling for neighborhood crime rates (Eitle & Eitle, 2004; Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 2001). These findings suggest that predominately minority schools tend to be focused on discipline and conformity, as opposed to learning and creativity compared to predominately White,

middle-class schools. This has led some scholars to suggest that schools focusing on conformity—overwhelmingly schools dominated by minorities—are training students to be passive citizens willing to accept the authority of those who have power over them (Harber, 2004; Jung & Bonilla-Silva, 2011; Irwin et al., 2013; Kupchik, 2010).

Highlighting these findings further, Welch and Payne (2010) found that school disciplinary actions tended to be much more punitive in schools with larger populations of Black students (see also Welch & Payne, 2012). Schools with a greater proportion of Black students were less likely to use restorative practices in discipline, more likely to focus on severe punishment, more likely to use zero tolerance policies, more likely to use extreme measures of action (such as calling the police for minor offenses), and less likely to refer students with behavioral issues to the counselor. Other studies mirror this finding as Irwin et al. (2013) show that schools with high rates of racial/ethnic minority students use law enforcement and security personnel to a greater degree than schools with low levels of racial/ethnic minority students (see also Kupchik & Ward, 2014). Welch and Payne (2010) conclude, “Schools with a larger composition of [B]lack students are more likely to respond to student misbehavior in a harsh manner and less likely to respond restoratively” (p. 40).

In addition to racial and class dynamics of school discipline, some research finds that too much severity in punishment may actually lead to greater levels of delinquency and crime within a school. For example, Way (2011) found that students who perceived greater levels of strict rules actually engaged in more disruptive behavior compared to students who perceived lower levels of strictness in school rules and discipline. Schools

with more severe punishments actually exhibit more defiance and rule breaking among the student body. This counterintuitive finding suggest that although school rules must be enforced in order to have an effect on the student, an overtly harsh school atmosphere may actually encourage further delinquency (Way, 2011), resulting in the opposite of the intended effect of the harsh disciplinary tactic used. This is largely attributable to the deterioration of the school social climate decreasing levels of efficacy among students, teachers, and administrators resulting in more students misbehaving (see also Gordon, 2001).

Although the trends in increasingly harsh school punishment have been well documented, it is worth noting there have been recent calls for change in school discipline policy (see Kupchik et al., Forthcoming for an overview of political rhetoric in the United States). Kupchik et al. (Forthcoming) outline that beginning in December, 2012, the federal government began an ambitious investigation into the harmful effects of harsh school punishment by convening a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to explore the school-to-prison pipeline. This effort, among others, contributed to the publication of an open letter in 2014 by the Department of Education (DoE) and Department of Justice (DoJ) addressing harsh punishment and racial imbalances in school discipline (Department of Education, 2014). The DoE and DoJ outlined recommendations on using restorative justice rather than school suspensions or expulsions to combat student misbehavior. Similar movements and recommendations have also been observed at some local and state levels (see Evans & Didlick-Davis, 2012 for an overview). While these

efforts do seem to be occurring with increasing frequency, the extent to which these calls will transition into actual reform remains unknown.

Prior research has also explored the deleterious effects of these policies on students. Hirschfield (2008) demonstrates that harsh punishment and discipline often place poor, minority youth on the criminal justice “track” (p. 79), placing them at a greater risk of arrest and involvement in the formal justice system. In addition, students who receive a suspension once are at a greater risk of being suspended again (Fabelo et al., 2011; Polakow-Suransky, 2001), and may face being labeled as a problem student. Students who experience suspension or expulsion are also placed at a higher risk of failing to graduate high school and/or matriculating (Fabelo et al., 2011) as harsh punishment may lead to a student dropping, or being pushed, out (Polakow-Suransky, 2001). Clearly, there are significant consequences of these practices on students (Fabelo et al., 2011).

2.1.3 Collateral Consequences of Punishment

This emerging research on the negative consequences of harsh school punishment fit within a larger trend within criminology, as there is a vast amount of literature that explores the collateral consequences of punishment in general (Clear, 2008; Travis, 2002; Uggen et al., 2006). Specifically, researchers have connected school discipline with broader trends in punishment by shedding light on the so called “school-to-prison pipeline” that explores collateral consequences of student punishment within the school setting.

High rates of formal punishments such as incarceration can damage social networks, relationships, child development, family dynamics, and community infrastructure and cohesion (Clear, 2008; National Research Council, 2014). Harsh punishment may also break families apart and place strain on family members' emotional wellbeing (Braman, 2004). Individuals who are punished may experience a decrease in pro-social networks, but may not experience a decrease in relationships with others who are criminally active (Rengifo, 2007). This may lead an individual who has been punished to engage in more delinquent or criminal behavior.

Disrupted family bonds and emotional problems are not the only collateral consequences of punishment. Families may also encounter financial strain as a result of lost work, and of the expense of engaging with the criminal justice system (Christian, 2004). In studying family efforts to cope with incarceration, Christian (2004) suggests that both fiscal and emotional costs have a direct negative impact on the wellbeing of family members due to overtly harsh punishment. While this research does not specifically address school punishment, it is possible that fiscal and emotional issues may arise among the collateral consequences of school punishment as well, especially if the parent is forced to take time off work, or pay for legal representation. Research has also shown that punishment can have other far-reaching effects by discouraging civic engagement and impairing an individual's ability to find work and forge meaningful relationships (Uggen et al., 2006).

Moving beyond what we know about the collateral consequences of punishment more broadly, there is also a body of literature outlining long-term consequences

experienced by students who are removed from school, too. Students who are removed from school tend to have lower self-esteem than students who are not removed (Lawrence, 2007). While some students drop out of school voluntarily, when a school fails to retain a student, though the student wishes to stay, they are called “pushouts” (Lawrence, 2007). Students who are pushed out are more likely to spend time in prison than students who are not pushed out (Hatt, 2011; Verdugo, 2002), and may face the stigma of being labeled criminals for the remainders of their lives. Students who are removed from school and placed in juvenile detention halls or adult prisons are also more likely to become victims of violence, rape, and suicide (Casella, 2001). Research has also shown some school officials adopted disciplinary policies to push out students who were deemed as problematic students (Bowditch, 1993). Schools may find it easier to push out “problem” students than to engage with the student in order to reform them (Bowditch, 1993). Yet, we know this is problematic, which I discuss below.

One of the features of the school-to-prison pipeline is the formation and emergence of formal and informal partnerships between local and state law enforcement agencies and school officials (Heitzeg, 2009). Many schools have seen the decision making aspects of punishment turned over from school authority to local police and prosecutors. This is increasingly important to understand as numerous studies show that the majority of incarcerated students fail to graduate from a traditional high school (Evans & Didlick-Davis, 2012; Swanson, 2006; Zeiderberg & Schiraldi, 2002). Increasing drop-out rates tend to have spill-over effects into already disadvantaged communities (Roberts, 2004), especially because low-income minority students tend to

be differentially impacted by harsh punishment and zero tolerance policies (Hatt, 2011; Fowler, 2011). Coupled with findings that students who are pushed out of school are more likely to engage with the criminal justice system (Verdugo, 2002), and have lower self-esteem and employment prospects (Lawrence, 2007; Tuck, 2012), the collateral consequences may not end with effects on the student.

Though there is not any existing literature on the collateral consequences of school discipline on parents, it is possible that parents with children who receive harsh punishment may be less likely to become involved with the school. As Black and Hispanic students are much more likely to be severely punished relative to White students, and lower income students are more likely to be punished than middle- and upper-class students, there may also be important racial and class differences in how severely such consequences are felt. Harsh punishment may further deter racial and ethnic minority parents or poor parents in becoming or remaining involved with the school. Parents may also suffer from financial, emotional, and physical strain as a result of their children experiencing punishment. Overall, what remains yet to be seen is the effect of these measures and policies on parents, and the potential collateral consequences that may occur due to these processes.

Research Question 1: Do school security measures and school discipline affect parental involvement within the school?

2.2 Parents and Schools

The important role parents play in their child's education has been well documented (see Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2007; The National Science

Teachers Association, 2009). Parents are usually the first teachers in the life of a child, and this interest is not lost when the child enters the formal education system. Parents consistently cite involvement in the schooling of their child as among one of the most important functions of parenthood (Coleman, 1998), and this finding remains regardless of race, ethnicity, social class, or educational-level of the parent (Barton et al., 2004; Carlisle et al., 2005; Coleman, 1998; Muller, 1998; Shriner et al., 2010). Studies have shown that parental involvement is directly associated with higher levels of academic achievement, and students who have involved parents generally experience better rates of attendance, higher math and reading scores, higher graduation rates, and lower rates of grade retention (Fan & Chen, 2001; Hill & Taylor, 2004; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995; LaRocque et al., 2011; Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Further, parental involvement has a positive impact on the overall quality of a student's education, and is linked to a multitude of positive non-academic outcomes such as higher levels of self-esteem (Cripps & Zyromski, 2009; Kaplan, 2013), and better behavior at school (Lassiter & Perry, 2009).

These findings highlight the important role parental involvement within the schools plays in the process of socialization for children. Studies overwhelmingly find that successful parents, those defined as raising pro-social children, often involve themselves in the educational realm in order to promote academic achievement, the endeavors of their children, and to emphasize the importance and value of education (Muller, 1998). In becoming involved with the educational institution, parents are able to connect familial values and their relationship with their child to the broader context of the school setting (Steinberg et al., 1996). In sum, parental involvement with actors in the

school is crucial to both a child's cognitive development and the transitional process children undergo as they develop into autonomous adults.

There are also some notable trends in parental involvement in schools. According to a recent report by the U.S. Department of Education, parental involvement in public K-12 schools rose between 1999 and 2007, but has generally decreased since then (Noel et al., 2013). As of 2012, approximately 87 percent of all parents reported attending a general meeting at the school, 76 percent reported attending a scheduled meeting with a teacher, 74 percent reported attending a school or class event, and 42 percent reported serving on a school-related committee in K-12 schools (Noel et al., 2013).

Important differences exist in parental involvement by school type as well. Parents are most likely to become involved in primary school, and involvement tends to decrease as the student progresses through middle and high school (Noel et al., 2013). For example, in 2012, 54 percent of parents with children in elementary school reported volunteering in the school compared to just 28 percent of parents with a child in high school. Looking specifically at parental involvement with children in high school, parental involvement has generally been decreasing—or remained stagnant—since 1997 across all measures (e.g. attending a general meeting, attending a scheduled meeting, attending a school/class event, serving on a school-related committee (Noel et al., 2013)).

While parental involvement with the educational process of their child/children can occur within the home (DePlanty et al., 2007), community, or school setting (Crosnoe, 2001), there are many factors that contribute to a parent's ability to freely engage at these levels. Following is an exploration of both individual and school-level

factors that shape parental involvement in the educational process. Next, I overview literature on the theoretical mechanisms—social capital and social status—that allow us to understand these dynamics. At the end of this section, I argue that school discipline and security may be significantly overlooked influences on parental involvement and social capital theory allows us to understand patterns in the collateral consequences of discipline.

Research Question 2: What school-level and individual-level characteristics of parents and students relate to parental involvement in schools?

2.2.1 Individual-Level Factors

There is a large body of literature that explores how specific individual-level factors relate to involvement in school broadly. Most parents have been found to highly value involvement within the school (Coleman, 1998; Parker-Jenkins, 2007), but studies consistently show parental circumstances and characteristics highly impact a parent's ability to successfully become involved (Schneider & Coleman, 1993). Below, I explore how individual-level factors relate to parental involvement,

2.2.1.1 Race and Ethnicity

Past research has found that White parents are significantly more involved in the formal educational process than Black or Hispanic parents (Noel et al., 2013; Overstreet et al., 2005; Unseem, 1992). However, Crosnoe (2001) finds that this difference could simply be a broader reflection of the historical legacy of the exclusion of Black and Hispanic individuals from the institution of schooling, resulting in Black and Hispanic

parents remaining less likely to become involved within their child's school. In this light, prior research has found that racial minorities are much less likely to trust in traditional institutions, such as schools (Lareau & Horvat, 1999). For example, Elder et al., (1995) found that Black parents face unique barriers in engaging with formal institutional participation, including schools. The authors find that African-Americans face an historical legacy of distrust of the schools systems; Black parents often feel that such institutions are resistant to act on their behalf, and are therefore less likely to become formally involved within the school setting (see also Friedman et al., 2006).

It is important to distinguish that minority parents do not hold less value in educational involvement; but rather, they may express their interest in their child's education differently. While minority parents are less likely to become actively involved with the school system, they are no less likely to assist their child in informal capacities within the home (Lareau & Horvat, 1999). Furstenberg (1993) found similar strategies in Hispanic families, too. In the case of Hispanic families, cultural norms are often misinterpreted as a lack of involvement. For example, Latino families tend to respect the teacher's role as an expert with specialized skills, and thus questioning the teacher may be considered disrespectful (Bower & Griffin, 2011). In this vein, Williams and Kornblum-Williams (1994) found that both Black and Hispanic parents tended to employ strategies to engage their child with informal institutional resources, such as tutoring programs and recreation centers, with the goal of promoting positive social behavior. In light of this, DePlanty et al., (2007) found that both students and teachers believed the

parent had a greater impact on the student's financial success by becoming involved with the child at home, as opposed to working within the school proper.

2.2.1.2 Socioeconomic status

Along with race, the socioeconomic status of a family greatly impacts the parents' ability to become involved in their child's education. Parents who struggle economically often face rigid work schedules, transportation issues, and child care needs that prevent them from attending or volunteering for school events (Hill & Taylor, 2004). For some families, employment issues, as characterized by hourly jobs with inadequate benefits, result in an inability to participate to the extent that their middle-class salaried counterparts can (Barton et al., 2004; Elder et al., 1995). Overall, traditional definitions of parental involvement require investments of time and money from parents (Bower & Griffin, 2011) and parents who lack monetary resources are often deemed inadequately involved. For example, due to an inability to interact formally with the school due to long work hours, parents from the working-class often report their efforts to advocate for their child go ignored (Barton et al., 2004), again highlighting the important role of social capital in this process. In turn, the insights of such parents are often disregarded because they are not respected as active participants (Koonce & Harper, 2005). As a consequence of this, the dismissal of their insights further alienates these parents and leads to a cycle of increased withdrawal from involvement. Taken together, parents from the working-class are often viewed as "difficult" by teachers and administrators.

In *Unequal Childhoods*, Lareau (2003) studied 12 different families to explore how social class-based norms are reflected in parental involvement with their children,

and with children's schooling. According to Lareau (2003), middle-class parents engage in "concerted cultivation" whereby they engage actively with their child's socialization process, especially within school and school-related activities. Middle-class parents closely monitor their child's experience within the school, and develop clear expectations of how their child interacts with school officials. Middle-class parents also develop the expectation that their child question authority and engage in critical discussions with individuals in authority (re: teachers). These values are reinforced by the parent at home as well as within the school setting.

Lareau (2003) finds that working-class families engage in "the accomplishment of natural growth" whereby working-class and poor parents still exhibit similar levels of love and support as middle-class parents, but they often do so with a hands-off approach. Working-class and poor parents tend to engage with their child through directions, as opposed to negotiations. This overflows into the arena of schooling as children from working-class families are taught to follow authority, and not to question it. Finally, Lareau (2003) finds that working-class families are often distrustful of the school, and tend to lack the access to resources that would allow them to engage with the school.

Similar findings have been mirrored in other work. For example, Diamond and Gomez (2004) studied 18 families over the course of a year and found that working-class parents viewed the home and the school as entirely different arenas. At home, working-class parents viewed themselves as the expert and authority of the family, able to command respect from their child, set rules, and provide guidance. Working-class parents viewed the educators and school officials as legitimate authorities within the

school, and cited that it would be inappropriate for them to make demands to the school as that would be to question the authority and expertise of the educators. Diamond and Gomez (2004) also found working-class parents were hesitant to engage in educational activities within the home as that would be to question to authority and ability of the school officials as well. The authors suggest this process is vastly different than middle-class experiences as middle-class parents were far more likely to see educators as working together with them, as opposed to working from a position of authority.

Socioeconomic status can also be reflected in family stability, wherein “intact” families generally have a greater degree of social support, thus allowing them time and encouragement to engage themselves within the school in more formal capacities (Eccles & Harold, 1993). Likewise a parent’s level of education influences a parent’s ability to formally participate in the educational process (Pate & Andrews, 2006). This is due, in part, to varying degrees in the understanding of how the educational system works, again related to the social capital framework. Parents with higher levels of education may feel more comfortable interacting with an institution they are familiar with. As a child ages through the educational system, less formally educated parents may demonstrate decreased involvement because they become less comfortable in discussing their child’s curriculum.

2.2.1.3 Race and Class Interactions

In providing a general conclusion based on decades of ethnographic and focus group work in schools, Noguera (2003) finds, “...I often have found that even when educators assert that they want to get parents involved in the education of their children,

parents are more likely to be excluded and treated with disregard if they are poor, uneducated, and non-White” (p. 49). Likewise, Howard and Reynolds (2008) find that working-class and/or Black/Hispanic parents are generally not afforded decision making positions such as positions on the school board or other local government opportunities. While these parents are often encouraged to volunteer within the school, administrators and teachers often exhibit a large degree of discretion in allowing parents to engage in the school (Howard & Reynolds, 2008). Therefore, while many parents state that they want to be involved in the school, there may be official and unofficial barriers that present some parents from freely engaging with the educational institution largely due to variations in social capital.

As Howard and Reynolds (2008) note, research on middle-class African-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic student and parent experiences in schools remains relatively unstudied. Yet, the research that does exist on the intersection of race and class show that even when holding social class constant, Black and Hispanic students attending middle-class schools still have lower levels of achievement than their White middle-class counterparts (Howard & Reynolds, 2008). Other research has found similar trends (Ferguson, 2002; Ogbu, 2003). Though much is known about the achievement gap, few studies have explored parental involvement by race and class together.

Looking specifically at Black and Asian-American middle-class parental involvement in schools Diamond et al. (2004) found that Black and Asian-American parents had similar expectations of success for their children in school, but engage in entirely different involvement techniques. Black parents were more likely to become

involved with the process of schooling for their child within the home, while Asian-American families were more likely to be active in school. Diamond and colleagues (2004) suggest this is due to cultural expectations of parents, communities, and even schools, and that Asian-American parents may feel more welcomed by school officials than do Black parents.

In a large ethnographic study, Howard and Reynolds (2008) examined parental experiences in schools among middle-class Black parents. Seeking to understand the middle-class Black parent experience, the authors found an array of responses, but many parents cited racial discrimination as a barrier to advocate for their child, while others believed it was best to engage in schooling at home and not “rock the boat” in the school setting (p. 93). The authors demonstrate that social class alone is simply not enough for many parents to overcome structural and institutionally-based racial barriers, but that all middle class Black parents believed their involvement—in whatever form available to them—was crucial for the success of their child. Highlighting this finding, one respondent stated:

In many ways, when educators know that you are informed, they make sure that they do right by your children. So that would be my number one issue, get involved, and make sure they (school personnel) know who you are. (Howard & Reynolds, 2008, p. 91)

Overall, this statement captures a common theme expressed by many of the respondents in the study. Middle-class Black parents felt the need to become involved in the school to advocate for their child (Howard & Reynolds, 2008). In a similar manner, other respondents stated that it was important for them to become formally involved in the school so their children could see that they could exceed in the same capacity as children

of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. In sum, the relationship between race, class, and parental involvement is complex, further highlighting the need to explore patterns among combinations of both race and class.

2.2.2 School-Level Factors

While individual factors are important when considering parental involvement within the school, school-level characteristics also play an important role in predicting parental involvement. In fact, some researchers have found that school-level generally exert a much more robust relationship on parental involvement than individual level factors (Epstein, 1995), though there hardly appears to be any general consensus among researchers (for an overview of this debate see Crosnoe, 2001).

2.2.2.1 School Size

Past research has established the size of the school significantly correlates with parental involvement whereby larger schools experience lower levels of parental involvement (Meier, 1996; Dee et al., 2007) due to a number of reasons. Large schools are generally characterized by lower intra-personal relations between school officials and parents compared to smaller schools (Meier, 1996). In addition, there may be an indirect effect between school size and parental involvement whereby teachers often feel alienated from the student, and therefore do not interact with the parent because teacher-student interaction is limited. In addition, parent-teacher associations, while generally declining in schools of all sizes, are more likely to function in smaller schools (Putnam, 2000) which may increase teacher-parent interaction.

As a result of this dynamic, private schools, which are typically smaller than public schools, and middle schools, which are typically smaller than high schools, tend to have greater levels of parental involvement due to increased levels of contact between actors within the school and the parents. Parents may feel more comfortable interacting with a teacher or administrator to whom they feel personally connected (Dee et al., 2007). This finding is overwhelmingly found in the literature on school size and parental involvement, even when accounting for the influence of economic status, family structure, funding, and geographic location (Dee et al., 2007).

2.2.2.2 School Socioeconomic Status

Previous research has also found that the socioeconomic status of the school and neighborhood significantly predict patterns of parental involvement. As Muller and Kerbow (1993) highlight, educators in more affluent schools may believe that parents of students in these schools have a better understanding of the educational process. In addition, as more affluent schools tend to have higher standardized test scores, there may be less tension between the administration of the school and the parents because the children are, overall, successful (Muller & Kerbow, 1993). Thus, in schools where the modal socioeconomic status of the family is higher, there are generally greater levels of parental involvement.

In addition, schools in higher income areas tend to have access to better resources, often providing the newest forms of education and educational technology. The abundance of resources often attracts more highly qualified and experienced teachers (Kozol, 1992), which often correlates with more active parents within the school (Hill et

al., 2004). Further, as Kozol (1992) demonstrates, schools in poorer neighborhoods are much more likely to experience unsafe conditions—such as inadequate lighting, unpredictable plumbing, and perceived unsafe outdoor space—more affluent schools typically do not have, and as a result, parental involvement is often higher in such schools.

2.2.2.3 Racial and Ethnic School Composition

Another important factor that plays a significant role in parental involvement concerns the racial and ethnic make-up of the institution. Teachers and administrators in predominately White schools are more likely to view the involvement of minority parents as interference to the process of formal education (Steinberg et al., 1996). Such situations generally occur because White administrators and teachers are less likely to believe the minority parent to be knowledgeable about the educational process compared to White parents. The influence of this is often hard to separate from the influence of the socioeconomic status of the school, as predominately minority schools are significantly more likely to be underfunded than predominately White schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012).

In stark contrast, schools with a higher proportion of minority students—and a higher degree of minority teachers—generally experience a greater degree of minority parents who are formally involved with the schools. Kerbow and Bernhardt (1993) suggest this is due to feelings of similarity whereby school teachers and administrators feel more comfortable reaching out to minority parents, and minority parents, in turn, feel more comfortable becoming more involved with the school system. Researchers have

found that schools with greater Hispanic populations are generally better prepared to deal with the language barrier of parents by hiring bi-lingual teachers and staff (Crosnoe, 2001; Smith et al., 2009).

In sum, there are important predictors at both the individual and school level that have effects on levels of parental involvement within the school due to a number of circumstances previously outlined. The importance of parental involvement should not be overlooked. For example, Cotton and Wikelund (2001, np) stated:

...parents often begin their participation doubting that their involvement can make much of difference, and they are generally very gratified to discover what an important contribution they are able to make. In this connection, it is important for school people and parents to be aware that parental involvement supports student's learning, behavior, and attitudes regardless of factors such as parents' income, educational level, and whether or not parents are employed.

Similar statements have also been made by the National Science Teacher Association (NTSA, 2009). Clearly, parental involvement within the school has important effects on child development. What is equally clear, however, is that some schools may present an environment that is more or less conducive to parental involvement, and when individual-level factors are considered, these important differences may become magnified. Given the continuing increases in school disciplinary policies and security measures, it becomes correspondingly important to understand the relationship between discipline, security, and parental involvement and wellbeing. Following, I review the limited research on this topic, and draw connections between the literature on parental involvement, well-being, and discipline.

2.3 School Discipline and Parents...a Missing Link?

Perhaps unsurprisingly, research finds that schools experiencing greater degrees of parental involvement often experience lower levels of misbehavior in school, and involved parents tend to have students who receive less punishment than students whose parents are not involved (Lassiter & Perry, 2009). At the same time, there are still variations in the extent to which parental involvement relates to punishment for racial and ethnic minorities. Jung (2007) found that White students whose parents were involved in the school experienced lower levels of out-of-school suspensions compared to White students whose parents were not involved with the school. This pattern did not hold true for Black and Hispanic students, as parental involvement did not relate to out-of-school suspension rates for Black and Hispanic youth only.¹ Scholars suggest racial minorities do not receive the same benefits in regard to discipline as White students because they are more likely to be punished severely already (Skiba et al., 2001). That is, even if parental involvement protects students against punitive discipline, because Black and Hispanic students are more likely to receive harsh punishment, the effect of parental involvement on punishment is not as great for racial and ethnic minorities compared to White students. Yet, we do not know if students who receive punishment have parents who are less likely to become involved in the first place due to a lack of longitudinal

¹ Findings from this report should be taken with caution as it was not a peer-reviewed publication. Several methodological limitations are present. Parental involvement was measured as a single measure, which does not capture the multifaceted nature of parental involvement in school. Second, the analysis was completed using less than 60 percent of the original sample. Third, the finding in regards to parental involvement is a footnote, and no comparison of coefficients test was done between Black, Hispanic, and White students. Therefore, while it appears there may be a difference in regards to discipline by race and parental involvement, no rigorous methodological hypothesis testing was done by Jung (2007).

research on this topic, how school discipline impacts levels of parental involvement, and how parental involvement within the school impacts the disciplinary process for their children.

Although the importance of parental involvement has been well documented, and the deleterious effects of harsh school disciplinary strategies and security measures on student outcomes have been investigated as well, what remains unclear is the effect disciplinary policies and security measures have on parents and parental involvement.

Take for example, the following narrative from *Lockdown High*:

In fall 2005, Shaquanda was fourteen and a ninth grader at Paris High School...her mother told her to go to school early to see the nurse for Prevacid and her ADHD meds. But a...teacher stopped her inside the school...saying she could not enter early. As Shaquanda was about to exit, she saw two white students enter and asked why she couldn't also go in...The school district claimed Shaquanda pushed the woman and caused her injury, although there was no medical evidence to support that. Shaquanda claimed the woman pushed her first and she reacted to it. No one debates the result: the school police arrested Shaquanda, and she was charged in March 2006, convicted of assault, and sentenced to seven years in a juvenile detention center run by the Texas Youth Commission (Fuentes, 2011, p.53)²

While anecdotes like this are alarmingly common in the literature on school discipline and security, what is missing from many of these narratives is the effect these occurrences have on parental involvement in the school, as well as parental emotional well-being. It is possible that the growth in security measures such as the use of police officer and metal detectors represent a school that is less conducive to parental involvement than has historically been the case. Schools using “pseudo-military” forms

² Shaquanda eventually completed her GED, but was not allowed to return to public school.

of school security may present an intimidating formal institution that dissuades parents from involvement. For example, in a recent interview when asked about the importance of balancing safety while maintaining an inclusion environment, a principle at Trinity High School in New York City stated, “Attending to the literal and physical safety of children is critical... But so is creating an emotionally safe place and you don't feel that way if you look like an armed fortress” (Hollander, 2013, np). This demonstrates there is the recognition—even from school administrators—that overt use of school security measures and discipline may present an unwelcoming environment to individuals involved with the school. This may extend to parents.

In addition to the effect of visible security measures, parents with children who receive harsh discipline may become less likely to view the school as an entity that is willing to work on their behalf. This may lead the parent to believe their involvement has little effect on potential outcomes involving their child within the school including discipline. This is especially important to investigate as research has established Black and Hispanic families, and working-class individuals, are already less likely to view school as an entity of inclusion (Elder, 1995; Friedman et al., 2006). It seems plausible the disciplinary climate of the school may impede the parent’s ability to interact with the school, and could have far reaching consequences on the parent and family. Scholars suggest that one way in which to understand parental involvement in school is to understand how social capital allows, or does not allow, some parents to become involved. Following, I overview this body of literature and then tie it into the discussion of school discipline and security.

2.4 Social Capital and Social Status

While the previously outlined research findings and frameworks provide a theoretical orientation to understand why schools use punitive punishments (see also Garland, 2001; Simon, 2007), and how this effects some student outcomes, it does not explain parental interactions within the school, nor does it explain why some parents are differentially impacted by punishment and security. In order to understand how parents might influence school discipline and how effects of discipline vary across important demographics, I draw on social capital theory and previous work on social status.

Social capital can be loosely defined as, "...social networks, the reciprocities that arise[s] from them and the value of these for achieving mutual goals" (Schuller et al., 2000, p. 1). In the most basic sense, social capital refers to the constellation of benefits individuals derive from their networks and associations with other individuals and organizations. Trust, connectedness, and mutual understanding with others are key components of social capital. These elements facilitate communication and the development of ties and bonds—both formal and informal—between individuals, groups, and organizations. Individuals with social capital often use their capital and social connectedness in order to promote their interests (Durant, 2011) and actively seek to transfer social capital to their family and children (Shriner et al., 2009). Closely related to social capital, social status generally refers to the benefits one receives from ascribed social characteristics such as race, social class, and gender. Members of dominant social groups generally enjoy some level of privilege due to their social status. For example, White, heterosexual, males in the United States generally experience social privilege due

to their status compared to their non-white, homosexual, and female counterparts (Schuller et al., 2000). Social status, then, is often used to generate, or compliment, social capital.

Individuals do not simply choose to have or not to have social capital and/or social status. Life conditions and social statuses such as birth, race, social class, and other levels of social capital such as employment and political affiliation directly impact an individual's ability to successfully generate and maintain social capital, and enjoy privilege due to status. As a result of this, working- and lower-class individuals in society generally do not have access to the same degree of social capital as their middle- and upper-class counterparts (Saegert et al., 2001). When there is a strong imbalance in social capital and social status, those without social privilege and/or status find it difficult to develop social capital (Marika, 2011), and are less likely to effectively engage in behaviors that would benefit them to the same degree that those with capital are able to do. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there is a strong relationship between social status and social capital.

A significant amount of research has explored how social capital and status impacts individual's lives (see Adler & Kwon, 2002). For example, previous research has found that social capital is often used by individuals to secure goods and services who lack traditional means to do so (Wolff & Draine, 2004). Turning to the literature on punishment and social capital, previous work demonstrates that formerly incarcerated individuals often use social connections to other formerly incarcerated individuals to secure housing, transportation, or employment during reentry (see Wolff & Draine,

2004). This form of social capital refers to what Bourdieu called less institutionalized relationships (Bourdieu, 1986). That is, these dimensions of social capital exist outside of the traditional, institutionalized forms of social capital in the form of social networks. What makes less institutionalized means of social capital important is that they are often underscored by obligation and mutual trust (Putnam, 2000; Uslaner, 2002), especially in populations of peoples who lack traditional social capital such as economic resources, or social status, such as racial and ethnic status.

Research has established that dimensions of social capital and social status are related to a whole host of outcomes outside of the criminological literature, which underscores the importance of social capital and social status. For example, recent studies have found that individuals with social capital will use the social capital to promote better health outcomes for themselves and their families (Moudatsou et al., 2014), secure goods and services such as housing (Rodriguez-Pose et al., 2014), and even promote positive social networking relationships (Jiang, 2014) and rights for their pets (Graham et al., 2014). In fact, previous work also shows that individuals with social capital and higher dimensions of social status reported greater levels of happiness compared to individuals who lack these dimensions (Rodriguez-Pose et al., 2014). What the review of these findings shows is that social capital and social status are important constructs that have been used in many bodies of research. Yet, what remains especially clear is that implicit in these findings is that levels of social capital are more readily afforded to the privileged members of society due, in large part, to dimensions of social

status and individuals who face disadvantage often face barriers in cultivating and using social capital.

The concentrated disadvantage and racial segregation of inner-cities often preclude the poor, and ethnic and racial minorities from successfully generating social capital compared to White, middle- and upper-class individuals (Fieldhouse & Cutts, 2010). Yet, there is a degree of autonomy in this process, and scholars have sought to explore how low-income individuals, and other individuals without social status, work to generate social capital through other avenues. Social scientists have found that “bridging” and “bonding” are mechanisms by which disadvantaged individuals may be able to secure social capital (Patulny & Svendsen, 2007). Bridging refers to the process by which poor individuals are able to connect to individuals with social capital through institutional connections. For example, a poor parent may be able to connect to broader social networks through their involvement in their child’s school. Through becoming involved with this institution, working-class individuals may be able to create a “bridge” to others with social capital. Yet, the degree to which poor and/or racial and ethnic minorities may be able to use institutional connections for social capital is generally negligible, though there are exceptions (see Patulny & Svendsen, 2007 for an overview). Prior research has found that poor individuals are less likely to actively participate in formal institutions, and their absence of participation generally results in further marginalization (Nogeura, 2003).

On the other hand, bonding is a process that refers to the connections forged between individuals without social capital. In these cases, working-class individuals may

be able to form ties with other disadvantaged individuals and may be able to coalesce these connections into collective action. Yet, research has found that disadvantaged communities are often characterized by ethnic heterogeneity and high residential mobility, factors that generally promote isolation and dissuade collective action. In turn, this promotes competition over resources and tends to result in a lack of collective action (Letki, 2008). While social bonding among individuals without social capital may result in the collective generation of social capital, structural conditions tend to preclude this process from coming to fruition.

Finally, disadvantaged neighborhoods tend to experience a lack of strong social institutions, or institutions that are willing to act on the behalf of residents (see Marshall & Stolle, 2004). Wacquant (1998) argues that institutions in urban areas may actually serve to undermine collective social cohesion among residents because of the lack of action taken on behalf of members of the community. In studying a large town in southern California, Noguera (2003) shows that while some urban areas have community centers or churches that exist to create connections among residents, these institutions do not necessarily generate social cohesion among residents. Instead, powerful Black churches are more likely to draw membership from middle-class Black citizens, and not the poor and otherwise disadvantaged citizens living in the area in which the church is located. In this same study, Noguera (2003) finds that inner-city residents are likely to cite that community centers become havens for drug dealers and other illicit activities, thereby decreasing social cohesion through these institutions, supporting other work finding that some formal institutions undermine social cohesion in the inner city (e.g.

Wacquant, 1998). Taken together, the high levels of racial and class segregation in the United States often result in the inability for individuals located in these areas, who lack social status, to generate social capital compared to middle- and upper-class communities.

2.4.1 Social Capital, Status, and Schools

Prior research has applied the lens of social capital theory, including an understanding of social status, to explain differences in family outcomes within the academic realm based on the family's access to resources (Mullis et al., 2003). Overall, research generally finds the quality of education is significantly impacted by the social capital and status of the parent (Coleman, 1988, Lareau, 1989). For example, Israel and colleagues (2001) found that high school students residing in two-parent households experienced higher academic achievement than students living in one-parent households, largely due to variations in social status. The authors suggest this is a direct reflection on the greater source and strength of social capital that two-parent households generally experience. This mirrors findings in more recent research applying the lens of social capital theory to families, children, and school outcomes (Shiller et al., 2010). Families with greater levels of social capital, and families with status, have more successful children in the school setting as they are able to take advantage of that social capital to influence various outcomes through direct, and positive, involvement (Hampden-Thompson & Pong, 2005).

Across the United States, children generally enroll in public schools based on the communities where they live (Kozol, 1992; 2005). Because of racial and class isolation,

disadvantaged children generally enroll in the lowest performing schools that exhibit less effective teachers, lower test scores, worse building conditions, and far fewer scholastic and extracurricular activities compared to schools located in suburban America (Kozol, 1992). In this way, underperforming schools often contribute to the gap in social capital among these populations, and preclude members of this populations from generating capital due to low levels of status (Morrow, 1999).

Noguera (2003) finds that middle-class parents are generally able to exert pressure onto social officials in order to influence outcomes in their favor. These parents tend to have access to financial resources, legal recourses, and strong unions and community organizations that are generally able to participate in—and impact—school processes. On the other hand, no such organizations or connections exist among the poor, and because of this, poor parents and children generally lack advocates who work on their behalf. When poor parents are able to organize, they general lack the resources to successfully sustain their efforts, and because of this, are generally unable to see that their interests are fulfilled. School officials also find it much easier to simply ignore the demands of poor parents. This can largely be attributed to the strong imbalance of social capital and status between the middle- and working-classes (Nogeura, 2003).

Nogeura (2003) also finds that political connections and financial resources are only part of the complex explanation for the stark differences observed between working- and middle-class parental influences in schools. Individuals among the lower socioeconomic classes, and Black and Hispanic parents especially, are simply treated differently by school officials than their White, middle-class counterparts (Lareau, 1989).

Although White, middle-class parents generally have social capital and financial resources, such as access to transportation and money, and networks, such as lawyers and PTAs, poor parents tend to lack these resources due to their disadvantaged status. Through a study conducted in Oakland, California, Noguera (2003) finds that even middle-class, White parents who may lack access to some forms of social capital, are still able to withdraw their child from a school they are unhappy with due to their social status. Poor parents tend to lack this option, and because of this, their satisfaction with the educational system tends to have little bearing on any changes that might otherwise occur within the school.

All of the above findings highlight how social capital and social status play an important role for parents, communities, and families with the school, and how social capital is unevenly divided among racial and economic groups (measures of social status). Due to these dynamics, poor parents are less likely to be able to intervene in the process of education, and as Noguera (2003) highlights, "...as a "captured market" they [poor individuals] are a group of consumers who are compelled to accept the quality of educational services provided to them, whether they like it or not" (p.94).

While social capital theory and social status have been used to understand how parents engage with the school in order to promote achievement in success of their child, these constructs have not yet been applied to exploring school discipline, security, and parental involvement. Yet, social capital theory and social status provide a way to understand 1) parental involvement within the school, and the relationship between school security and discipline and involvement, and 2) why there may be variation among

parents in their ability to successfully navigate disciplinary proceedings and influence outcomes. We know that parents with higher levels of social capital and those with status are generally able engage with the school more so than parents who lack social capital and social status (Crosnoe, 2001, Lareau, 2003; Mullis et al., 2003; Noguera, 2003; Shiller et al., 2010). It is likely the same pattern may be found in disciplinary proceedings as parents with social capital and status may be received as invested participants in the proceedings to a much greater degree compared to parents without social capital and with lower levels of status.

Research Question 3: How does parental status shape school discipline? Does parental social capital interact with other measures of parental social status (e.g., race) and school characteristics (e.g., school size, security practices) in shaping school discipline?

Similarly, it seems likely that parents with social capital and social status will be much more likely to successfully interact with teachers/administrators in reducing the severity of punishments given to their children due to the social networks they belong to, and the social and political power they yield. In this vein, individuals who lack social capital and social status will be less likely to engage in disciplinary processes, and when they are able to engage, they will be less likely to influence outcomes in their favor.

Research Question 4: What do parents experience during school disciplinary processes, and are these experiences conditioned by social capital and social status? How does this relate to outcomes of the meetings/proceedings?

2.5 Collateral Consequences, Social Capital and Status, and School Discipline

Understanding factors—like social capital and social status—that relate parents’ experiences in discipline are of utmost importance, but we must also consider the corresponding effects of discipline on parents and families. That is, while dimensions of social capital and variations in social status play an important role in predicting whether or not parents experience success in school involvement, it remains equally important to understand how parents’ social capital and status may relate to collateral consequences of these effects. That is, we do not yet understand how parents use social capital and social status, such as race, social class, and marital status, in effecting the school disciplinary process, nor do we understand how social capital may or may not relate to collateral consequences—such as the parent missing work or experiencing emotional distress—as a result of school discipline. In order to explore the influence of discipline on family life, I turn to prior literature on collateral consequences—much of which is outlined above—of incarceration and punishment to guide the understanding of how punishment shapes the lives of individuals impacted by school punishment, including parents, and how parents are or are not able to use social capital and status to mitigate these effects.

While the consequences of punishment on students have been well-documented (e.g. the school-to-prison pipeline), the understanding of consequences of school discipline and punishment on parents remains unclear. The literature (discussed above) on the collateral consequences of punishment, generally, offers a guide for investigating how school punishment may have spill-over consequences to parents and families. For example, the literature on the school-to-prison pipeline suggests that students who are

harshly disciplined are at a greater risk of essentially being pushed out of school, or face increased odds of dropping out of school before graduating (Verdugo, 2002; Fabelo et al., 2011). These are clear long-term consequences of punishment for students. It seems likely that students who receive punishments of increasing severity, or those who are repeatedly punished, will have parents and families who experience some collateral consequences, too. For example, a parent who is forced to miss too many days of work to deal with disciplinary issues may face the consequence of losing their job, or lost wages thereby compounding the effect of school discipline and moving it into the family unit. Likewise, parents of students who are punished repeatedly may suffer from emotional effects such as emotional distress, anger, and depression, and/or physical effects such as changes in weight, hair loss, and sleep deprivation due to these processes.

Further, social capital theory and social status perspectives suggests that these collateral consequences of school punishment will be felt differently in families with different levels of social capital and status. We would expect to see that parents who have social capital and status may be able to use their capital and/or status in order to mitigate, or avoid, these negative consequences. On the other hand, parents who lack social capital and/or status may be unable to influence the disciplinary process in their favor, may be ignored by school officials, or may be unable to become involved at all. In other words, we would expect the collateral consequences of school punishment to disproportionately impact parents based on their levels of social capital and status with parents who lack social capital, or those who are disadvantaged by their social status, to be significantly more likely to have less desirable outcomes in their favor.

In addition to impacting the parent, it is possible that the family unit may also be affected by collateral consequences. For example, previous research on zero tolerance policies has shown that disciplinary strategies and the use of security measures differentially impact students of color and students from working-class families (Skiba et al., 2001; Nolan, 2011). In line with this, those same strategies may also present barriers to parents from already marginalized families which may, in turn, serve to reproduce social inequalities. That is, the consequences of harsh punishment may vary in conjunction with a family's social capital. Families with lower social capital may be more vulnerable to the effect of punishment than families with higher levels of social capital. For example, Harber (2004) finds that overly harsh schools are "...schools that reproduce and perpetuate not only the socio-economic and political inequalities of the surrounding society...but also the...relationships that go with them" (p.20).³ Taken together, racial and ethnic minority families, and families who lack socioeconomic resources, may be more vulnerable than others to the consequences of school discipline.

Research Question 5: What effect does involvement in disciplinary processes within the school (such as meetings with administrators, teachers, members of law enforcement, security personnel) and outcomes (such as taking time off work) have on parents and families? What are the collateral consequences of these interactions?

³ Harber (2004) refers to these schools as Authoritarian Schools which is analogous to the conception of punitive discipline in the literature more broadly.

2.6 Current Project

The goal of the current project is to examine the impact of school discipline and security on parent and families. With the use of a nationally-representative data set, I seek to understand whether or not school security measures and school discipline impact differing types of parental involvement. I then use a multi-level model to gain a better understanding of the characteristics of parents, children, and schools that contribute to these outcomes with specific attention given to discipline, security, and dimensions of social status and social capital. Next, I turn to qualitative data in order to use narratives collected from parents in order to gain an understanding of parental experiences within the disciplinary process and to understand how social capital and social status relate to outcomes within these processes. Finally, I use data from the same interviews to explore the implications of collateral consequences of school discipline on parents, their children, and the family.

Chapter 3

QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

To answer these research questions, I use a mixed methods approach, combining the results of a nationally-representative survey data set and data collected from qualitative interviews in order to explore the reciprocal relationship between parenting and school discipline. Following, I outline the quantitative sample, variables and variable creation, and analytic approach. Then, I outline the qualitative sample, data collection, and coding.

3.1 Quantitative Data and Sample

The quantitative data for this project come from wave one of the 2002 Educational Longitudinal Study (ELS: 2002) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). The ELS: 2002 data are collected by the Research Triangle Institute for the National Center for Education Statistics of the United States Department of Education. The overall objective of the ELS: 2002 project is: "...to monitor the transition of a national sample of young people as they progress from 10th grade through high school and on to postsecondary education and/or the world of work" (NCES, 2002, p.7). The primary unit of analysis for these data are 10th grade students in the United States, but data were also collected from parents, school administrators, teachers, librarians, and the ELS surveyors on site. Students were randomly selected. One parent of each student was asked to complete a questionnaire defined as the parent who had the most knowledge of the student. The school principal

was asked to complete the administrator question, and the primary (or head) librarian was also asked to complete the questionnaire.

ELS: 2002 data were gathered using a two-stage sampling strategy. Schools were selected using a probability proportional to size strategy, a variation of cluster sampling, which generated a total of 1,221 public, Catholic, and other private schools eligible for selection out of a population of approximately 27,000 high schools across the 50 United States and Washington D.C with 10th grade students. Of the 1,221 schools identified, a total of 752 schools agreed to participate in the survey. 10th grade students within the schools were then randomly selected to complete the survey generating a total possible sample of 17,591 10th graders within 752 public, Catholic, and other private schools, or approximately 26 students per school. Students completed the survey in the spring term of the 2001-2002 school year. Of those selected for the survey, a total of 15,362 students completed the questionnaire, which also included 13,488 parents, 7,135 teachers, 743 principals, and 718 librarians. Because the key variables for this study are only collected at wave one, the current analysis is cross sectional.

This study limits the current analysis to public schools in the United States for a total potential sample of 11,969 students nested in 580 public schools. I focus on public schools because the existing literature on school discipline and security focuses on public schools (e.g. Kupchik 2010; Jung, 2007; Muschert & Peguero, 2010; Nolan, 2011; Peguero & Shekarkhar, 2011) , and also because the theoretical mechanisms by which discipline

and security impact parents and youth are probably different between public and private schools.¹

The student questionnaire is comprised of a 45-minute self-administered survey instrument and were generally completed in a classroom with other students selected to complete the survey. Students unavailable to complete the survey completed a computer-assisted telephone interview with ELS researchers. The questionnaires included questions assessing student behaviors, career aspirations, family life, disciplinary outcomes, and self-esteem questions. The parent survey was completed by the parent or guardian most familiar with the student, and was available as a hardcopy and as a computer-assisted telephone interview. The parent questionnaire included five topic areas concerning family background, information about the child's school and family life, opinions about the child's school, and plans for the child's future (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, p. 28). Parents also reported on measures about family background including educational levels, marital status, family structure, and socioeconomic status.

In addition to the student and parent surveys, a school administrator was also surveyed on a multitude of measures including school size, classroom dynamics, neighborhood dimensions, disciplinary issues within the school, and questions pertaining to the overall school atmosphere. Teachers were surveyed about school characteristics, classroom management, and a plethora of measures concerning the operation of school

¹ The vast amount of literature exploring punishment has focused on public schools (e.g. Kupchik 2010, Peguero, 2012), and there is very little information on private schools within the school discipline literature. It is likely that students/parents in private schools are qualitatively different than parents in public schools due to a multitude of factors including race, social class, marital status, and education levels of the parents. Therefore, I focus on public schools in this project.

curriculum. Librarians were surveyed concerning the use of computer equipment, state of the library materials, and general questions about student use and interaction. Finally, each ELS interviewer completed a facilities checklist assessing the general conditions at the school such as the presence of loitering, school security, and measures of general maintenance such as building and hallway conditions.

As part of the sampling strategy of ELS: 2002, African-American and Asian-American students were oversampled to generate large enough sample sizes for meaningful analysis and statistical power. In order to account for the effect of this oversampling, the current project uses sampling weights derived by the ELS from Census data. With weighting, this sample is representative of the 10th grade public school student population in the United States in 2002. Below, I discuss the variables used in the analysis, and follow that discussion with an outline of the analytic strategy.

3.1.1 School Security Variables

As noted above, each ELS interviewer completed a facilities checklist. Part of this checklist asked the interviewer to record whether or not the school had specific security measures in use. These measures included the use of security guard or police office, the utilization of metal detectors, closed circuit security cameras, the presence of fencing around the entirety of the school, and a required “check-in” area for anyone entering or exiting the school grounds. These variables were coded as 1 (security measure present), or 0 (security measure not present).

In addition to the facilities checklist, the school administrators were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning security procedures in place at the school. The

administrator was asked if the school used random drug sniffing dog checks, random searches for contraband on students or lockers, random drug testing of students, required a strict dress code, required the use of clear book bags or backpacks, and if the school required students to display identification at all times. These responses were also coded dichotomously as 1 (security procedure used), or 0 (security procedure not used). Sample characteristics can be found in Table 3.1.²

² For complete details on scale creation, please see Appendix A.

Table 3.1: Quantitative Sample Characteristics

Variable Name	Mean	Std Dev.	Range	Alpha	Description
Level 1					
Male Student	.495	.502	0, 1		Sex of Student
Female Student	.506	.499	0, 1		Sex of Student
Black Student	.149	.356	0, 1		Race of Student
White Student	.527	.499	0, 1		Race of Student
Hispanic Student	.158	.365	0, 1		Race of Student
Asian-American Student	.108	.310	0, 1		Race of Student
Other Race Student	.058	.234	0, 1		Race of Student
Married Parents	.761	.399	0, 1		Marital Status of Parent
Single Parent	.053	.209	0, 1		Marital Status of Parent
Divorced Parent	.121	.306	0, 1		Marital Status of Parent
Separated	.064	.229	0, 1		Marital Status of Parent
Family SES	.085	.716	-2.11-1.81		Family composite SES measure
In-School Suspension	.191	.554	0-4		Student has received an in-school suspension
Out-of-School Suspension	.117	.428	0-4		Student has received an out-of-school suspension
Student Got in Trouble	.591	.879	0-4		Student has gotten into some other form of trouble/punishment
Rules are Not Enforced	2.510	.759	1-4		Student believes rules are not enforced
Punishment is Equal	2.328	.864	1-4		Student believes punishment is equal
No English	.082	.275	0, 1		Parent has difficulty understanding English
Formal Parental Involvement	1.040	1.124	0-4	.715	Formal Parental Involvement (composite)
Academic Par. Involvement	.992	1.272	0-4	.714	Academic Parental Involvement (composite)
Behavioral Par. Involvement	1.231	1.743	0-4	.683	Behavioral Parental Involvement (composite)
Student Victimization	1.994	2.380	0-16	.733	Student's level of victimization (composite)
Parent/Child Activities	36.974	5.578	12-48	.767	Parent and Child engage in activities outside of school (composite)
Parents Efficacy	5.302	.994	2-8	.794	Parents have say in setting school policy, parents work together to support school policy (composite)

Table 3.1: Continued

Variable Name	Mean	Std Dev.	Range	Alpha	Description
Level 2					
Paid Security	.749	.404	0, 1		School uses paid security
Dogs	.510	.500	0, 1		School uses drug sniffing dogs
Contraband	.272	.412	0, 1		School does random searches for contraband
Drug Test	.141	.323	0, 1		School does drug testing
Clear Books	.114	.297	0, 1		School requires clear book bags
Student IDS	.178	.359	0, 1		School requires students to wear IDs
Strict Dress	.490	.464	0, 1		School requires strict dress
Emergency Button	.599	.490	0, 1		School has emergency (panic) buttons in classrooms
Metal Pass	.030	.158	0, 1		School requires students to pass through metal detectors/wands
Metal Detectors	.076	.262	0, 1		School has metal detectors
Cameras	.301	.453	0, 1		School has surveillance cameras
Fencing	.243	.423	0, 1		School has fencing around the entire school
Sign In	.720	.447	0, 1		School requires everyone to sign in
Total Security	4.195	2.084	0-13		Sum of all security measures used
Urban	.272	.445	0, 1		School urbanicity
Rural	.224	.417	0, 1		School urbanicity
Suburban	.504	.500	0, 1		School urbanicity
Northeast	.167	.373	0, 1		School geographic location
Midwest	.242	.428	0, 1		School geographic location
West	.212	.408	0, 1		School geographic location
South	.378	.485	0, 1		School geographic location
School Size	3.865	1.784	1-7		School Size
Neighborhood Crime	1.531	.812	1-4		Levels of crime in the neighborhood
School Crime Levels	28.950	4.754	19-51	.852	Levels of crime in the school (composite)
Parental Discipline Involvement	1.606	1.122	0-3	.755	The School has a process to involve parents in discipline, help parents, train (composite)

3.1.2 School Discipline and Delinquency Variables

In addition to assessing the relationship between parental involvement and school security, I also explore the impact of school discipline levels and delinquency on parental involvement. To measure school discipline and delinquency, the school administrator was asked a series of questions about delinquency within the schools. These include items such as, “How often is class cutting a problem at the school?” and are measured from 1) happens daily; 2) happens at least once a week; 3) happens at least once a month; 4) happens on occasion; and, 5) never happens. The following 13 variables were identified in the data set:

1. How often is class cutting a problem at the school?
2. How often physical conflicts a problem at the school?
3. How often is vandalism a problem at the school
4. How often is the use of alcohol a problem at the school
5. How often is the use of illegal drugs a problem at the school
6. How often do students use drugs/alcohol at the school
7. How often is the possession of weapons a problem at the school?
8. How often is physical abuse of teachers a problem at the School?
9. How often is student bullying a problem at the school?
10. How often is verbal abuse of the teachers a problem at the school?
11. How often is disorder in the classrooms a problem at the school?
12. How often is student disrespect for the teachers a problem at the school?
13. How often is gang activity a problem at the school?

These 13 items were reverse coded such that higher values represent more disciplinary issues within the school, and summed. This composite index has a Cronbach alpha of .852, suggesting a high level of inter-item reliability, and ranges from 19-51 with a mean of 28.95.

To assess student discipline, students were asked to report the number of times they had experienced an in-school suspension, how many times they had experienced an out-of-school suspension, and how many times they had gotten in trouble. These items were collected using an ordinal measure; students were asked to select the range of suspensions they had received (never, 1-2 times; 3-6 times; 7-9 times; and 10 or more times). These variable was recoded such that 0=never, 1=1-2, 2=3-6, 3=7-9, and 4=10 or more. These measures capture the overall rates of in-school and out-of-school suspensions, as well as the overall rate students report getting into trouble, with higher values representing a greater rate of discipline.

3.1.3 Parental Involvement

One parent or guardian of each student was asked a series of questions concerning their involvement in various school and school related activities. Parental involvement is measured in two ways: formal involvement within the school setting, and informal involvement with their child outside of the school. To capture *formal parental involvement*, parents were asked if they were a member of the parent-teacher association (PTA), whether or not they attend PTA meetings, if they were involved with the PTA in some other capacity, and whether or not they volunteered in a formal role with the school. Each question was coded as 1 (yes) or 0 (no). These measures were summed along a 4 point scale to create an index of formal parental involvement with higher values

representing a greater degree of involvement. The Cronbach alpha for this measure is .715 suggesting a moderately high level of inter-item reliability.

The parent was also asked about how often they informally contacted the school regarding things such as: their child's performance in school, if their child had any behavioral problems in schools, questions about their child's school classes, questions about their child's attendance, if they needed help with their child's homework, questions concerning their child's academic record, and any questions concerning school activities. Parents were also asked if they helped their child with homework, and if they speak with their child about their child's report card, about selecting courses or programs at school, planning for college entrance, applying to college after high school, and applying for a job after high school.

To capture different dimensions of this type of parental involvement, a varimax rotated factor analysis was performed which yielded two distinct factors: academic involvement, and problematic involvement. While there is no consensus on the absolute cut-off point for factor loadings (though the most widely cited expert on the topic suggests .3 as the absolute cut off point [Kline, 1994]), I utilized .5 as the threshold for construct validity. Please see Table 3.2 below for the factor loadings. *Academic involvement* includes questions regarding contacting the school about available academic programs, academic plans, and academic courses for their child. *Behavioral involvement* includes questions about contacting the school about problem behavior, poor school performance, poor attendance, and problems with the child's homework. In addition to using loadings of .5 as a cut off, construct validity can be further observed through the Eigenvalues of the

analysis as both factors produced Eigenvalues above 1.5 suggesting the total explained variance of these combined measures is sufficient to be used as a single factor.

Table 3.2: Rotated Factor Analysis

Factor 1: Academic Involvement	
School Plans	0.7054
School Courses	0.7032
School Programs	0.5915
Factor 2: Behavioral Involvement	
Poor Performance	0.6892
Poor Attendance	0.5016
Problem Behavior	0.5767
Homework Problem	0.5222

3.1.4 Individual Level Control Variables

3.1.4.1 Parent and Family Measures

The Educational Longitudinal Survey (2002) data contain a socioeconomic status composite measure consistent with prior measures used in similar data bases (National Longitudinal Survey, 1972; National Educational Longitudinal Survey, 1988). The scale is based on equally weighted measures including the father's/guardian's education, mother's/guardian's education, mother's education, father's education, mother's occupational prestige score, father's occupational prestige score, and total family wealth. The occupational prestige score was computed using the widely-used 1989 General Social Survey values.³

³ Nakao, K., and Treas, J. (1992). *The 1989 Socioeconomic Index of Occupations: Construction from the 1989 Occupational Prestige Scores*. General Social Survey Methodological Report No. 74. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

In addition, parents were also asked about relationship dynamics with their child. Parents who are involved with their child outside of school may also be likely to be involved with their child in the school. These include items such as how often they know their child's whereabouts, how often they set rules, how often they spend time together as a family including going to sporting events, attending church, attending family functions, going shopping together, eating together, watching a movie, and attending a sporting event. Each variable was measured on a four point scale, and were then summed to create a scale with higher values representing a greater number of parent-child interactions. This scale has a mean of 37.1 with a standard deviation of 5.5, and a range of 12 to 48. The alpha for this scale is .757 suggesting a high level of inter-item reliability.

Marital status may also impact parental involvement. For example, single parents may be less likely to become involved because they lack a significant partner who is able to assist in balancing the demands of child care and schooling with employment (e.g. reduced social capital (Nouegra, 2004). In addition, divorced and single parents often report lower levels of involvement in the life of their child (e.g. Brody & Flor, 1998), which could also translate into school involvement. Because of these findings, I include variables representing single, divorced, or separated marital status (married contrast).

Finally, parents were asked about the degree to which they had a say in setting school policy. Parents were asked if they had a say in setting school policy, and if parents work together to support school policy. These measures asked parents if they strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree and are coded such that higher scores indicate parents more strongly agree with the statements. This composite measure ranges from 2-8 with a mean of 5.44 and an alpha of .794.

3.1.4.2 Student Measures

As highlighted by the review of the literature in chapter 2, race is often significantly associated with school discipline, security, and parental involvement. To account for the influence of this, dummy variables were created to represent Black, Asian-American, Hispanic, and Other race students (White student contrast).

Similarly, as parents are more likely to become involved with the school with their son, as opposed to a daughter, and males are more likely to receive discipline and punishment (Crosnoe, 2001), I include a dummy variable for females in the model (male student contrast).

Students were asked about victimization, including if they had something stolen, had gotten assaulted, had property vandalized, were bullied, offered drugs, extorted, or got into a fight. These measures were coded never, once or twice, or more than twice. These measures were coded such that higher values represent a greater degree of victimization with a range of 0-16, mean of 1.92 and alpha of .733.

Students also were asked about perceptions of schools rules. Students were asked if they believed school rules were fair, if everyone knew what the rules are, whether they knew the punishment for broken rules, and whether or not the rules were strictly enforced. Student perception of rules may relate to discipline and/or parental involvement and I will control for that effect. This variable ranges from 5 to 20 with higher scores indicating the student perceives the rules as unfair. The mean of this measure is 11.25 with a Cronbach alpha of .671.

3.1.5 School Level Control Variables

At the school level, an administrator reported whether or not the school had a program in place to involve parents in disciplinary proceedings. This may be a key variable in the present analysis on parental involvement generally and also as it relates to discipline and security.

It also seems reasonable to believe that crime levels within the neighborhood in which the school is located may also relate to parental involvement, delinquency, and school security/discipline. Each administrator completed a question assessing the degree to which the neighborhood was safe/unsafe with higher values representing a more unsafe neighborhood. This measure ranges from 1 to 4 with a mean of 1.53.

To account for variations in school discipline and security by school type, I use a dummy variable in the analysis representing urban, and rural schools (suburban contrast). As highlighted in the literature review, school size often relates to the use of security measures due to, in part, budget and funding availability, and the current analysis uses a variable representing the school size to account for this influence.

To account for variations in geographic location, the current study utilizes variables representing that the school is in the West (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, OR, UT, WA, WY), Northeast (CT, ME, MA, NH, NJ, PA, RI, VT), and South (AL, AR, DE, DC, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV (Midwest Contrast – IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI). These regions coincide with the four-level regions identified by the U.S. Census Bureau.

3.1.6 Missing Data

As with most large scale-quantitative data sets, missing data are present in the ELS: 2002. Because the primary sampling unit was students, there are missing data present in many of the parental and administrative responses. For example, the index for parental involvement was missing 2,676 cases due to non-response. Some cases were missing at random, while others were partial (meaning the parent failed to complete that portion of the survey due to time), while others were simply nonresponse (meaning a parent could not be located to complete the survey).

With pairwise deletion, the sample would have been reduced by approximately 38 percent. In order to maintain power, multiple imputation in Stata 12.1 was used. Multiple imputation by chained equations (MICE, or ICE) using all variables in the data set was used to impute missing values. In order to impute data, ICE matches variables with missing data to variables without missing data. Then, using the variance among these measures, ICE generates imputations by performing a series of univariate regressions.⁴ Using the results of these chained equations, missing data are imputed on a case-by-case basis using sampling weights.

Because many of the security variables and parental measures are dichotomous, ICE is generally preferable to the multivariate normal model (MVN), which assumes all variables are approximately normally distributed. That is, ICE can generate estimates for dichotomous measures, *and* it can use dichotomous measures to generate estimates for both dichotomous and continuous measures.

⁴ http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/seminars/missing_data/mi_in_stata_pt1.htm

There is also a second reason ICE is preferable over MVN. MVN attempts to impute data based on a large single model, as opposed to ICE which performs individual regression analyses. Due to the complex survey design and sample size, MVN produces less efficient results in the imputation. Overall, with the use of ICE, the total sample in the current analysis is 11,969 students nested within 580 schools, which represents 100 percent of the original sample of public schools.

3.2 Analytic Strategy

3.2.1 Multilevel Model

As noted above, the ELS data are collected through a complex survey design and cluster sampling by which schools were sampled through unequal probability selection, and then randomly sampling students within the selected school. Because of this sampling strategy, the data violate the assumptions of independence because students are nested within schools. That is, OLS regression assumes that each case is independent of every other case and that there is not some outside (also called endogenous) variable causing some cases to be correlated in their outcomes that the model fails to capture. Because students were selected through schools, students are therefore clustered around schools. In other words, students in school A may report different levels of the dependent variable than students in school B due to some school-level characteristic. This is referred to as a nested, or clustered, effect.

This nested design requires a multi-level modeling strategy to overcome the violation of independence (e.g. correlated error terms; Raudenbush and Byrk, 2004). Therefore, Stata 12.1 is used to explore the multilevel relationship between parental involvement, security, discipline, and the control variables in the analysis. In addition to

overcoming the violations of assumptions for OLS, a multilevel modeling strategy allows for the examination of relationships among and between variables both at the individual level (among students and parents) and group (among schools) level, as well as cross-level interactions. This approach will demonstrate what individual level and school level factors relate to parental involvement, and interaction terms will show how dimensions of social capital and social status interact in predicting involvement with specific attention given to understanding the role of school discipline and security in this process.

3.2.2 Propensity Score Matching

Because temporal ordering cannot be satisfied due to the cross-sectional nature of this sample (as parental involvement was only measured in the first wave), I use a propensity score model (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983; Becker & Ichino 2002). This allows for school discipline and security to be used as a treatment. Like-reported cases are matched on a 1:1 basis with a caliper of .01, which will allow for the effect of school discipline and security on levels of parental involvement to be assessed. That is, the propensity score analysis compared a treated group (i.e., parents whose children go to schools with particular school discipline and security characteristics) to a control group (i.e., parents whose children go to schools without these characteristics) to determine if the treatment (the school discipline and security) has an effect on the outcome. What makes this method most appropriate for my dissertation is a propensity score compares a treated and control group who are similar in terms of everything that influences the outcome, except for the receipt of the treatment. Schools were matched based on all of the above listed variables; that is, the matching process finds pairs of cases that are similar on all

characteristics except discipline and security, on which they differ. The process of matching is discussed in the subsequent chapter.

In this model, I use security measures and disciplinary rates as the treatment. In order to create this variable, I first created a count variable of all security measures for each case. I then divided this count around the overall mean (1=above the mean, 0=below the mean) In this way, schools falling above the mean are reported as high security environments, while schools below the mean are reported as low security environments, all else equal. Next, I divided in-school and out-of-school suspension rates around the mean where 1=high suspension rates, and 0=low suspension rates.

To create the treatment variable, each of the variables were combined and recoded such that 1=high discipline/security, and 0=low discipline/security. This lead to a total of 3,039 cases coded as high discipline and security, and 4,280 cases as low discipline and security. Using this method, the outcomes variable is parental involvement, and the treatment variable is the security and disciplinary variables, while controlling for the host of other variables used in the analysis. In this case, any differences between the treatment and the matched control groups are assumed to be the result of the treatment. This approach will demonstrate whether or not parents who are similar on all other measures—except school discipline and security—are effected by punitive discipline and security therefore answering research question one: does school discipline/security effect parental involvement?

3.3 Qualitative Data

As noted in the previous chapters, the quantitative analysis is only one part of the dissertation. In order to gather firsthand accounts of the impact of school discipline on parental outcomes, 17 in-depth interviews were conducted in a large, southern city in 2012 and 2013. While the majority of the interviews were one-on-one, some of the interviews were conducted with parents, children, aunts, uncles, and siblings. Below, I describe the sample, sampling method, sample characteristics, and interview and interview schedule.

3.3.1 Sample

In 2012, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) contacted Dr. Aaron Kupchik, a professor at the University of Delaware. The SPLC, a well-known civil rights litigation firm, had recently been engaging with parents whose children and/or grandchildren had experienced disciplinary issues in their schools. The lead attorney in the case reached out to Dr. Kupchik, and invited him to utilize their networks in order to speak with families and children in order to gain an understanding of how discipline had effected them. Dr. Kupchik traveled to the research site in late 2012 to conduct an initial wave of interviews, and returned in early 2013 with me to conduct additional interviews.⁵

All of the participants were identified through the Southern Poverty Law Center, and agreed to complete interviews at a location and time of their convenience. The interviews were usually conducted in a public setting such as church/mosque, library, restaurant, or community center, although some narratives were collected in the respondent's home. The narratives were recorded with the consent of each participant and

⁵ Please see Appendix B for the interview schedule.

transcribed for analysis and coding. The interviews consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended question. Respondents were asked about basic demographic information, and then a series of questions about school discipline, their child and child's experiences, as well as their experiences and reactions. The interviews ranged in length from about 20 minutes to 115 minutes, with an average interview length of about 50 minutes.

The majority of the respondents were low income, or grandparents of child who were Black (88 percent), single mothers (71 percent), though some respondents were also aunts and grandparents (35 percent). Some interviews also included firsthand accounts from the child (18 percent). Overall, the average age of the adult respondents was approximately 50 years. Full descriptive statistics for the qualitative sample can be found in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Qualitative Sample Characteristics

	n	Percent
Black	15	88
White	2	12
Married	5	29
Single	12	71
Grandparent	5	29

It is important to note that a sample size of 17 may be too small to drawn firm and generalizable conclusions from. However, there has been recent academic debate on the focus on small sample sizes in qualitative research. For example, Crouch and McKenzie (2006) argue that the focus should be less on the *n*, and more on the unique contributions that are made by each case. In theory, it is possible to reach saturation with a very small sample size given the topic under study. Using cancer research, Crouch and McKenzie

(2006) show that by carefully selecting a small group, it is possible that each individual can represent a unique experience, thus a sample size smaller than 20 was more efficient and cost-effective for the researchers than a larger sample would have been. As Crouch and McKenzie (2006) discuss, due to the sample size of 17, we were able to spend much more time with each individual, thereby possibly elucidating further details from each more so than would have been possible if the sample size were larger.

3.3.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

To analyze these data, Atlas.TI version four was used to code the interviews for trends and findings. Guided by prior knowledge of the literature on school discipline and punishment, the data were coded for general themes such as parent missed work, effect on siblings, parent does not feel listened to, administrators ignore parent, and parent is experiencing emotional distress (see below). The major themes of the coding centered around the effect on the parent, child, family, financial well-being, emotional and physical health, and future goals, as well as the extent to which the parent/grandparent reported feeling involved or discouraged from involvement in school punishment.

After coding for these broad themes, I then used a grounded theory approach to uncover common trends among respondents with the goal of refining the understanding of the impact of school discipline on parents (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Corbin & Strauss, 1990). As Giordano et al. (2007) note "...such materials are useful as they point to the conceptual areas, including subjective processes [,] that may be overlooked when relying on traditional quantitative methods" (p. 1654). That is, the subjective experience of parents within the school disciplinary process is something I am able to capture within the narratives in a manner that I am unable to do with the quantitative data. Yet, because I rely

on a convenience and snowball sample the results presented are exploratory and descriptive, making generalizations to larger populations difficult.

It is important to note the majority of interviews conducted were with poor and working-class Black mothers in the southern United States. The current project will be limited in the ability to directly compare upper-class and working-class experiences qualitatively; however, social status and social capital also includes a parent's social network including friends and community resources. Moreover, the very fact that the Southern Poverty Law Center was primarily involved with poor and working-class Black mothers may also be a very worthwhile piece of data. As many qualitative researchers have demonstrated, what is not observed can often be as important as what is observed (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). In this case, the striking lack of middle- and upper-class, White, families working with the SPLC in regards to school discipline may be a noteworthy finding within the context of this mixed-method approach. Additionally, many respondents provided narratives about how they believed their experiences differed from the experiences of individuals in other social categories (e.g. middle-upper class, White, two parent households). These questions will shed light on how parents perceive social status and social capital relate to disciplinary outcomes. The pre-identified themes used in the initial coding include:

- Parent felt ignored by school officials, parent felt unwelcomed by school officials, parents have no say in school discipline, parent does not agree with the school discipline
- Parent believes school is not following procedures, parent believes school is violating established procedures, parent believes child is targeted, teachers bully student and/or parent
- Parent wishes to transfer student to another school, homeschool, or remove the child from school

- Socioeconomic status is an issue, money would solve the problem
- Race is an issue in school punishment
- Marital status/familial support is an issue
- Parent does not believe situation will improve, parent believes this has negatively effected the child/limited future for child
- Family experienced financial strain, parent missed work, parent lost job, trouble with finding caretakers
- Parent's health suffered
- Negative emotional effect on the parent, negative effect on the family.

In the next chapter, I address my first and second research questions.

Chapter 4

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ONE AND TWO: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

In this chapter, I address research question one and research question two. In doing so, I use propensity score modeling to explore whether or not parental involvement is affected by school discipline and security measures. I also examine the school-level and individual-level characteristics of parents and students that relate to parental involvement in schools through the use of multi-level modeling.

4.1 Research Question 1

Do school security measures and school discipline affect parental involvement within the school?

In order to determine whether or not parents are affected by school security and discipline, propensity score matching was used. Cases exhibiting approximately equal characteristics on the previously outlined variables were matched on a 1:1 basis.¹ One of the major benefits of this type of treatment analysis is that because propensity score matching matches cases on a 1:1 basis (experimental group: control group), the assumption is that any difference in coefficients is due to the effect of the treatment. This is a powerful

¹ One limitation to this type of analysis is that propensity score matching is not supported by multiple imputation. Therefore, this analysis relies on only cases with complete data reducing the sample size to 7,319.

way in which to begin to make casual claims using cross-sectional data, as it is a quasi-experimental design. Second, I am able to compare levels of parental involvement between experimental group and control group while controlling for every other variable in the analysis, therefore factoring out the effects of those covariates in the model. In short, what this analysis will show is whether or not parental involvement differs among similarly located parents due to the treatment of discipline and security.

One consideration that occurs in propensity score matching are ties. Ties occur when two or more cases (control or experimental) have a counterpart that shares the same propensity score. To account for this, I use a technique called nearest kernel matching. That is, in the event that more than two cases share equal scores on the treatment variable, they are paired with the weighted average of all controls with weights that are inversely proportional to the propensity score of the treated and controls (see Newton, 2013).² In addition, balance testing shows ties adjusted by this method occurred in less than 5 percent of all matches, and with kernel matching, this results in an entirely balanced analysis.

After matching similar cases, the results of this analysis demonstrate whether or not discipline and security has a treatment effect on types of parental involvement controlling for the influence of all the other variables in the analysis. The results of the propensity score modeling, average treatment effect (ATE), can be found in Table 4.1. The ATE represents the difference in the dependent variable among similar parents due to the effect of the treatment. In this case, the ATE shows whether or not levels of parental involvement (formal, academic, behavioral) vary among similar parents due to the effect of school discipline and security.

² <http://www.stata-journal.com/sjpdf.html?articlenum=st0026>

4.2 Results

Table 4.1: Average Treatment Effect by Parental Involvement Type

	Experimental Group	Control Group	Difference
Formal Parental Involvement	1.093	1.268	-.175***
Academic Parental Involvement	1.016	.999	.017
Behavioral Parental Involvement	1.781	1.426	.355***
Note: Results based on 1,769 matched pairs, controlling for all other variables in the analysis			

4.2.1 Formal Parental Involvement

For formal parental involvement, a total of 1,769 cases were matched (1,769 controls with 1,769 experimental cases), using the criteria outlined in the previous chapter. The average treatment effect for the treatment group is 1.09, while the average treatment effect for the controls is 1.268 ($p < .001$). This means that parents with children in high discipline and security schools exhibit significantly lower levels of formal parental involvement than parents with children in low discipline and security schools by .174 units, even though they are similar on all other measures. This suggests discipline and security have a treatment effect on formal parental involvement and contribute to lower levels of involvement, all else equal.

4.2.2 Academic Parental Involvement

Next, I applied the same model to explore academic parental involvement among similarly situated schools. The results indicated no treatment effect between the

experimental group and the control group ($p=.850$). This finding suggests that there is no treatment effect in academic involvement by discipline/security of the school.

4.2.3 Problem Behavior Involvement

Finally, I turned to the relationship between the treatment of high discipline/security and problem behavioral involvement. Comparing similar parents, the results show that the experimental group exhibits higher levels of parental problem behavioral involvement compared to the control group ($p<.001$). The average level of problem involvement for the experimental group is 1.78 and the average level of problem involvement for the control group is 1.43, for a difference of .355. This suggests that parents with children in a high discipline and security school are much more likely to be involved in the capacity of their child's behavior than similar parents with children in schools with low levels of discipline and security.

4.3 Summary of the Models

Overall, the results of the propensity score matching indicated interesting, and complex, results. First, the results show that formal parental involvement is lower when parents have children in high discipline/security schools compared to parents with children in low discipline/security schools who are otherwise nearly identical. At the same time, academic involvement does not appear to be affected by the discipline/security environment. On the other hand, parents with children in high discipline and security schools actually have more problem behavior involvement than nearly identical parents with low discipline and security.

There are a number of theoretical explanations for the results of this analysis by type of parental involvement. First, prior research has demonstrated that parents may feel less welcome in schools than others for a variety of reasons (race, gender, age, socioeconomic status, school location (Fieldhouse & Cuttz, 2011; Hampden-Thompson & Pong, 2005; Nogeura, 2003; Saegert et al., 2001; Shiller et al., 2010)). I suggest that this analysis demonstrates some parents may also feel less welcome in schools with high discipline and high security. This could explain why formal parental involvement is lower among parents with children in high punitive/security schools than similar parents with children in low punitive/security schools. Parents could be dissuaded by the overall environment—or presence—of the school, something even school administrators have recently begun to acknowledge could be occurring (see Fuentes, 2011, p 101). This “fortress” effect could be occurring in schools due to punitive security practices.

The lack of any significant difference among parents, discipline/security and academic involvement supports prior literature that suggests that even parents who are not comfortable interacting with the school proper (DePlanty et al., 2007; Furstenberg, 1993; Lareau & Horvat, 1999), still engage with their child in less formal ways, such as helping with homework, advice about school, and school coursework. Therefore, it seems highly likely the atmosphere of the school in terms of discipline and security not likely play a role in parental involvement with their child’s academics.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, parents with students in high discipline/security schools are more likely to be involved due to behavioral issues than students in low discipline/security schools. That is, discipline and security do provide a treatment effect. It is possible students attending schools with high levels of discipline and security are simply more

delinquent, but I control for levels of delinquency. It is possible, then, that students in high discipline/security schools have parents more involved with the school because they get into trouble more often. This could be due to the punitive punishment and security measures used at the school, and not actually due to increased levels of individual student misbehavior. Prior literature has found that the presence of security measures such as CCTVs and security guards may actually inspire students to act out (see Gordon, 2001).

Given the results of these analyses; that both formal and behavioral involvement are treated by security and discipline, I now seek to extend our understanding of differing types of parental involvement in schools with specific attention given to individual- and school-level factors that relate to parental involvement through the use of multi-level modeling.

4.4 Research Question 2

What school-level and individual-level characteristics of parents and students relate to parental involvement in schools?

While the propensity score model demonstrates that security and discipline do have treatment effects on formal parental involvement and problem behavioral involvement, it does not allow us to understand, specifically, what school-level and individual-level factors contribute to parental involvement. Therefore, to assess what factors contribute to parental involvement in schools, a series of multi-level regression models was run. As noted in the previous chapter, multi-level models are used to overcome the clustering effect of the dependent variable. Yet, many of the assumptions of OLS remain, and there are also some added assumptions.

First, multi-level modeling makes the assumption that the between and within effect are constant. In other words, we assume the effect of a given independent variable is the same at both level 1 and level 2. This can often be a lofty assumption to make; however, the Hausman test of endogeneity can be used to determine if the fixed effect (within) is the same as the random effect (between) by performing a likelihood ratio test between the full model run as a fixed effects regression, compared to the model run as a random effects regression. When this test is significant, it indicates cluster-level confounding (i.e. we have violated the assumption that the between and within effect are approximately equal). If a violation of equality occurs, researchers generally include the centered group mean and centered group standard deviation within the model to estimate the difference of the between and within effect.

Second, multi-level modeling is generally appropriate when the unconditional inter-class correlation (also known as the unconditional ICC) is ten percent or greater. This indicates the clustering effect accounts for ten percent or more of the variation in the dependent variable. Thus, the unconditional ICC can assist in determining whether or not a multi-level model is appropriate. With the addition of the covariates to the model, I then assess the conditional ICC which is the total variation between clusters that remains after the effect of the covariates have been accounted.

Third, three R-squared statistics can be computed to assist in understanding the effect of level one and level two covariates on the dependent variable. Those are the overall r-squared for the entire model, and then the level one r-squared, and the level two r-squared statistics. These measures will inform me how much of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the covariates in the model overall, and at each level.

Fourth, a continuous multi-level model assumes a linear relationship with continuous independent variables. Therefore, plotting the dependent variable against the independent variables can assist in checking for a linear relationship. Prior to running the models, I ran a series of plots to check for linearity, as well as tests for outliers, with acceptable results. In addition, skew tests performed on the dependent variable indicated skewness was within an acceptable range indicating transformations were not necessary.

4.5 Formal Parental Involvement

4.5.1 Model Selection

Running the variance components model with formal parental involvement revealed that total variance in formal parental involvement to be 1.436. The average formal parental involvement across schools is 1.157. The estimated variance between schools is .284, and the estimated variance within schools is 1.152. The unconditional intraclass correlation (ICC) is .1979 indicating that 19.79 percent of variation in formal parental involvement is between schools. These initial results indicate the use of a multi-level model is required to account for the clustering effect.

Next, I ran the fitted model. The total variance in the fitted model is 1.147. Using the variance in the variance-components model and the fitted model, I see the overall r^2 statistics is .202. Therefore, I am explaining 20.2 percent of the total variation in formal parental involvement in this fitted model. More specifically, 51.7 percent of the variance is between schools, and 11.90 percent of the variance is within students in each school. The conditional ICC in the fitted model is .357, which indicates the percent of residual variance at the school level (between effects) that remains once the covariates are included

in the model. Again, these results indicate a multi-level model is necessary to account for the effect of clustering.

To test the assumption of endogeneity, the mixed-effects model was then run separately as a fixed effects and as a random effects model. I then stored the estimates of each and performed the Hausman test of endogeneity to assess the impact of the within and between effects on formal parental involvement. This test indicated cluster level confounding was occurring ($p < .000$), which is not uncommon in multi-level modeling (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal, 2011). Assessing the differences in the between and within effects indicated the effect for the level 1 variable for Black students and parents who had difficulty speaking English had the strongest difference in the between and within effect. In order to account for this, I created variables representing the group-centered mean and group-centered standard deviation for these two variables and included these variables in the model. Together, these variables represent the difference of the between and within effect.

Next, I reran the models including the group-centered variables. However, neither variable was significant in the model which indicates the endogeneity is not severe enough to significantly impact the results of the multi-level model. Therefore, these variables were removed and the model was re-estimated.

4.5.2 Results

4.5.2.1 Level 1

The results of the regression on formal parental involvement can be found in Table 4.2 below. First, I find that Hispanic and Asian-American students, relative to White students, have lower levels of formal parental involvement. Students from higher SES

families had parents who were significantly more involved than students from lower SES families. Similarly, parents who reported greater levels of activity with their child outside of school reported significantly greater levels of formal involvement within the school.

Table 4.2: Formal Parental Involvement

Level 1	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.051	.036
Hispanic Student	-.089*	.037
Asian Student	-.900*	.399
Other Race Student	.020	.044
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.014	.023
OSS	-.032	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.186***	.016
ParentChild	.063***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.100***	.010
Single	-.134*	.053
Separated	-.094*	.044
Divorced	-.151***	.033
No English	-.152**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table 4.2: Continued

Level 2		
School Crime	.013***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.143	.144
Metal Detectors	-.032	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.078	.049
Sign In	-.062	.042
Dogs	-.045	.042
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

Parents who reported that they believed they had a say in setting school policy and that parents worked together to achieve the goals of the school also reported greater levels of formal involvement in the school compared to parents who reported less. Single, separated, and divorced parents, compared to married parents, all reported lower levels of formal parental involvement, all else equal. In addition, parents who reported that they spoke no English, or had difficulty understanding English, reported lower levels of formal parental involvement compared to parents who reported no difficulty with English. Parents with children who reported that punishment in the school was not fair and rules were not equally enforced were less likely to be formal involved than parents with children who reported the rules and punishment were fair and enforced. Next, I turn to the school level factors that influence formal parental involvement.

4.5.2.2 Level 2

First, I find that rates of school delinquency negatively relate to formal parental involvement. That is, parental involvement is lower in schools with higher rates of delinquency. In other words, a parent is less likely to be formally involved in schools with high levels of delinquency. Parents with child in rural schools, compared to parents with children in suburban schools, are less likely to be formally involved. On the other hand, parents with children in urban schools are more likely to be formally involved than parents with children in suburban schools. Parents living in the South, compared to the Midwest, tend to be more significantly involved. On the other hand, parents in the Northeast, again compared to parents in the Midwest, report significantly lower levels of formal parental involvement.

Parents are less likely to be formally involved in large schools. At the same time, parents are more likely to report being involved formally with the school if the school reported having a process to involve parents in the disciplinary process relative to schools without a formal process to involve parents in disciplinary proceedings.

Turning to the school security measures, we see that formal parental involvement is lower in schools that have paid security guards relative to schools without paid security guards. No other security measure was significant in the model.

4.6 Academic Involvement

Next, I turn to understanding what factors influence academic parental involvement. The results of which can be found in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Academic Parental Involvement

Level 1	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.123*	.042
Hispanic Student	.053	.043
Asian Student	-.060	.047
Other Race Student	.129*	.052
Female Student	-.051*	.023
ISS	.054*	.026
OSS	.042	.033
Got in Trouble	.019	.016
Victimization	.016**	.005
SES	.170***	.019
ParentChild	.042***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.004	.012
Single	.017	.062
Separated	-.029	.053
Divorced	-.009	.038
No English	.063	.056
Rules Not Fair	.017	.017
Punishment is Equal	-.023	.014

Table 4.3: Continued

Level 2		
School Crime	.002	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.053*	.025
Urban	.033	.048
Rural	-.079	.050
ParDisInvo	.007	.016
West	.155*	.062
South	.040	.051
Northeast	-.063	.062
School Size	-.049***	.013
Paid Security	.022	.051
Emergency Button	-.055	.040
Contraband	-.040	.046
Drug Test	-.036	.054
Clear Books	.008	.063
Student IDs	.082	.055
Strict Dress	.029	.042
Metal Pass	.046	.145
Metal Detectors	-.054	.100
Cameras	.040	.044
Fencing	.018	.050
Sign In	.020	.042
Dogs	-.075	.042
Between Effect (SD)	.342	.017
Within Effect (SD)	1.193	.008

4.6.1 Model Selection

Similar to the prior analysis, a number of steps were taken to choose the most appropriate method to model the data. Running the variance components reveals that .173 of the variance in academic involvement is between schools, and 1.521 is within schools. The unconditional intraclass correlation is .102, which means that 10.2 percent of the total variation in academic involvement is between schools.

After fitting the model (results discussed in detail below), the total variance once the covariates have been accounted for between schools is .117, and 1.423 is within schools. The overall r^2 statistic is 10.4, which means the covariates in the model account for approximately 10 percent of the variation in academic involvement. Of that, 32.6 percent is at the school level, and 6.4 percent is at the individual level. The conditional intraclass correlation is .188 which means that 18.8 percent of the total variance in academic involvement is between schools after accounting for the effect of the independent variables.

To test for cluster level confounding, a Hausman test was run to compare the estimates of the fixed and random effects. The Hausman test indicated no cluster level confounding ($p=.283$) which suggests the magnitude of effect for the fixed and random effects was approximately equal in the analysis.

4.6.2 Results

4.6.2.1 Level 1

At the student level, the results indicate that Black students and Other Race students, relative to White students, have parents with higher levels of academic involvement in school, all else equal. In addition, students who reported receiving an in-

school suspension also reported a greater level of academic parental involvement. Victimization was positively related to parental academic involvement. Students who reported greater levels of victimization had parents who were more likely to become involved in this capacity. Finally the more activities the parents engaged with their child outside of the school, the more likely to engage with the school academically.

Female students, relative to male students, were less likely to have parents who reported academic involvement, all else equal. No other individual level covariate had a negative relationship with parental academic involvement.

4.6.2.2 Level 2

At the school level, neighborhood crime and school size are both negatively related to parental academic involvement. Schools in higher crime areas have lower levels of parental academic involvement. Larger schools also report lower levels of parental academic involvement.

Schools located in the West, relative to schools in the Midwest, experience higher levels of parental academic involvement. No other school level variable reached statistical significance in the model.

4.7 Problem Behavior Involvement

Finally, I turn to parental problem behavior involvement, the results of which can be found in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Problem Behavior Involvement

Level 1	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.228***	.055
Hispanic Student	.234***	.056
Asian Student	-.264***	.060
Other Race Student	.099	.066
Female Student	-.164***	.030
ISS	.325***	.034
OSS	.226***	.043
Got in Trouble	.183***	.021
Victimization	.036***	.007
SES	-.002	.024
ParentChild	.016***	.003
Parent Efficacy	-.089***	.016
Single	.207*	.081
Separated	.154*	.068
Divorced	.118*	.050
No English	.034	.072
Rules Not Fair	.079***	.022
Punishment is Equal	-.009	.019

Table 4.4: Continued

Level 2		
School Crime	.005	.005
Neighborhood Crime	.001	.031
Urban	.132*	.061
Rural	-.173*	.064
ParDisInvo	.062**	.021
West	.245*	.079
South	-.125	.065
Northeast	-.056	.079
School Size	-.032	.018
Paid Security	-.044	.064
Emergency Button	-.056	.051
Contraband	-.024	.059
Drug Test	-.065	.069
Clear Books	-.070	.080
Student IDs	-.039	.070
Strict Dress	.019	.063
Metal Pass	.197	.184
Metal Detectors	-.062	.128
Cameras	-.040	.056
Fencing	.015	.063
Sign In	.078	.054
Dogs	-.034	.053
Between Effect (SD)	.431	.021
Within Effect (SD)	1.55	.010

4.7.1 Model Selection

Running the variance components model without any covariates shows that .287 of the variance is between schools, and 2.71 is within schools. The unconditional ICC is .101 indicating that 10.1 percent of the total variance in behavioral parental involvement is between schools.

Running the fitted model reduces the variance to .186 between schools, with 2.39 within schools. The overall r^2 for this model is .14. This shows that about 14 percent of the variation in parental behavioral involvement is explained by the covariates in the model. The level 2 r^2 is .353 and the level 1 r^2 is .118. The conditional ICC is .184, which shows that 18.4 percent of the variance is between schools once the effect of the covariates have been accounted.

Again, I compared the magnitude of effect between the fixed and random effects. The Hausman test indicated marginally significant differences in these effects ($p=.061$), with the largest differences located within the measures of parent's comfort with English and socioeconomic status. To account for this, I used group centered means and standard deviations for these variables only and included them in the model. Neither variable reached significance in the final model and were therefore dropped from the analysis.

4.7.2 Results

4.7.2.1 Level 1

As shown by the results of the regression analysis, Black and Hispanic students, compared to White students, experience significantly greater levels of parental problem behavior involvement. Students who've received in-school or out-of-school suspensions,

or reported getting into trouble, experience greater levels of parental problem behavior involvement relative to students who do experience suspensions, or reporting getting into trouble.

At the same time, the greater the student experiences victimization, the more likely the parent is to become involved. Similarly, students who report that school rules are not fair are more likely to have a parent who is involved in this capacity. Single, separated, and divorced parents are much more likely to reported problem behavior involvement relative to married parents. Interestingly, parents who report engaging in activities with their child outside of school are also more likely to become involved in this capacity than parents who are not involved with their child in the school.

On the other hand, Asian students, relative to White students, and females relative to males, have parents who are less likely to become involved due to problem behavior. Likewise, parents who report that they have a say in setting school policy and who believe parents work together to achieve the goals and aims of the schools are less likely to become involved in this capacity.

4.7.2.2 Level 2

At the school level, the results of the regression show that urban schools, relative to Suburban schools, experience greater levels of problem behavior involvement. Schools who have a process to involve parents in the disciplinary process experience greater levels of parental problem behavior involvement. Schools located in the West, relative to Midwest schools, report greater levels of parental problem behavior involvement.

On the other hand, rural schools, relative to suburban schools, experience lower levels of parental problem behavior involvement. Schools in the south also report lower

levels of parental problem behavior involvement. School size is negatively related to problem behavior involvement with larger schools experiencing lower levels of parental involvement.

4.8 Summary of Findings

Overall, the results of the analysis for research questions one and two present a complex relationship between individual- and school-level characteristics that relate to parental involvement, and the relationship between discipline and security and parental involvement is equally complex. The results of the propensity score matching found that formal parental involvement is lower in schools with high security/discipline environment, academic involvement is equal between high and low security discipline/environments, and problem behavioral involvement is higher high security/discipline environments relative to similarly located schools.

The result of the multi-level models closely mirror the findings of the propensity score models. Schools with paid security guards and emergency buttons in the classroom have lower levels of formal parental involvement. Likewise, students who reported the rules were not fair also had parents who were less likely to be formally involved in the school. At the same time, no security measure was related to academic involvement. Yet, on the other hand, disciplinary rates were related to parental problem behavior involvement with students who had reported greater levels of suspensions, victimization, disparities in rules enforcement having parents who reported greater levels of behavioral involvement. (NOTE: Table 4.5 reports the direction of significance for all the models in the multi-level model for easier comparisons. Table 4.5 is found below.)

Table 4.5. Statistically Significant Variables in the Models

Level 1	Type of Parental Involvement		
	<u>Formal</u> Direction	<u>Academic</u> Direction	<u>Behavioral</u> Direction
Black Student		+	+
Hispanic Student	-		+
Asian Student	-		-
Other Race Student		+	
Female Student		-	-
ISS		+	+
OSS			+
Got in Trouble			+
Victimization		+	+
SES	+	+	
ParentChild	+	+	+
Parent Efficacy	+		-
Single	-		+
Separated	-		+
Divorced	-		+
No English	-		
Rules Not Fair	-		+
Level 2			
School Crime	-		
Neighborhood Crime		-	
Urban	+		+
Rural	-		-
ParDisInvo	+		+
West		+	+
South	+		
Northeast	-		
School Size	-	-	
Paid Security	-		
Emergency Button	-		

Other factors also played an important role in parental involvement. Socioeconomic status was highly related to formal parental involvement, and problem behavior involvement. Likewise, the parent child relationship was significantly related to all forms of parental involvement. Overall, the results of these findings show that discipline and security do affect some forms of parental involvement in the schools.

For the first research question, the results find that parental involvement is affected by school discipline and security, but that the type of involvement varies. Parents are less likely to be formally involved in schools with high levels of discipline and security compared to similarly situated parents in schools with low levels and delinquency. At the same time, there is no difference in school discipline and security and parental academic involvement. Yet, parents are more likely to be involved in schools with high levels of discipline and security due to behavioral issues with their child compared to similarly-located parents in schools with low levels of discipline and security. These findings move our understanding of these dynamics forward as no prior research has sought to explore school discipline and security as a treatment effect on parental involvement. This challenges the popularly accepted perspective among some teachers, administrators, and politicians that more discipline and security measures are needed for the good of the public, including parents and students (see Addington, 2009). Clearly, students must be safe, but given the highly rare events of attacks on schools, we must consider the effect of the school's disciplinary climate on parents. My results demonstrate that harsh school discipline and security can negatively affect parents, which both supports and extends the findings of prior research showing the deleterious effect of punitive discipline and security use on students (e.g. Coon, 2007; Hirschfield, 2008; Kupchik, 2010; Spring 2010; Phaneuf,

2009). In short, I suggest the negative effects do not end with the students, but also affect parents, and may have broader consequences for families.

The results of research question two demonstrate a complex constellation of findings. Assessing school security and disciplinary measures on formal parental involvement revealed parents with children in schools with paid security and an emergency button in the class are less likely to be involved in the school than schools without these measures. It could be the case that these characteristics are representative of more punitive schools, resulting in lower levels of parental involvement. On the other hand, socioeconomic status, after controlling for a multitude of effects, school discipline did not relate to formal parental involvement. The effects of socioeconomic status, the feelings of mutual trust and togetherness of parents (parent efficacy), the relationship between the parent and child, and the marital status of the parents were significant predictors. This suggests that while some security measures may predict lower formal parental involvement, there are other factors—namely, social capital—that individually play a more important role.

At the same time, by parsing out different types of parental involvement, I found that behavioral parental involvement was highly related to school discipline. This is, perhaps, an unsurprising conclusion, but given the controls for a multitude of other affects including school crime, neighborhood crime, and student's perceptions of rules and punishment, this suggests there is a relationship between students receiving an in-school and out-of-school suspension and a parent becoming involved with the school due to other behavioral issues. On one hand, it is possible the parents are involved because their child is a “trouble maker” yet, it seems equally as plausible—given previous research (Bowditch, 1993; Lawrence, 2007; Polakow-Suransky, 2001;)—that these students were targeted or

labeled as problematic students which necessitated the intervention of the parent. The latter explanation is also supported by the fact that parents with Black, Hispanic, and male children were significantly (and quite robustly) more likely to report involvement in the schools due to behavioral issues compared to White and female students, respectively.

Next, to continuing exploring this issue, I seek to explore how social capital may interact with other social statutes and school characteristics and how these, in turn, may affect parental involvement. Moving forward, I include interaction terms in the mufti-level model, and then explore the results of the qualitative interviews to gather first-hand accounts of these dynamics.

Chapter 5

RESEARCH QUESTIONS THREE AND FOUR: PARENTAL SOCIAL CAPITAL, STATUS, AND SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

In this chapter, I address research question three and research question four by examining how parental social capital and status relate to school discipline, and by exploring how parental capital and status interact with school characteristics and student/parental characteristics in the school disciplinary process. First, I proceed by including theoretically important interaction terms in the same multi-level models used in chapter four. This allows me to understand how measures of social capital and status interact with school characteristics in disciplinary outcomes. I then turn to the qualitative data described in chapter three to gain a better understanding of what parents experience during school disciplinary processes. That is, the qualitative analysis then allows me to understand how the quantitative findings represented the lived realities of individuals. Within the qualitative analysis, I provide an overview of the parents' experiences in the disciplinary process broadly, and then give specific attention to understanding how social capital and social status relate to the outcome of the meetings and disciplinary proceedings. To put this differently, the quantitative analysis allows me to demonstrate how social capital and status interact at a broad level. I am able to understand how key attributes such as income, race, and marital status interact. Then, to better understand the

mechanisms by which these dynamics interact within the disciplinary process, the qualitative analysis allows me to illustrate how these findings play out in the lives of individuals.

5.1 Research Question 3

How does parental status shape school discipline? Does parental social capital interact with other measures of parental status (e.g., race) and school characteristics (e.g., school size, security practices) in shaping school discipline?

While the findings for research questions one and two extend our knowledge on understanding the relationship between differing types of parental involvement and school security and discipline, the results do not demonstrate how specific parental, student, and school characteristics might compound this relationship. In order to explore the conditional effect of various factors, I incorporate interaction terms in each multi-level model. This allows me to understand how parental social capital and social status interact with other parental and school characteristics in shaping school discipline and parental involvement outcomes.

To create each interaction term, variables were centered around their grand mean, and then multiplied together. This avoids issues of collinearity and allows me to investigate the interaction among key variables in the analysis by centering each variable on zero (see Hofmann & Gavin, 1998 for an overview of grand mean centering and collinearity). In this chapter, I present a table for each type of parental involvement (formal, academic, and behavioral) with each interaction term included at the bottom of

each table. The individual regression coefficients are called the simple, or main effects, while the combined effects are referred to as interaction terms.

The goal of including the interaction terms in the analysis is to gain a better understanding of how social capital and dimensions of social status interact to effect involvement in the school, and to understand how school discipline and security play a role in these interactions. For example, a review of the previous research on social capital/status and schools suggests that racial and ethnic minorities and individuals from the working-class are less likely to be involved in the school than White parents, and parents from the middle- and upper-class (e.g. Noguera, 2003). Previous literature also suggests elements of social capital and status interact; that is, the combination of racial and ethnic minority status *and* being a member of the working class relate to lower levels of involvement to a greater degree than one of the statuses alone. Therefore, guided by theory, as well as the results from the initial multi-level models, interaction terms among socioeconomic status, race, parental/child relationship characteristics, parents' ability to communicate in English, parental efficacy, security and disciplinary measures, school urbanicity, and size of school (as measured by total student enrollment) were used to make the interaction terms. For example, previous research shows that socioeconomic status is a significant predictor of parental involvement, but the influence of socioeconomic status on involvement tends to decrease in large schools (Meier, 1996; Dee et al., 2007). The inclusion of an interaction term between socioeconomic status and school enrollment within the models will test this idea. Likewise, if a parent has difficulty speaking English, s/he is less likely to be involved in the school, but previous

work also shows that racial and ethnic minorities who have difficulty speaking English are far less likely to be involved than White parents who have difficulty speaking English. Interaction terms between the ability to speak English and race will provide details in understanding the joint influence between race/ethnicity and ability to speak English on each type of parental involvement. I outline each specific interaction term in greater detail below.

To test these interaction terms, I re-estimated the models by regressing formal parental involvement on the full models and then included each interaction term individually. I then completed the same analysis for academic involvement, and finally behavioral involvement. First, I present the individual level main effects and individual-by-individual level interactions. I then present the school level main effects and school level interactions as well as the cross-level interactions. Results showing the significant interaction terms for formal parental involvement can be found below, in Table 5.1.

5.2. Quantitative Results

Table 5.1: Formal Parental Involvement Interactions

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.051	.036
Hispanic Student	-.089*	.037
Asian Student	-.900*	.399
Other Race Student	.020	.044
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.014	.023
OSS	-.032	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.186***	.016
ParentChild	.063***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.100***	.010
Single	-.134*	.053
Separated	-.094*	.044
Divorced	-.151***	.033
No English	-.152**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012
Individual Level Interaction Terms		
SES x Hispanic Student	-.228***	.042
SES x No English	.284***	.056
SES x Single Parent	-.224**	.080
SES x Parent Child	.013***	.002
SES x Parent Efficacy	.027*	.013
Hispanic Student x No English	-.234**	.091
Single x Black	-.267**	.103
Victimization x ParentChild	-.002***	.001
ParentEfficacy x OSS	-.037*	.022

Table 5.1: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.013***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.143	.144
Metal Detectors	-.032	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.078	.049
Sign In	-.062	.042
Dogs	-.045	.042
School Level Interaction		
Urban x School Size	-.051**	.023
Cross Level Interactions		
ParentEfficacy x School Delinquency	-	
	.006***	.002
ParentEfficacy x School Size	-.011*	.005
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

5.2.1 Formal Parental Involvement

As shown by Table 5.1 some individual-by-individual interactions, school-level interactions, and cross-level interactions reached statistical significance in the model for formal parental involvement. Below, I discuss each of the n interaction terms as they relate to the full model.

5.2.1.1 Individual-Level by Individual-Level Interactions

At the individual-level, a number of theoretically important interaction terms reached statistical significance in the model. First, the interaction term between socioeconomic status and Hispanic student (White student contrast) is significant and negative. This suggests that the effect of socioeconomic status on formal parental involvement is conditioned by race for Hispanic students. In this case, as socioeconomic status increases, the effect of socioeconomic status on formal parental involvement decreases for Hispanic students. Put differently, the slope of socioeconomic status on formal parental involvement is lower for Hispanic students relative to White students due to the joint interaction between these two constructs.

Next, I find that the interaction between socioeconomic status and parents who report difficulty speaking English is significant and positive. This suggests that the effect of socioeconomic status on formal parental involvement is conditioned by the ability to speak and communicate in English positively. That is, socioeconomic status does have a differential impact on parents who have difficulty speaking English in predicting how formally involved they are in the school; as socioeconomic status increases, the negative simple effect of difficulty speaking English becomes less important.

Turning to the interaction between socioeconomic status and single parental status, I find the joint effect is significant and negative. Similar to the relationship for socioeconomic status and Hispanic student status, this finding suggests that as socioeconomic status increases for a single parent, they are less likely to be involved in the school; that socioeconomic status differentially impacts involvement for single parents (e.g. a lower slope).

On the other hand, the interaction between socioeconomic status and the relationship of the parent and child is positive. This suggests that as socioeconomic status and the relationship between the parent and child increase together, the parent is more likely to be involved formally. This interaction is, perhaps, unsurprising given the prior literature on the significance of parent child relationship and socioeconomic status on parental involvement in the school (Barton et al., 2004; Bower & Griffin, 2011), and the finding that both simple effects for socioeconomic status and parent child relationship are statistically significant and positive in the fitted model.

The interaction between Hispanic student and parent's ability to speak English on formal parental involvement is significant and negative. Again, given the statistical significance and direction of both variables individually in the fitted model this interaction demonstrates that the slope is further compounded when considering the conditional effect of both constructs together. More specifically, while Hispanic parents (White parent contrast) are less likely to be formally involved, and parents who have difficulty speaking English are less likely to be involved, the joint influence of both of

these dimensions of social capital/status further decreases the likelihood of involvement as shown by the negative direction of the interaction.

Next, I find that the interaction between single parent and Black student on formal parental involvement is negative. This finding is of particular interest as the simple effect for Black (White contrast) failed to reach significance in the fitted model suggesting no difference in formal parental involvement between Black and White parents. Yet, when marital status (divorced, married contrast) is interacted with the variable representing whether the student is Black, a significant—and negative—trend emerges suggesting that divorced parents with Black children are less likely to be formally involved within the school.

The interaction between student victimization and parent-child relationship on formal parental involvement is negative. That is that although the simple effect for the parent-child relationship is significant and positive, having a student who is victimized decreases the amount of formal involvement for parents with higher levels of parent-child relationship quality. I find that the joint influence between levels of victimization for the student and the quality of the parent-child relationship jointly exert a negative effect on formal parental involvement.

Finally, the interaction between parent efficacy and out-of-school suspensions on formal parental involvement is also negative. This finding is of interest, as the simple effect for parent efficacy is significant and positive. Yet, in cases when the student has received an out-of-school suspension, parents are less likely to be formally involved due to the conditional effect of out-of-school suspension on parental efficacy. To put this

finding in a different light, the influence of out-of-school suspensions appears to negate the influence of parental efficacy in predicting formal parental involvement; even when parents feel connected to other parents and invested in their school, if their child has received an out-of-school suspension, they are less likely to be formally involved. This finding will be further explored in the discussion section.

5.2.1.2 School-Level by School-Level Interactions

At the school level, the only significant interaction term occurred between the dummy variable indicating the school is an urban area and school size. The significance and direction suggests that parents with children in large urban schools are further conditioned to have lower levels of formal involvement. This is especially interesting given the finding that the main effect of urban schools is positive, demonstrating that parents with children in urban schools are more likely to be involved than parents with children in suburban schools. Yet, when I consider the joint effect of school size on this relationship, I actually see a decrease in formal parental involvement in urban schools.

5.2.1.3 Cross-Level Interactions

Cross-level interactions can be particularly revealing in nested data. In my analysis, I find that the interactions between parent efficacy and rates of school delinquency, and parent efficacy and school size are both significant and negative. This suggests that school level rates of delinquency negatively condition the relationship between parental efficacy and parental involvement. To put this finding in a different light, even when parents feel connected to other parents and invested in the school, if the

school has high rates of delinquency among the student body, formal involvement decreases due to the joint effects of these characteristics. This finding is of interest as the main effect for parental efficacy is significant and positive, but when we consider the influence of school rates of delinquency on the relationship between efficacy and involvement, we see a decrease, all else equal.

The second significant cross-level interaction term found in this analysis occurred between school size and parental efficacy, which is negative in direction. This is, perhaps, unsurprising as it demonstrates that school size negatively conditions the relationship between parental efficacy (feeling connected to other parents and invested in the school) and formal parental involvement; larger schools decrease the effect of parental efficacy on parental involvement. Next, I turn to the interactions in the regression analysis of academic parental involvement, the results of which can be found in Table 5.2

5.2.2 Academic Involvement

Running the interaction terms in the model for academic involvement revealed that only two interactions reached statistical significance, and both are at the individual level.

Table 5.2: Academic Parental Involvement Interactions

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.123*	.042
Hispanic Student	.053	.043
Asian Student	-.060	.047
Other Race Student	.129*	.052
Female Student	-.051*	.023
ISS	.054*	.026
OSS	.042	.033
Got in Trouble	.019	.016
Victimization	.016**	.005
SES	.170***	.019
ParentChild	.042***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.004	.012
Single	.017	.062
Separated	-.029	.053
Divorced	-.009	.038
No English	.063	.056
Rules Not Fair	.017	.017
Punishment is Equal	-.023	.014
Individual Level Interaction Terms		
SES x Parent Child	.008**	.002
ParentEfficacy x OSS	-.067*	.026

Table 5.2: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.002	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.053*	.025
Urban	.033	.048
Rural	-.079	.050
ParDisInvo	.007	.016
West	.155*	.062
South	.040	.051
Northeast	-.063	.062
School Size	-.049***	.013
Paid Security	.022	.051
Emergency Button	-.055	.040
Contraband	-.040	.046
Drug Test	-.036	.054
Clear Books	.008	.063
Student IDs	.082	.055
Strict Dress	.029	.042
Metal Pass	.046	.145
Metal Detectors	-.054	.100
Cameras	.040	.044
Fencing	.018	.050
Sign In	.020	.042
Dogs	-.075	.042
Between Effect (SD)	.342	.017
Within Effect (SD)	1.193	.008

5.2.2.1 Individual by Individual-Level Interactions

The interaction between socioeconomic status and parent-child relationship exerts a positive effect on academic parental involvement. That is, higher levels of socioeconomic status and higher levels of the parent/child relationship condition greater levels of academic parental involvement. This interaction is unsurprising given that the main effects for both socioeconomic status and parent/child relationship were statistically significant and positive in the model. The inclusion of the interaction does show that the joint effect between these two variables increases the slope of academic parental involvement to a greater degree.

On the other hand, the interaction term between parent efficacy and out-of-school suspensions relate to lower levels of academic parental involvement. Put differently, even when parents feel connected to other parents and feel invested in the school as parental groups, when their child receives an out-of-school suspension, they become significantly less likely to engage in academic involvement for their child. Punishment conditions the effect of academic involvement through parental efficacy, therefore mitigating the potential positive effect of parental efficacy. In addition, this is an interesting finding as the simple (main) effect for both variables failed to reach statistical significance in the original model. Yet, the interaction term is significant ($p < .01$). This means that while the simple effects may not significantly relate to academic parental involvement individually, the effect of the interaction demonstrates that together, there is a joint effect on academic parental involvement. Next, I turn to parental behavioral involvement, the results of which can be found in Table 5.3.

5.2.3 Behavioral Involvement

Table 5.3: Behavioral Parental Involvement Interactions

Individual Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.228***	.055
Hispanic Student	.234***	.056
Asian Student	-.264***	.060
Other Race Student	.099	.066
Female Student	-.164***	.030
ISS	.325***	.034
OSS	.226***	.043
Got in Trouble	.183***	.021
Victimization	.036***	.007
SES	-.002	.024
ParentChild	.016***	.003
Parent Efficacy	-.089***	.016
Single	.207*	.081
Separated	.154*	.068
Divorced	.118*	.050
No English	.034	.072
Rules Not Fair	.079***	.022
Punishment is Equal	-.009	.019
Individual Level Interaction Terms		
SES x Parent Child	-.013***	.003
ParentEfficacy x OSS	-.121***	.034
Divorced x OSS	.226***	.117

Table 5.3: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.005	.005
Neighborhood Crime	.001	.031
Urban	.132*	.061
Rural	-.173*	.064
ParDisInvo	.062**	.021
West	.245*	.079
South	-.125	.065
Northeast	-.056	.079
School Size	-.032	.018
Paid Security	-.044	.064
Emergency Button	-.056	.051
Contraband	-.024	.059
Drug Test	-.065	.069
Clear Books	-.070	.080
Student IDs	-.039	.070
Strict Dress	.019	.063
Metal Pass	.197	.184
Metal Detectors	-.062	.128
Cameras	-.040	.056
Fencing	.015	.063
Sign In	.078	.054
Dogs	-.034	.053
Between Effect (SD)	.431	.021
Within Effect (SD)	1.55	.010

Similar to the proceeding analysis for academic involvement, the analysis on behavioral parental involvement first shows that only individual level-by-individual level interaction terms are significant. All school level-by-school level, and cross level interactions failed to reach statistical significance.

5.2.3.1 Individual by Individual-Level Interactions

First, I find the interaction term between socioeconomic status and the parent/child relationship is significant and negative. This demonstrates that parents with higher socioeconomic levels combined with higher levels of parent/child relationship status report lower levels of behavioral involvement (e.g. difference in slope), all else equal. Similarly, parents with higher levels of parental efficacy with students who have received an out-of-school suspension condition lower levels of behavioral involvement.

Finally, the positive interaction among divorced parents and parents with a student who has received an out-of-school suspension reveal that students who are suspended and whose parents are divorced, have parents with greater levels of behavioral involvement, all else equal. Again, this finding is not entirely unexpected given the significance of each effect in the fitted model, though it does clearly demonstrate these two variables interact and relate to even greater levels of behavioral involvement.

5.2.4 Summary of Findings from Interaction Effects

There are a multitude of findings from the results indicating that considering the relationship between socioeconomic status and other indicators of social capital prove

useful in understanding how these factors interact with other parental characteristics and school discipline in relating to parental involvement. Overall, interactions among many measures of parental status do relate to parental involvement, and measures of status do interact with some measures of discipline in impacting parental involvement. Following, I briefly outline the major findings, discuss the theoretical implications, and demonstrate how these findings support prior literature, but also move our knowledge on parental involvement in schools and the relationship to social capital and discipline/security forward.

First, the interaction of socioeconomic status and parent-child relationship was significant in each model. The interaction was positive for academic involvement and formal involvement, but negative for behavioral involvement. Importantly, the simple effects for these dimensions in the regression analysis support prior literature that shows that both socioeconomic status (Barton et al., 2004; Elder et al., 1995; Hill & Taylor, 2004), and parent-child relationship (LaRocque et al., 2011) are strongly correlated with parental involvement. Yet, the interaction terms demonstrate that socioeconomic status and parent-child relation have a joint influence on parental involvement. That is, these two dimensions of social capital interact in predicting involvement in school. Given the abundance of research showing that parents who are involved with the child in the home are also likely to be involved in the school, and that socioeconomic status is among the strongest predictor of parental involvement identified in previous literature (e.g. Lareau, 2003; Burton et al., 2004; Koonce & Harper, 2005), the fact that the joint influence of these variables together is strongly correlated with parental involvement in schools is

unsurprising. In addition, the direction of the interaction term on types of parental involvement is also as I expected. High levels of socioeconomic status and high levels of parent-child relationship status relate to higher levels of formal involvement and academic involvement. On the other hand, the influence of the same interaction term is negative on behavioral involvement (a form of negative school interaction as discussed in depth in previous sections).

Second, the interaction terms between parental efficacy and out-of-school suspension rates were significant and negative in each model. This suggests that even when parents feel connected to other parents (a form of social capital), but have a child who receives an out-of-school suspensions as punishment, the parent is then less likely to become involved in the school. This finding is of particular interest as no previous research that I am aware of has explored how parental efficacy is conditioned by student punishment. It also helps to explain the results of the propensity score models in the prior chapters, the results of which showed that parents in high discipline and high security schools are less formally involved than parents in low discipline and low security schools. In the multi-level model, I find that out-of-school suspensions negatively condition the levels of involvement by parental efficacy. It could be the case that even when parents feel invested in the school and connected to other parents, but has a child who receives punitive and harsh punishment, they then become less likely to seek to become involved in the school. This could be because levels of efficacy decrease when their child becomes the target of discipline. At the same time, it is important to note—

again—that due to the cross-sectional nature of the analysis, I cannot establish temporal ordering. However, this could be one theoretical explanation for these findings.

Interactions among race, marital status, and punishment also reveal the importance of parental status in the process of discipline and parental involvement in schools. The interaction between divorced parental status and out-of-school suspension was positive and significantly correlated with behavioral involvement, suggesting that divorced parents are especially impacted by out-of-school suspensions and are significantly more likely than married parents to be impacted by out-of-school suspensions in the process of becoming involved in the school due to behavioral issues. Likewise, the interaction between single marital status and Black students was significant and negative for formal parental involvement only. This suggests that single Black parents are further less likely to become formally involved in the school which supports prior literature (see Diamond et al., 2004; Eccles & Harold, 1993).

In sum, the results of the analysis in this section of chapter five suggest that dimensions of social capital and social status interact and play an important role in predicting differing types of parental involvement as well as disciplinary outcomes within the school. Overall, the results show that marital status (in particular single parental status, [married contrast]), interacts with race for Black parents only in predicting an interaction effect on formal parental involvement. The ability to speak English interacted with race for Hispanic students only. Turning to other dimensions of social capital, punitive discipline interacted with parental efficacy in predicting lower levels of parental involvement across races. On the other hand, socioeconomic status and the relationship

of the parent and child interacted to predict greater levels of parental involvement for formal and academic involvement, but the same interaction related to lower levels of behavioral involvement, all else equal. I find that these results help to provide the context in which to understand how social capital and status interact, and how school punishment affects the joint influence of many important predictors.

The results also demonstrate that individuals with lower levels of social capital, those who lack social status (e.g. racial and ethnic minorities, parents with low socioeconomic status, single or divorced parents, and parents who experience difficulty speaking English), are the least likely to be formally involved and most impacted by harsh school discipline. Yet, interactions among parental status/discipline relate to higher levels of behavioral involvement for many parents exhibiting these exact same characteristics. This shows that individuals with lower levels of social capital and status are clearly impacted by discipline, and the lack of social capital and status may further compound the relationship between discipline and negative outcomes for parents. In order to explore this issue further, I now turn to the qualitative interviews conducted with disadvantaged parents to move our understanding of these dynamics forward.

5.3 Qualitative Results

In order to understand parents' experiences during school disciplinary processes, the role of social status and capital in discipline, and how social capital and status relates to the outcomes of the meetings and proceedings, I now turn to the qualitative data collected in 2012 and 2013 that were previously outlined in Chapter 3. In presenting these findings, I use first names to refer to respondents and also describe the demographic

characteristics of each respondent referenced in this section to provide background information and context to the findings.¹ In this chapter, I focus specifically on understanding the parental experience in the disciplinary process, and how that experience is effected by social capital and social status. I also discuss, when possible, how these experiences related to the outcome of the meetings. I save a discussion of the collateral consequences of these meetings for chapter six.

Coding the data revealed several major trends. These trends can broadly be categorized into five categories. The first category concerns the finding that parents reported (1) feeling ignored and/or unwelcomed by school officials. Other distinct themes emerged as well including (2) parents feel cheated and betrayed because school administrators break their own rules, (3) parents feel attacked and expressed that their children are mistreated by teachers and administrators, (4) parents feel frustrated because they believe that schools—a form of local government—are not run properly. Another broad theme that emerged is that parents overwhelmingly expressed in their narratives (5) the important role social status and social capital such as race, class, and marital status played in the disciplinary process. Parents consistently cited their lack of power in effecting school disciplinary outcomes largely due to a lack of social capital and social status. Following, I outline the major themes by describing general trends that emerged from the interviews and subsequent qualitative analysis. I also provide specific examples from respondents in their own words. In a small number of cases, I present a small section of a narrative including questions prompted by the interviewer and the response

¹ The names of all respondents have been changed to maintain anonymity

from the interviewee. The goal of including a handful of longer passages is to convey the complex nature of the discussions about race, class, and school discipline, and to highlight how multiple dimensions of social capital and social status shape parents' experiences in the disciplinary process.

5.3.1 Research Question Four

What do parents experience during school disciplinary processes, and are these experiences conditioned by social capital and social status? How does this relate to outcomes of the meetings/proceedings?

5.3.1.1 Ignored and Unwelcomed

The overwhelming majority of parents interviewed reported feeling ignored and unwelcomed by school officials. Many parents reported the belief that school teachers, administrators, and board members did not welcome the input of parents in the disciplinary process. For example, when asked if the school principal listened to parents or grandparents, Sarah, a Black grandparent, reflected on trying to communicate with school administrators and teachers; she stated, "They don't listen to me, even though I am in their face, but not in a negative way..." Similarly, Emily, a married Black mother with three children in school stated, in reference to her son who had experienced disciplinary issues in school, "We [mother and son] had to go and have a meeting...to me it does not solve the problem. All they say is that they are going to get them [the children] back in school, but they don't give us a chance to say nothing about the problem...I'm just

frustrated. It gives me a headache.” Both parents highlighted that their efforts to interact with school officials went unheard.

Others parents expressed similar sentiments of being ignored, even when they attempted to interact with administrators. For example, concerning the rights of parents in the role of discipline Rosa, a single White mother with two sons in school, stated that she had no rights:

...when I got to the school to pick my sons up, I always talk to the principal, and the vice principal, and tell them I was working with them. But you know, they got, you gotta be willing to work back with me, you know that was the thing. They shut it down. It was over with. No, no, no, no more discussion about it.

Relatedly, respondents also expressed concerns that teachers and administrators generally make all decision without any parental input, and that the majority of decisions are made prior to contact with the parent concerning the incident. For example, Adrianna, a 35 year old mother of four school-aged children stated, “...their paperwork is already done and it’s just come get him [her son]. Whenever I try to talk on his behalf, it’s basically like it’s already...the judgment is already done.” When asked if anyone ever asks for the opinion of parents, Adrianna went on to find, “Oh, I express my opinion all the time but it was always on deaf ears. So it’s basically like, you know, it’s already been ruled on, it’s already final.” This was mirrored in other respondent’s experiences as well. During an interview with a Catherine, a 49 year old single mother of three children who worked part time as a janitor, when she was asked if there was a chance for her to tell her side of the story, she said, “He [the principal] already made it [the decision] when

I got there, what he was gonna do. He made the decision at the end of the week.” Clearly, parents believe their input is not welcome or appreciated by school officials.

The finding that parents are ignored or unwelcomed was pervasive in nearly all interviews, and a reoccurring theme. Highlighting the ubiquity of this finding, when asked if race played a role in parent-teacher interactions, Beth, a Black, single mother in her mid-thirties with a 5th grade son t stated, “They won’t interact! They won’t interact, so they wouldn’t let me come up to the school. They granted me one conference, they wouldn’t meet with me again, so I really don’t know [if race plays a role].” Similarly, Ruth, a single Black mother in her early forties with a daughter in 7th grade was concerned that the teacher was asking her daughter for her social security number. When confronting the teacher, the teacher simply ignored her. Ruth stated, “Which is typical...this is the new normal just ignore parents...I called [the principal’s office] and they didn’t respond, and weeks were going by...” Ruth continued and reached out to the assistant superintendent, superintendent, and finally, the school board, all without receiving a return phone call.

Although the majority of respondents reported not being listened to, one individual did report feeling respected. For example, in discussing details about the punishment of a young grandson, Sarah related that, “They [school administration] were respectful but they had already made up their mind.” This sentiment that the decision on the punishment was made prior to the parent becoming involved was echoed by nearly all of the respondents’ narratives, with others citing a lack of open-door policies and transparency in the disciplinary process as normal. For example, Ruth related her

experiences, finding that, “As a matter of fact, they [school officials] treat us as if they want us to go along with them and not ask any questions. They treat us as if there is no open-door policy.” This theme also emerged when parents would seek additional information about the discipline their child had encountered. Beth cited that the school kept a disciplinary file on her son, and that she had repeatedly sought to get copies of her son’s file. When asked how she had attempted to get copies, and if she had received them, she found, “I’ve written, I’ve emailed, and I’ve asked to review his regular file. I’ve asked for copies of the detention file because I feel like if this is what you’re using to penalize him, the least you can do is detail what he done. Most of the checks, most of the sheets of paper they refer to as being detention checks were blank...” When asked if she had received the file, she said “No, they still haven’t given it up.”

Some respondents reported that the current state of parent-school relations has changed over time. Highlighting this, Ivalu, a grandparent, stated that in her experience as a mother, the schools were always willing to speak with parents and listen to them. But now, as a grandmother, the times are different. Ivalu stated,

Now I’m totally shocked by the lack of respect for parents and their children. [There] seems to be a lack of recourse for children and for parents. I have not ever been close with kinds of situations that the parents are facing here. I just have never been faced with it and I’m in total shock and awe by it. People not being accepted, administrators not being accepting...I’m not accustomed to that.”

These narratives clearly demonstrate that parents and school officials are often at odds. Parents often feel ignored and unwelcomed in the school, and many do not believe they have any say in the disciplinary process. Next, I turn to exploring the other

predominate themes that emerged including findings that parents feeling cheated, attacked, and frustrated. Then, I turn to a discussion of the social capital and social status played within interactions between parents and school officials.

5.3.1.2 Cheated

In coding the data, another theme that emerged reflected the issue that parents felt cheated because teachers and administrators would break their own rules. This trend emerged in more than half of the interviews. For example, Emily related feeling cheated and sought to complain about schools not following the guidelines concerning punishment. She finds, “The guidelines says you call me, send him [her son] to another room...all these other alternatives than just suspending him [her son], so I’m having to deal with them at that not because he still getting suspended.” Emily relates that she understands the rules, and believes that teachers and administrators also know what the rules are, but that they have the ability to ignore the rules and parents often lack the resources to combat this issue. This sentiment was also echoed by others. After attending an informational meeting sponsored by the SPLC aimed at informing parents of their rights, Sarah found that, “...from now on, I will be armed with ammunition that I need and will follow through with it...I said from now on, if they get suspended I will know what to do; how to handle it.”

In discussing how teachers and administrators decide and implement punishment, Greta found that, “...teachers do whatever they want, whatever they want right or wrong [and the] principal will uphold them or whatever unless the parent really knows their rights as written in the book there. Otherwise, they do whatever the principal [or]

teachers say and it could be completely wrong.” Similarly, Ivalu found that school administrators had the ability to change the rules of discipline when it suited them. She highlights that, “...principals should not have the kind of leeway that they have because parents don’t have appropriate resources and due process.” This narrative shows that parents feel cheated because schools change their policies without regard to the rights of the parent. This sentiment was echoed by others as well.

Ruth discussed a similar issue in discipline that her middle-school aged daughter encountered. She finds, “Whenever I would inquire or keep pushing for accountability for rules and regulations under the school system, but yet, many schools create their own rules regardless of the [school system name]’s rules.” Later in the interview, Ruth continued in this theme by reflecting that, “They [school administration] don’t follow regulation; they don’t follow the student handbook that they give us. They do it [give parents the handbook] because of the law, but they don’t follow it, you know?” In addition to feeling cheated, parents also feel attacked which I turn to now.

5.3.1.3 Attacked

The majority of parents felt that they, and their children, were attacked by teachers and administrators. For example, Beth related an incident that she believed had greatly impacted her child and demonstrated that teachers and administrators bully students, and that parents were rather helpless to intervene on their child’s behalf. She related a story in which her son had been caught with a toy in the classroom:

[The teacher] paraded him to difference class, and he had to tell each class that he was a thief. And when she [the teacher] walked him to the car, he looked like he wanted to say something. And I say you better say it right

now...and he said a little boy gave it to me [the toy] and I said, do you know this? [to the teacher]. She said yes. I said he is seven years old, and she marched him from classroom to classroom and had him tell each class he was a thief.

She explained that this type of reaction and punishment was not appropriate for a seven year old child and that this was really a form of bullying children; that teachers bully students.

Other parents also found that administrators and teachers are often bullies to both children and parents. Upon reflecting on some recent dealings with a particular teacher, Brittany found that, “I’ve been in a stage where I didn’t want to deal with them [school teachers]...the school with the principal who was a bully – she would actually drive and knock on your door and come to your house [to demand a meeting].” Brittany reported that she felt attacked and that, “It just, it makes you feel real bad, like you’re not a good parent of you’re not doing a good job at raising your child. You know, it’s hurtful to your image.”

Moving beyond harming the parent’s identity, parents also expressed that they attempted to assist their child and protect them from being attacked, often without results. Emily expressed that her son had been targeted and bullied by a teacher:

I even had him one time record [the bullying] from teachers because I didn’t believe him because he said the teacher constantly calls his name, and he recorded it because the teacher is picking on him and there’s nothing I can do about [it]. Nothing I can do for him in that situation but complain and it’s like I were against the teachers...

Emily continued and explained that her son was often a target for teachers to attack. She related an incident involving discipline over a clothing dispute:

One teacher even said he went on a field trip and his pants were sagging and he had on a wife beater shirt, and I'm like, that's not even true! I buy [son's name] clothes, he cannot sag his pants because I buy his clothing. And all of his pants fit around his waist. And she's like, maybe he just pulled them down and I'm like, that cannot be true! We don't even own wife beaters in my house. My husband doesn't even wear wife beaters, so unless he walked out the door and put it on, there is no way he wears it. She said, maybe he took it from someone else, and I'm like, really lady? I think she was just making something up...

Rosa also expressed similar sentiments. After her son was sent to the office, she found that the teachers and administration often acted together to target her son. Rosa finds, "They all ganged up on him and talked to him, saying he was lazy. Nobody ever called me." Following this incident, Rosa tried to intervene and requested that she be contacted if her son is sent to the main office again, but that to this day, no one has ever called her.

As part of feeling attacked, parents also felt an imbalance in power. For example, Rosa stated:

You gotta be careful how you talk to these principals because they got the power. I mean, they honestly have the power over you, really they do. I mean, what it all boils down to it, and they know they do. Because I mean, and that's what is so upsetting as a parent because you feel like you don't have any rights even though they're your children your sending them there, hoping their being taken care of.

One respondent who had a middle-school aged boy who had received disciplinary sanctions for clothing infractions that ultimately led to his expulsion from school (e.g. not wearing a belt), had a mother who was a retired teacher whom she would reach out to for assistance. "She [the mother] retired from teaching and I would even consult her. I was like, 'mom, this happened, what do you think I should do?' And she was like oh no,

that's awful! You know they [the teachers] team up...that's how teachers are these days. We gotta watch out for these teachers."

5.3.1.4 Frustrated

About half of all parents expressed frustration that schools--a form of local government—are not run properly. Highlighting this, Sarah relayed that while she thought the curriculum and instruction were good, the way the schools operate and enforce the code of conduct is not appropriate for children. Sarah finds, "Not the curriculum and everything there is very good; I love the curriculum that is there. But the code of conduct they have, I mean, if you go to that school you won't hear a sound up in there, you won't hear a child talk....they don't talk...you talk, you're suspended." She continued to relate that while the instruction met her expectations, the discipline had significant negative effects. In regard to the focus on punitive and harsh discipline, Sarah found that, "I told him [the principal] these are children and young adults. You have to give them the opportunity to grow. I would have fond memories of being in middle school, but these children will not have fond memories of middle school." Similarly, when asked why schools are run the way they are, Brittany tried to explain it as, "I just feel like they don't have the patience for the kids...or...I can't begin to understand what's going on..." This sentiment was echoed by other parents as well.

A few parents found that the chain of command and even the elected leaders did not seek to include parents in the running of the school. For example, Ivalu found that, "...the teacher's not paying him or her (parent) any attention, so they go the principal...the principal is not held accountable by the superintendent, and the

superintendent is not held accountable by the school board, then this is the lack of recourse of due process because there's no chain of command." Ivalu expressed frustration that there was no clear way for parents to interact with school officials.

Other parents reported frustration because some children were on transfers from their home school to other schools. In this sense, a transfer means that a student attends a school they are not zoned for; instead, they have received permission to attend a school outside of their zone for a variety of reasons. These reasons can include the student being advanced in their studies, requiring additional support due to mental or physical health, because the parent has requested it, or because they were originally zoned for an underperforming school. Some parents reported that school administrators would threaten to revoke the transfer of the child, therefore sending them back to the school where they were originally zoned. Parents reported frustration because they believed this was a threat employed to keep parents out of schools and to punish students. For example, Donna, a single Black mother in her early thirties with two children in school, found:

I went up to [the school] this morning and we went up to the office and she [the principal] said she was gonna revoke [daughter's name] transfer. And I was like, for what? Oh, for her phone? Do you know how many kids have phones in school? So she revoked her transfers and [my daughter] is really hurt about it...

Donna believed this was done so that the school could send her daughter back to her home school to keep enrollment down. Ruth also had similar issues. She found that, "If you're a transfer student, they treat you like you don't have the right to open your mouth because everything is pretty much you are always told well, you know your daughter is

here on a transfer or your son and he reminded of that transfer and I feel like that's bad." Ruth related that school officials remind parents that the transfer can be revoked at any time and often use that as a threat to keep parents from questioning the way schools are run.

Other parents also reported frustration with transfers. For example, Donna found that when her son got in trouble, the principal would contact her and threaten to revoke her sons transfer, regardless of how minor the incident. She finds, "Any little thing my son did, and he [the principal] was gonna put it in the computer to revoke his transfers...and that's what he did...was revoke his transfer." Donna stated that her son's transfer was revoked within three weeks of receiving it, and she believed the reasons cited were not worthy of revoking a transfer. Her son had been accused of skipping school, but Donna did not believe her son actually skipped school; rather, the administration lied about the issue in order to revoke her son's transfer and send him back to the school he was zoned. Donna stated, "They [teachers] try to provoke him [her son] so that they can revoke his transfer."

These passages highlight that parents feel frustrated because they do not believe that schools are run properly, that schools do not follow established protocol, and school officials often victimize students and parents. In addition, parents report that as citizens, they have a connection to the school and feel some sense of ownership because it is a form of local government. Yet, because they believe the school works against their interests to varying degrees, they are frustrated with the local government. Parents report that schools use tactics to keep them out of the school, and threaten sanctions against the

student, or parent, to keep parents from questioning the way schools operate which violates the parents' rights. Next, I turn to understanding the role of social status in parent's experiences within the school as it relates to discipline.

5.3.2 The Role of Social Status and Social Capital

All of the respondent's interviewed addressed dimensions of social capital and social status in the disciplinary process, and how these dimensions influenced the outcome of disciplinary meetings and proceedings. Primarily, respondents generally highlighted issues of race, class, and marital status. At the same time, many also spoke about their attempts to use other forms of social capital—such as a grandparent or extended family—in advocating for their child and affecting the disciplinary process.

5.3.2.1 Race

One reoccurring theme concerning the role of social status that emerged was race. For example, in explaining how race factored into the inclusion, or lack of inclusion, of parents in the school, Ruth explained, "They almost treat them [Black parents] as if they're not a parent of the school system..." This belief was highlighted by many respondents, both in respect to school discipline, but also within the broader social-cultural context of the area in which they live. For example, when asked if race was an issue in school discipline, Greta, a grandmother in her early 80s who had experience working in the school as a para-professional prior to retiring, stated that racial tensions between Whites and Blacks was a significant issue and that people failed to realize that there is no such thing as "White" or "Black." For example, in the follow exchange, Greta

explains that the biggest issue is that individuals fail to realize that race is a social invention, and instead tend to think that it divides people into distinct categories. In turn, this impacts who receives punishment and why it disproportionately impacts Black youth relative to White youth. Greta began by explaining that there was no real thing as White or Black in society, but that people fail to realize this:

Greta: Let me tell you this. As a nation, as a world, we can get away from the identification of White and Black... See this thing [referring to the interviewer] you are not this color (points to White napkin) I'm not this color (points to coffee cup) so we can eliminate that...because it's so stupid. Because I've African American friends, they are African-American, and she's your color [White], or the color Black how stupid is that?

Interviewer: "...and were treated differently because of that, even though we have the same color skin...?"

Greta: We just need eliminate that because we're all human beings, and I think so many just trying to almost instill the mentality of slavery. We are all the same people, I mean honestly. We've only been up from slavery 135 years... My grandmother just passed [and] she was 108. And the things that we have done in that span of time, that's less than the blinking of an eye. But the thing of it is...see God created us all and color ain't got nothing to do with it...nothing.

Because of the history of racial issues and because racial tensions that dominated the structural level of the area, these problems also applied to the school setting including discipline. For example, we continued on with the discussion as Greta explained that children from disadvantage backgrounds—overwhelmingly Black—are punished to a greater degree than White children because of race.

Interviewer: Do you think the kids from disadvantaged homes...are they punished more than kids that aren't from those homes?

Greta: They may be... They just may be.

Interviewer: do you think there are differences in race and punishment here in [city name]?

Greta: When we had segregation there was...

Interviewer: And who was more disproportionately effected by that?

Greta: Our children, African-Americans

Interviewer: do you think it's the same way [now]?

Greta: It may be getting a tad better, but we don't have corporal punishment anymore. But I have seen it, when I was working [in the school]. They have a thick strap and I'm telling you it's like they enjoyed it...beating on children.

Interview: Do you think they enjoy giving children suspensions now? Did suspensions and detentions take the place of that strap...is it used the same way?

Greta: Yes

In addition to race serving as an important predictor of school discipline and punishment, as well as playing a significant role in predicting the success of a parent in advocating for their child in the disciplinary process, the role of race was often compounded by other factors. For example, in speaking with Ruth, whose daughter had encountered some disciplinary issues in the school, she explained that poor White families receive *almost* the same treatment as poor Black families. "They almost treat them as if they're not a parent of the school system..." On the other hand, Ruth continued and explained that middle and upper-class White parents had an advantage in that, "You ["well-to-do White parent"] can pick up the phone and call your Councilman [or] state legislator. You have context where a phone call can be made and the principal will be shaking in her boots."

When asked if there was a difference between predominately Black and predominately White schools, Ruth stated, “Yes, as a matter of fact, it’s a new kind of racism. In the 60s, it was a Black and a White racial situation. But not...a lot of the Black principals will treat Black students in a degrading way. But if the same Black principal was out of the predominately White school, her behavior would be professional...totally professional.”

Though the majority of respondents were Black, the few White respondents approached race differently. For example Rosa, a 44 year old White mother who had been involved in the disciplinary process with her son highlighted the belief that there are qualitative differences between White and Black youth.

If you are White, and you are civilized, you don’t go to [predominately Black school name]! These um, these minority, Black ghettos that live in [predominately Black school name area] don’t fight, they maim. They will beat you. Because of the way they...the way they carry on. They have their pants down...dropped down. And they’ve got this attitude they will hurt you, you know, they are very aggressive. I can tell when they’re from that [area]. Because they’re dangerous. And I worry because of, if it was a White boy hurting a Black, then I worry about them coming to that school, the gang....if you live in [area of school] and you’re Black, you have a different, you been raised in...you have a different approach. I’m not prejudice, I’m from the South...you know how these racial things come about when you have a White boy beating up on a Black girl. It would be the same thing if there was a Black boy at school beating up on a White girl. It’s a southern thing, you know? ... Maybe it’s everywhere, I don’t know, I’ve lived in the South. I think it’s pretty much everywhere...you live.

This quote is especially revealing as it provides a window in which to compare White and Black responses in a large southern city with a history of racial tension, and extreme racial segregation and poverty. While this perspective is certainly not representative of some—or possibly most—Whites in the area, it does demonstrate the pervasiveness of

race in understanding school discipline and punishment. In addition, this also suggests that some White individuals who are treated poorly by the school use racism as a means in which to pass along the disrespect they receive onto other groups. While I am limited in exploring the extent to which White individuals use race to explain patterns in punishment in the current interview data, this is something that future research should explore. At the same time, other dimensions of social status, such as social class and marital status, also emerged as an important theme which I turn to next.

5.3.2.2 Social Class

In asking parents about their experiences within the schools and whether or not they were able to effect the outcome of disciplinary proceedings, many parents cited socioeconomic status and disadvantage as important structural and social barriers. For example, Ruth was asked if she felt listened to when attempting to advocate for her daughter in the disciplinary process. “No, Oh no! They treat us like as if...depends on the area that you live in. I live in a poor community....the principal carried herself as a dictator...she didn’t give you any respect...she was very disrespectful, she’ll over talk you.” Ruth explained that parents from middle- or upper-class neighborhoods were able to successfully advocate for their child.

Other parents believed that transferring their child to a private school might assist in overcoming the disciplinary issues experienced in public school. For example, “If I could take my kids—if I could afford it—I would have them in private schools. You know, Catholic schools.” This sentiment was echoed by other parents as well, that they wish they had the economic capital to remove their child from the school and place

him/her in private school, or in a more affluent public school system. For example, Donna discussed trying to send her son to live with relatives to attend school. She stated, “I tried to...to send him to Atlanta with his aunt to see if she could find a program for him so maybe he could go back in school...” Yet, Donna lacked the money to support her son and enroll him in a different program hundreds of miles away. Emily also highlighted the difference between public and private schools and indicated that she would prefer private schools because, “They don’t have these problems [unfair discipline] in private school.”

Similarly, Rosa spoke about the difficulties of effecting the outcome of harsh discipline due to a lack of resources, “I mean, when you see your child sad and moping around...It effects you. You know you see your child just going completely downhill and you can’t do anything about it. But then, you got all other things you’ve got to do as a parent to maintain a household. You feel stuck....you want all these things you want things to change, but you have no ways to change them.” Overall, many parents felt stuck due to their lack of access to economic capital.

5.3.2.3 Marital Status and Support

Another important dimension of social capital and status concerned marital status and support. For example, during the interview with Donna, a single Black mother with two children in school, she expressed utter despair due to the disciplinary process encountered with her middle-school age daughter. After breaking down in tears, Donna stated, “...I don’t know how to keep myself together...to keep her [daughter] together...I just don’t have no help. I email everybody trying to get help...” In short, this respondent

lacked the social support provided by a significant other, and because of that, believed that the lack of help in the household placed a strain on her such that she was unable to become involved in the disciplinary process. In fact, the interview ended at the conclusion of this sentence due to the emotional toll this was taking on the respondent.

Similar sentiments were echoed by others. For example, Sarah explained that due to illness, she has not been able to help her daughter and grandson as much as she would have liked. When asked if she had the chance to interact with teachers or school principals recently, she found, “Lately, I have been really under the weather because I have a few illnesses that I have, but I tried to [interact]...” Therefore, even when single mothers had grandparents they could rely on, other circumstances such as old age or illness often acted as barriers for parents to use social networks to help them in the disciplinary process.

In a similar vein, Ruth explained that school officials targeted single Black mothers because they lacked social support. She finds:

Let me say like this a profound number of students come from single parent households that are headed by a single Black female. By it being that way, we don't have too many people... Whether it's a grandmother or grandfather to come over there and help us. So we get very worn out, and they know this and it's a tactic. When they know you're a single-parent you pretty much all alone. Trying to educate your children, you know, it's a practice where you just get beat up from trying to go through a chain the does not work. They don't answer you in a timely manner. You go in and they tell you that the principal is in a meeting. And that do that for the next four or five weeks. Or months, or they don't answer you at all. In other words, you get danced around so...and that makes a lot of parents give up.

These narratives highlight the importance that marital status—as a form of social capital—plays in understanding parents’ experiences in the disciplinary process. In particular, single parents expressed difficulty in balancing the needs of their children at home, maintaining a household more broadly, being employed, and that engaging in the disciplinary process severely disrupted these life activities. Further, some respondents expressed the belief that single parents were targeted by school officials, and that when school officials recognized the parent was a single parent, they employed tactics, like not returning phone calls, until the single parent simply gave up on attempting to advocate for their child in the disciplinary process.

5.3.3 Summary of Findings

Overall, the results of these findings reveal that parents’ experiences in the disciplinary process share many commonalities; experiences are conditioned by social capital and social status, and capital and status do appear to relate to the outcomes of the meetings/proceedings – at least, from the perspective of the majority of respondents in this sample. Yet, given that this sample of convenience was made primarily of single, working-class, Black, mothers, these findings must be understood that they are not generalizable to the larger population of parents in general. Instead, these experiences represent the lived reality of marginalized individuals and are important in multiple dimensions.

First, these findings highlight the experience of individuals that the quantitative analysis—as well as previous literature—suggests would be most impacted by disciplinary processes. That is, the simple coefficients and the interaction terms generally

showed that those who lacked social capital or social status had lower levels of formal involvement in schools, higher levels of negative involvement due to behavioral issues of their child, and that levels of involvement were conditioned by joint effects of interaction terms among social capital, social status, discipline, and security. These findings are supported and complemented by the qualitative findings as the qualitative findings provide the context in which to understand these broader trends.

As previously outlined, dimensions of social capital and status relate to differing forms of parental involvement, and interaction terms reveal that the joint influences of multiple dimensions of social capital on involvement, too. Moreover, school discipline and security do play a role in these processes. The qualitative interviews mirror many of the findings of the quantitative results in that parents highlighted that their lack of social capital often precluded their involvement in the disciplinary process. Racial, class, and marital disadvantage were consistently highlighted within the narratives as key barriers to involvement within the disciplinary process. Clearly, these findings mirror the findings from the quantitative analysis in terms of the role these dimensions of social capital and status play in shaping parental experience with school discipline.

In addition to complementing the quantitative analysis, the results of the qualitative findings presented in this chapter demonstrate that parents are aware that their lack of power in advocating for their child in the disciplinary process is due to their lack of social capital and lower levels of social status. Parents perceive that their children are treated differently than the children of parents who have the political, economic, or social capital to successfully intervene on their child's behalf. That is, the parents interviewed

highlight that their children might actually be treated differently if they—as parents—had access to political, economic, or social privilege and power. This suggests that parents are very aware of their relatively powerless state, especially in light of their view of the experiences of middle- and upper-class, White, married parents.

Analyzing the data for trends first shows that respondents overwhelmingly reported that they were ignored, unwelcomed, and/or disregarded by school officials in school discipline and punishment. Respondents highlighted that school officials had already decided on school punishment prior to contacting the parent, if the parent was contacted at all. The majority of respondents reported that their efforts to become involved in the decision making process largely went ignored. Similarly, these narratives highlight the degree to which many parents report a general unwillingness by school officials to engage with parents in any meaningful capacity.

Second, in addition to feeling ignored and unwelcomed, parents felt cheated because school officials often changed or ignored the laws governing what school officials can and cannot do. That is, school administrators would often break their own rules in regards to punishment. The narratives show that the implementation of discipline was arbitrary and unfair, and done without regard to actual school protocol. Parents reported feeling angry that that discipline was applied unfairly and inconsistently with established disciplinary policy.

Third, parents also felt attacked and expressed that their children are mistreated by teachers and administrators. Parents cited that their children were often targeted by teachers and school officials. In addition, parents were unable to assist their child within

the school. In some cases, parents expressed that their child was bullied—not by other students—but by school officials, and that parents were also bullied when they attempted to intervene.

Fourth, parents reported frustration because schools are not run properly. Many parents expressed that school officials have no accountability, and that because of this, school officials are not held to any particular standard or law. Parents also reported that the chain of command had no outlet for parents and that parents were frustrated because they could not interact with school officials at any level.

Fifth, many respondents highlighted issues of social status. That is, race, social class, and marital status were issues that were presented in the majority of narratives that were collected. The majority of Black respondents interviewed expressed that race was a major issue in the disciplinary process, and highlighted their belief that Black parents were unwelcome in the decision making process of the school. In addition, the small number of White respondents interviewed expressed the belief that Black individuals were qualitatively different than White individuals, thereby underscoring the essentialist belief in race in these processes and further highlighting the role of race in discipline and social control.

Social class was also a major theme that emerged. Many parents expressed the concern that school officials and teachers interact with poor and working-class parents in a different manner than middle- or upper-class parents. For example, many respondents highlighted the role of social status in the outcome of disciplinary processes, either

through firsthand experience, or from the expression of what “others” (e.g. middle/upper class families) could do to effect outcomes.

Much like race and social class, marital status was also cited as an issue. Single parents lacked the help they needed in order to maintain the household, and also become successful advocates for their child in the school. Some single parents felt singled-out or targeted by school administration. Overall, it is clear that marital status does effect the parents’ experience in the disciplinary process.

In sum, the interviews revealed that social status and social capital do play an important role for many parents in the disciplinary process within schools, and that by virtue of being ignored and unwelcomed by school officials and administrators, social status plays a key role in the outcome of disciplinary processes. Poor, disadvantaged parents believed they faced unique barriers in effecting the outcomes of disciplinary process compared to their White, middle- and upper-class counterparts. Social capital played a key role in the disciplinary process for parents, and the lack of social capital for many respondents precluded the majority of them from engaging with school officials in order to impact the outcome of the disciplinary process in their favor.

These findings support prior literature that demonstrates that parents who lack social capital such as economic and political resources, or those with lower levels of social status such as marital status or racial and/or ethnic minority status face challenges in becoming involved within the schooling of their child (e.g. Noguera, 2003). Yet, the

findings of this analysis move our understanding of this forward by applying this framework to school discipline and disciplinary outcomes. In order to understand this complex process in greater detail, next I turn to exploring the collateral consequences parents experience due to school discipline, and how social capital relates to these interactions in the following chapter.

Chapter 6

RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE: COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

The prior chapters outline a number of important findings. First, the results of a propensity score analysis using a nationally-representative sample of public schools show that both formal and behavioral parental involvement are effected by levels of discipline and security within the school. The results of the multi-level models with interaction terms demonstrate that combinations of social capital and social status help to explain these trends in parental involvement. These findings also help to explain the relationship between parental involvement and individual-level measures such as race, income, and suspensions, and school level measures, such as school security.

Next, an analysis of qualitative data show that disadvantaged parents feel cheated, frustrated, and attacked when attempting to become involved in the school to advocate for their child within the disciplinary process. Coding the interviews also showed that parents felt ignored and unwelcomed within the school, and recognized that their lack of social capital and social status played an important role within this process. Lacking social capital and social status presented barriers to parents in effecting the outcome of the disciplinary process in favor of their child. Overall, the previous chapters examined how parents shaped, participated in, or perceived discipline. In this chapter, I change the causal

direction of this question to explore how discipline shapes—or impacts—parents. By changing the causal pathway, this approach allows me to examine the outcomes that occur to the parent as a result of becoming involved in the disciplinary process by examining the collateral consequences parents, and to a lesser degree families, experience. Finally, I end this chapter by connecting these findings to conclusions from the previous chapters and previous work on the collateral consequences of punitive punishment more broadly.

6.1 Research Question Five

What effect does involvement in disciplinary processes within the school (such as meetings with administrators, teachers, members of law enforcement, security personnel) and outcomes (such as taking time off work) have on parents and families? What are the collateral consequences of these interactions?

Coding the qualitative interviews revealed a number of trends in the narratives outlining the effects of disciplinary proceedings on parents and families, and the collateral consequences of these interactions. The primary themes that emerged were centered around (1) financial consequences, (2) physical consequences, (3) family and family-emotional consequences, and (4) anticipated future consequences. These categories represent both effects of discipline on parents, as well as the consequences of discipline on parents and family.

Financial consequences refers to the financial burden the parent encountered due to disciplinary action within the school. Though explored in greater detail below, many parents expressed that they had suffered financial consequences caused by school discipline due to missed work and lost wages, the inability to maintain steady employment,

and a lack of ability to hire legal representation for their child. Other parents expressed feeling the financial burden of traveling to and from disciplinary meetings due to the costs of transportation.

Physical consequences refers to the physical toll parents experienced due to involvement within the school. Some examples include parents reporting changes in weight, loss of sleep, and an upset stomach. In a handful of cases, parents also reported hair loss.

Family and family-emotional consequences refers to the toll discipline took on both family dynamics, such as the relationship between the parent and child, as well as the emotional distress parents experienced due to interacting with school officials that then negatively impacted dynamics within the family. For example, parents reported emotional reactions such as embarrassment, anger, and frustration caused by school discipline that, in turn, had spill-over effects into the family. In some cases, the parent partially blamed the child for the issues they experienced, felt a disruption in their relationship with the child, or expressed that they had lost connection with the child. Therefore, the actual collateral consequence of the emotional distress parents experienced due to school discipline occurred within the family.

Finally, anticipated future consequences refers to the parents' decrease in the belief that their child would experience certain milestones of success, such as graduating high school, attending college, or experiencing happiness as an adult; or, that parents experienced a decrease in other future hopes or goals for their children due to school

punishment. Some parents expressed concern that their child's self-image had decreased as a result of discipline which could then have negative consequences in the future.

These four categories are not mutually exclusive. In the subsequent sections of this chapter, I outline each type of consequence and place portions of the narratives into sections given the predominant theme of the discussion. I then provide an analysis of each theme, and include narratives from respondents to provide an in-depth exploration of each type of consequence.

6.1.1 Financial Consequences

One of the major types of consequences caused by school discipline and reported by nearly all parents that were interviewed concerned financial consequences. A number of parents reported issues including losing their job, the inability to secure a job due to school discipline, the inability to find—and pay for—a caretaker for their child due to suspensions and/or expulsions, and the financial cost of trying to hire legal representation within the disciplinary process. As a result of having to become involved at the school with teachers and/or administrators, many parents reported having to quit their job, had attempted to find another job with flexible hours or night shifts, and generally highlighted the cost of having to travel to and from disciplinary proceedings within the school or at the central office. Due to issues like these, parents reported experiencing a financial burden because of school discipline. Below, I describe some of the ways in which parents experience these financial burdens.

In many cases, when a child is disciplined, the parent is contacted to pick the child up from school. This often causes the parent to miss work. Because the majority of

individuals interviewed were hourly employees, this also meant a loss in wages. Beyond picking the child up from school, many parents were also required to attend meetings with the teachers and/or administrators, or attend hearings at the central office. This often meant a loss of time at work as well. In cases when the child was removed from school—whether temporary or permanent—parents needed to find someone to watch the child. Some parents were able to rely on other family members, but in some cases parents did not have family members, or had family members who were not available to assist in caring for the child, which then meant that the parent was faced with paying for someone to watch their child.

Demonstrating this, when asked if she had missed work because of school discipline of her child, Beth related to the interviewer that, “Absolutely I did. I am in sales where I travel, [and] go from business-to-business and...my production was really cut short this week. Some days he [her son] rode with me.” When asked if there was a broader financial impact, and whether or not she thought other parents had similar experiences, Beth continued by conveying that, “The individuals [parents], they don’t have the means to get an attorney or have an expert come in and help them, and they they’re having to take off time from work, and you’re stuck between a rock and a hard place.” Beth went on to explain that she was told she could hire an attorney to represent her son in the school disciplinary meetings, but she finds: “...the lady at the front desk at the school board said to me, ‘oh you can bring your attorney if you’d like,’ and I was thinking, ‘girl you know I can’t afford an attorney...’” Similar experiences and consequences were expressed by other parents as well.

When discussing her experiences with discipline in the school, Rosa explained that she had also experienced negative financial consequences as a result. In discussing the effect of discipline on her small cleaning business, she finds, “[I] had to take out time from work to go up to the school last year...so it had an effect...some of that has to do with economics, but anyways, it’s been a struggle.” Clearly some parents are forced to miss work and lose wages as a consequence of punitive school discipline.

Ruth also expressed similar sentiments as Beth and Rosa. In discussing her financial consequences of school discipline, she finds:

...and if you missed too many days you end up being terminated [from work]. Now some jobs will work with you, most of them don’t seem to be working with the younger parents. What happened is again you get parents who are unemployed, they might get unemployment or food stamps or whatever but it creates a hardship for the family. Hardships bring about other problems, especially if you have teenagers.

Ruth continued outlining her experiences, and likened her experiences to others

...I hear how a lot of parents have to change their hours of work because they’re calling them for nonsense at the school so much, or even quit jobs. It has caused a lot of depression, stress, hardship on families because a lot of families don’t support you when you got through stuff like this.

This type of narrative expresses that financial consequences can also place hardships on the emotional wellbeing of the parent as well as hardship on the family, which I discuss in greater detail in the following sections.

For some parents, the cost of childcare, or the potential cost of childcare, presented a financial burden. Jackie highlights this:

They [Jackie’s sons] stay with their grandparents. You know, if they are not with their grandparents, I can tell my oldest daughter....but it’s a total rearrangement of your schedule. You know? I have the support system, but a lot [of other parents] don’t have a support system and they’re [child

is] left at home. I'm fortunate enough not to have to do that, but you know I would have to hire a babysitter if I wanted to go to work.

Jackie also discussed having to change jobs because she had to come to the school which interrupted her work, and that she had to take a night job because she was having to go to the school so often, detailed in the following exchange.

Jackie: I mean, it was coming to where I switched jobs, you know, I had to take a night job

Interviewer: Because you were going to the school so much?

Jackie: Yes, at least three times

Interviewer: You shifted jobs because of the school discipline?

Jackie: Absolutely. Absolutely, Absolutely. And I'm still working nights now. You know that the suspensions affect the family in so many different ways. From the elementary school to high school, it affects the parents. Because the parents have to rearrange their schedule they are taking off for suspensions. I mean, that's another thing you have to take off, for the school board, when they decide you have an appointment. So you already took off for the child, when you have to come pick them up, then you have to take off because the child is suspended, then you have to take off again to appeal it, you know, in between phone calls during the day. How do you maintain? You still have to feed your family. You know, work so that you can maintain and it's a constant interruption.

Brittany also found issues with employment, highlighted in this brief exchange:

Interviewer: ...did you ever have to go to the school to pick him up a lot? If they were kicking him out? How did that affect you?

Brittany: [deep sigh] I missed a lot of time at work. Some jobs, I lost.

Interviewer: You lost jobs because of it?

Brittany: Yes, because they were calling for the least little thing. You know...just...it has been a real inconvenience.

Rosa also found that it effected the family financially due to an interruption in her day-to-day routine, "...because I wasn't able to carry on my daily activities. Which, what I mean is that I wasn't able to....I had to be here with him, and worry about him being here." Because of that, Rosa had to miss work, which caused financial distress within the family due to school discipline. For some, even attending the meetings caused financial strain outside of missing work. Highlighting this, Adrianna reported that attending the school disciplinary hearings cost gas money, and due to the length of the meetings, she would often have to attend meetings on subsequent days, "A few times, I went there all day...come back the next day just to wait for them to hurry up...but no, now I have to come back here [to the school] tomorrow, waste gas when we could've done it the day before." What these passages highlight is that many parents experience financial distress due to school discipline. Next, I turn to a discussion of the physical consequences of school discipline.

6.1.2 Physical Consequences

In addition to the financial consequence of school discipline, another consequence caused by punitive school discipline can broadly be categorized as physical consequences. Though only reported by a small number of parents in the sample, those that did report physical issues as an outcome of discipline highlighted some issues including changes in weight, loss of sleep, and loss of hair. Others reported feeling ill when interacting with school officials, such as experiencing an upset stomach.

In highlighting the physical consequence of school discipline, Ruth likened her experiences to posttraumatic stress. She finds:

It's [experiences with school discipline] traumatizing...you know when they were on the Today Show maybe talking about the soldiers and posttraumatic stress. When you go through from year to year just dealing with the system part of, of it all. It's almost like you feel almost like a posttraumatic stress. I have been so stressed out...I cut my hair off because my hair would just come out. Even though I went to the police department and the lawyer wrote the letter on my behalf. When I went back to the school, I just...you couldn't see it but I was just a nervous wreck. I never thought in 100 years I'd have to endure this just to have her [daughter] educated.

In a similar vein, Donna found that: “[Suspensions] have hurt me too, because we're all scratched out. I be up all night, and I can't sleep...lose weight and my hair's coming out of the side. But it's hurtful, it is hurtful, it's really hurtful.” Another parent also reported feeling physically sick when she was contacted by school officials concerning the punishment of her child. Outside of financial consequences, the duress experienced due to school discipline can clearly manifest within parents as a decrease in physical wellbeing. Next, I turn to providing an overview of family and family-emotional consequences of school punishment.

6.1.3 Family and Family-Emotional Consequences

While family and family-emotional consequences might represent distinct concepts, respondents overwhelmingly cited these two issues as consequences that occur concurrently by nearly all respondents. For example, an increase in stress caused by school discipline was often coupled with an increase in the amount of strain within the family. To put it differently, while many parents reported general stress or anxiety about school discipline—certainly a negative emotional effect on the parent—the narratives

overwhelmingly located the negative emotional outcome as a consequence within the family. Take, for example, the experiences that Jackie relates concerning the effect of discipline on her. Jackie finds:

...it [school discipline] can cause friction between the mother and the child...the parent and the child. Because now the parent is upset with the child all the time because the child is that nail. You know it's like a thorn in my side. You know every time I'm getting this phone call for you, and now all the time the child is a problem. It's the relationship the child has with the school, or the school's relationship with the child, is causing friction in the household. Now the child's confidence is low, because he is the black sheep of the family, and it's causing a little family thing going on. You know, so that's breaking up the family dynamic as well. You know, so now you're looking at, you are labeled as a bad child. When you're just slipping in math. You know? So now you're bad. And that trickles down. So you have the self-esteem issues.

This narrative clearly demonstrates the collateral effects of school discipline on the family: that parents can feel alienated from their child due to school discipline, and that attempting to become involved in the disciplinary process—often repeatedly—can cause problems in the family relationship. Further, while the negative emotional affect experienced by the parent is a consequence (e.g. stress due to disciplinary proceedings), the narratives show that the real consequence is how the emotional reaction of the parent impacts the parent-child relationship, something I explore in greater detail through additional interviews below.

Feelings of frustration and embarrassment were also other reactions parents cited due to involvement in the school disciplinary process, and these feelings often contributed to changes in family dynamics. Highlighting this, Emily finds that,

It's embarrassing to have to go to school, you're [her son] 14 and I'm tired of having to get over [to the school]...and talk to these people about you

not sitting down and being quiet...I'm basically at my wits end and about to take him out of school.

In this discussion, Emily expresses that the issue of school discipline has caused emotional strain through embarrassment, but that she also partly sees her son as playing a role in this. She tells her son, "You know these people [school officials] are watching your every single move, just go to school and be quiet so I don't want to keep going to the bat for him if he's not doing what he is supposed to do." Here, Emily outlines that there is a negative consequence due to punishment in school and that this had a negative impact on her beliefs that her child can succeed (discussed in greater detail in the following section), and that this change in orientation has also caused strain to occur within the family. That is, while Emily is effected emotionally and highlights embarrassment and frustration, the true consequence is the emotional disruption that occurs between the parent and child as a result of school discipline.

Other respondents also discussed the negative emotional consequences that occurred within the family due to discipline. For example, Ruth relates: "But it [school discipline] has caused a lot of depression, stress, hardship on families because my family, a lot of families, don't support you when you go through stuff like this. What they tell you to do is just leave it alone. How can I? She's my child."

At the same time, other parents expressed that school discipline had caused a rift in the relationship status between parent and child, another form of family-emotional consequence. Brittany finds that because her son had been removed multiple times from school through suspensions that, "I just...I've lost him [her son]...I feel like I've lost him

to the streets.” In this sense, she is relating that harsh discipline removed her child from the school, and she was unable to reintegrate back into school because he was unwelcomed. In turn, her son occupied his time by engaging in activities in which she did not approve, nor did she believe she could successfully intervene. This decreased the quality of the relationship between the mother and son, and increased emotional distress and family conflict.

In considering the importance of joint effects in this process, some respondents found that the financial burdens increased emotional distress within the family as well. Brittany finds,

And it's been a struggle not just financial, but emotionally. And it effects financially...it effects emotions and when it affects emotions, it affects everything. Because your emotions make you, if you're upset and you're trying to get something across to somebody, and you're doing it in a professional manner...then you're not seeing any actions behind it...

Emotional distress was highlighted in other ways as well. Brittany finds that, “You gotta, you gotta do what you need to do for your kids. It just, it makes you feel real bad, like you're not a good parents or you're not doing a good job at raising your child. You know, it's hurtful to your image.”

In addition to the direct effects of school punishment, parents also expressed the negative consequences caused by wondering when they were going to receive a phone call from school officials; parents knew they could be contacted by school administrators at any time, causing stress. “It's every day, you know, and I sit here thinking, oh am I gonna get called today? You know, on the defense every day.” Jackie expressed that living with this was difficult. Elizabeth expressed similar issues and that, “sometimes, a lot of the

times, I just won't answer the phone. If I see the school calling I know what they're calling for, to come get [child's name]." Rosa also expressed the same type of issues, "My stomach would turn when I would see caller ID. You know like when you see caller ID, the dread. My stomach would turn when I would see the caller ID. Like I don't have enough already, like what now?"

In discussing the impact of discipline on her position as a parent, Rosa found, "They basically kept telling me it was my obligation....this it was my responsibility to take my 16/17 year old behave and obey the rules and regulations of the school. That you know, that it was going to be put on my. That I could actually be arrested for my child not going with the codes and regulations of the school." Later in the interview, she discussed the impact on her beliefs and outlook for her child. She finds:

Well, it's affected me in a lot of different ways. I mean when you see your child moping around...I think there were three months when he didn't even get out of his pajamas...you can't do anything about it. You just feel stuck...in the way things are. You want all these things you want things to change, but you have to know ways to change them.

6.1.4 Anticipated Future Consequences

Finally, the last consequence concerning school discipline centers on the theme of anticipated future consequences, which was expressed by roughly half of the adults interviewed. Anticipated future consequences refers to the consequence that parents report a decreased hope in how far their child will go in school or how the child's future life experiences will be impacted by school punishment. Like the proceeding sections, anticipated future consequences clearly interacts with dimensions of family and family-emotional consequences. The difference between this and prior categories is that the

negative outcome of anticipated future consequences is located within the future expectations the parent has with the child. For example, Rosa highlights:

I don't want my kids to have a future where they work in a Burger King for the rest of their life, and then they won't have the money to support a family or have a life of their own. And when you're broke all the time and you're a man, how you gonna get your car, how you gonna take your girl out? It [school discipline] hinders all aspects, every single aspect. I mean, you want so much for your children. And you feel so bad every time something else happens, because that's one more pullback, one more hurdle, and time gap.

Other parents expressed a change in their future hopes for their child due to discipline as well. When asked if discipline has shaped her expectations for her son, Emily stated, "I think it is his [child's name] last year in school. He has just given up hope...and I'm like, you're just 14...I don't think he'll make it past 8th grade, not at [his current school]. Similarly, Beth tried to discuss the future with her child, "I've tried to explain to them that just because you have this experience does not mean that when you go to the next level...that it will continue to happen. I said that I think in the normal world it may have an effect on them because they are not able to do anything..."

Likewise, Sara found that,

It is already a hard time. As...African-American young men, they [her grandsons] are willing to learn and that you're going to put them out on time. And if you have a negative force out there with the children being in school and they come home they will feel the same thing. So that is my problem.

Sara went on to discuss that because the children were not receiving the instruction they needed in school, that the negative effect it had on her grandsons would probably impact them later in life. She explained, "I told them [her grandsons] if you...you have to go to

school for a long time for those two professions [lawyer/doctor] that you want to be... That they want to, but this [school discipline] [has an] ill effect on them.” Clearly, what Sara is concerned about is that the overabundance of discipline will cause the children to fall behind in their studies and may impact their goals in life, but may also impact their self-identity. Sara recognizes that the children’s desires to become a lawyer or a doctor may be impacted by school discipline. In this case school discipline may present tangible barriers—such as failing to graduate from high school or get into college—but Sara also expresses concern that school discipline may present intangible barriers such as a decrease in the children’s desire to continue to attend school and strive for these future goals and ultimately, a change in identity.

Parents also reported that they felt angry about future negative consequences for their children. For example Beth related a situation in which a teacher required her son to write, “I am a cheater. I will not cheat again” over and over during an in school suspension, and then apologize to other students for allegedly cheating. She highlights the impact this had on her emotionally, and how this might impact her sons’ identity:

He [her son] had to acknowledge the fact that he was a cheater and that he would not cheat again. That angers me. Because when you begin to say things about yourself and writing it down, you start to internalize it...I resent the fact that they made him write that. That should be against the law...

In this sense, the discipline may not effect employment prospects of college entry directly, but she believed that it could impact her child’s self-esteem and that this may have negative indirect effects in the future.

Other parents were also concerned about how discipline could shape their child's experiences later in life. For example, Ruth found that,

She [her daughter] tell me she didn't want to go to school, she said, 'Mama, I want you to homeschool me.' And I said, 'I can't homeschool you, I'm not qualified,' if I was qualified, if I had been in school and could homeschool you but...

Ruth went on to discuss that without receiving a proper education coupled with a decrease in desire to attend school, she feared for her daughter's future. Donna also expressed similar sentiments and fears about her child's future. She discussed her belief that no one would give her son a chance, especially without an education, "I said [son's name] still got time. I said even though the time is ticking on you but you still have time, but nobody would not give him the chance. I don't tell him that but I know that he know that nobody will give him the chance."

Parents also spoke about anticipated issues in college. For example, Kelsey found:

That's why I'm trying to push [daughter], trying to keep stuff from happening to try and keep her from being in trouble. So her GPA don't drop, so she can apply for scholarships for college. But you keep doing this, that, and the other, I mean, you putting her out more than she's in. She....she's not, she can't learn nothing there.

Other parents were bleaker in their assessment with some believing that discipline may introduce their child into the criminal justice system. In this vein, Rosa finds,

So, I mean, that's what the school system ends up having...they [the child] end up with prisons. I mean, that's...I don't see...because he didn't get any educational training in school it has actually hindered his adulthood, too...how's he really gonna have the tools to support himself? Or how much longer is it going to take for you to be a parent, instead of your child becoming an adult? I don't see him going and having this drive to go be a doctor or lawyer.

In other words, punitive discipline may cause estrangement from future goals for children, and parents are keenly aware of this consequence. This awareness is reflected in a change in the future aspirations they hold for their child; a negative consequence of school punishment on parents.

6.2 Summary of Findings

The goal of this chapter was to understand the effect school discipline has on parents and families, and to explore the collateral consequences parents experience due to school discipline. An analysis of the qualitative interviews highlights a number of important themes and helps to explain the quantitative results and qualitative results described in previous chapters. In addition, this analysis also adds to the body of literature on school discipline and consequences by understanding how school discipline causes collateral consequences for parents.

First, I find that parents do experience financial consequences as a result of school discipline. Parents consistently highlighted missing work, quitting their job, losing their job, and difficulty in finding caretakers for their children due to school punishment. Some parents reported seeking work with flexible hours or night work, while others cited the cost of transportation as a negative effect in dealing with school discipline. These findings support the findings from previous chapters showing that social capital and status play important roles in understanding the impact of school discipline on parents. In the previous chapters, I find that parents consistently cited feeling ignored and unwelcomed by school officials, and that they largely attributed this to a lack of social capital. At the same time,

prior research informs us that parents, regardless of socioeconomic status, race, and marital status report that they want to be involved in the schooling of their children (Barton et al., 2004; Coleman, 1998; Shriner et al., 2010). The findings of this chapter, coupled with the previous chapters, show that a lack of social capital place parents at greater risk of experiencing negative consequences due to harsh school punishment. Largely, a lack of socioeconomic status—a form of social capital—was consistently highlighted in the narratives as relating to negative consequences. In many of the interviews, parents expressed the negative effects of the financial burden of school discipline because they lacked economic resources. Although firm conclusions concerning parents who do have socioeconomic capital cannot be drawn from my sample, it is likely that parents from the middle- and upper-classes with more flexible working hours (e.g. salary vs. hourly wages), and greater pay may not report that there are personal financial consequences due to school discipline to the same degree that parents in this population reported.

These findings also support prior literature that suggests there is a financial burden on individuals and families due to punitive punishment (Christian, 2004). For example, Uggen et al., (2006) demonstrate that punishment—such as incarceration—impairs an individual's ability to find work. While prior studies focus on the impact of punishment on the individual who has received punishment, the results of this analysis show that many parents face barriers to finding, and maintaining, employment due to school punishment. In addition, hiring representation and engaging with the criminal justice system can be costly (Christian, 2004), and because of that, families who lack financial resources are often differentially impacted. My results demonstrate that similar dynamics occur within

schools; that parents (and families) who lack financial resources to combat school discipline are negatively impacted and cite the financial burden of interacting with school officials as a key consequence of punitive disciplinary policies. While the child may be impacted in the future, which I discuss in greater detail below, it is the parent who is clearly impacted financially over the course of dealing with the school discipline.

Second, some parents highlighted physical consequences of school discipline. A handful of parents reported weight and hair loss as a result of dealing with school punishment. Others reported feeling physically ill when being contacted by school officials. To my knowledge, there are no studies that assess the physical effects of discipline on individuals in this context, yet clearly the results of this study demonstrate that there can be negative physical consequences of school discipline on parents.

In addition to financial and physical burdens, parents also reported issues in family dynamics and what I refer to as family-emotional consequences. Many parents reported that school discipline made them stressed, nervous, angry, frustrated, and embarrassed. In turn, some parents reported feeling alienated from their child. In some cases, such as Emily, this was because she reported feeling embarrassed interacting with school officials and partly blamed her son for the effects of the discipline on her and the family. In other cases, such as Ruth's, school discipline effected the family because it interrupted the daily routine of family members, causing them to adjust their schedules which, in turn, created conflict in the family. Other parents, such as Rosa and Sara, indicated that they were stressed each time the phone rang because they were afraid it was the school contacting

them in regards to disciplining their child. This, in turn, caused emotional distress and negatively impacted the family dynamics.

These findings support some of the conclusions from the previous chapters as they highlight that poor, minority, and single parents are probably the most likely sect of individuals to become involved in schools due to their child receiving punishment. For example, the multi-level models presented in chapters four and five showed that poor, single, minority mothers were the most likely to report involvement in schools due to their child's behavioral issues. At the same time, the finding that school discipline and security negatively impact family dynamics supports prior research on the effect of punishment on families (see Braman, 2004) because punitive policies negatively impact family dynamics and cohesion (Uggen et al., 2006). While this body of literature is primarily focused on reentry and the effect of prison, what these findings demonstrate is that there are a number of ways in which collateral consequences manifest in negative family and family-emotional consequences, and that parents overwhelmingly reported negative effects on family dynamics due to school discipline.

There are additional ways in which school discipline and other types of punishment may be similar in the effect on family and parents. For example, research finds that punitive discipline of adults in the form of incarceration can increase family conflict (e.g. Berg & Huebner, 2010; Philips & Lindsay, 2011). In turn, this conflict can often decrease the successful reintegration of the formerly incarcerated individuals (Mowen and Visser, 2014). The results of my dissertation demonstrate that this process, and the effects of other forms of punishment on families, may also be similar to the outcomes of school discipline.

In my current study, many parents reported emotional conflict, and also expressed that this conflict caused tension between parent and child. This could, in turn, decrease the amount of support between parent and child over time which could then lead to negative family consequences similar to the consequences many families face during the course of reintegration due to increased family conflict (Mowen & Visser, 2014).

Prior literature also informs us that students who are impacted by punitive school discipline face negative consequences later in life such as a decrease in the ability to find employment (Tuck, 2012) or complete school (Bowditch, 1993; Evans & Didlick-Davis, 2012), and are placed at a high risk of victimization (Casella, 2001). At the same time, we know that many of these consequences are consistently found in the literature on reentry (see Visser & Travis, 2003 for an overview), and that one of the most consistently cited factors that help to protect formerly incarcerated individuals from these consequences is family (Berg & Huebner, 2010). At the same time, individuals who are incarcerated often report increased levels of family conflict which decreases bonds and may often negate the protective influence of family cohesion (Mowen & Visser, 2014). In my current study, I find that punitive discipline impacts parents which in turn, increases conflict between the parent and child. It seems reasonable, then, to suspect that there may be important theoretical overlap between these two bodies of literature. Punitive school discipline may decrease bonding between parent and child, which may place the child at a greater risk for negative consequences in the future.

Finally, parents reported a decrease in their future aspirations for their children due to school discipline. A handful of parents reported that their child had given up on the

school due to harsh discipline and this, in turn, caused the parent to lower their expectations for their child. Other parents reported strong expectations for their child, but expressed that school discipline created a barrier for their child to achieve their goals. Outside of estrangement from scholastic goals such as graduating high school or attending college, parents were also concerned that their child would not be able to find employment or support a family, and that their child may suffer from a decrease in self-esteem or a change in personal identity as an outcome of leaving school due to school discipline. School discipline presents the consequence to parents of decreasing their aspirations for their child.

Coupled with the findings from the previous chapters, it is likely that parents who have socioeconomic resources would be able to withdraw their child from school and enroll them in private school (as many parents expressed wishing to do), to overcome the consequence of a decrease in aspirations for their child. This trend also helps to explain why parents feel cheated, frustrated, and attacked insofar that they see schools as presenting a barrier to their child instead of providing an opportunity to improve the quality of life of their child.

These findings also extend prior work on school discipline and the effect on children. For example, prior literature has established that students who are impacted by school discipline are more likely to drop out of school, or become “pushouts” (Lawrence, 2007). Students who are pushed out or otherwise removed from school are more likely to spend time in prison (Hatt, 2011) or become victims of violence (Casella, 2001) than students who stay in school. These findings suggest that parents are aware that failing to stay in school has negative consequences, and that school discipline presents barriers to

their child's future success. In turn, school discipline decreases the parent's aspirations for their child.

Overall, the results of this chapter suggest that school discipline does not end with the child, nor do the effects of discipline stay in the school. Instead, school discipline has a “spill over” effect and impacts the parent, which in turn effects the family. Financial, physical, family and family-emotional, and future aspirations are all forms of collateral consequences experienced by parents. Given the findings of this chapter, coupled with findings from the previous chapters, I now turn to a discussion of the overall conclusions, importance, and policy implications of this project.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

The goal of this dissertation was to explore the relationship between school discipline, security, and parental outcomes in U.S. public schools, and to gain an understanding of parental experiences within the disciplinary process. Specifically, I sought to understand the collateral consequences of school discipline on parents by exploring how social capital and social status relate to disciplinary outcomes and parental experiences within the context of school discipline. The results of both quantitative and qualitative analyses reveal a complex relationship across these dimensions. I find that (1) some forms of parental involvement are effected by school discipline and security, (2) social capital and social status play a key role in understanding parental experiences in the disciplinary process, (3) some dimensions of social capital, social status, and discipline interact and relate to levels of parental involvement in schools, (4) social capital and status also relate to parental experiences and outcomes within the discipline process; and, (5) parents do experience collateral consequences caused by punitive school discipline. Following, I provide a brief summary of each of the preceding chapters followed by an in-depth discussion of the key findings of this project.

In chapters one and two, I outlined the previous research on school discipline, security, and parental involvement in schools. I noted that while prior research has found

that a number of factors relate to parental involvement in schools, including individual-level factors such as race and social class, and school-level factors such as school size and location, there exists no research on the relationship between school discipline and security and parental involvement in schools. Prior research also provides very little context by which to understand parents' experiences within the disciplinary process in schools. Although prior research projects have explored the collateral consequences of some forms of punishment, such as incarceration, and consequences of discipline on youth, such as the school-to-prison pipeline, there is very little existing research on the collateral consequences of school discipline on parents.

Next, in chapter three, I provided an overview of the data used in this dissertation. First, I outlined the Educational Longitudinal Survey (2002) data, including the issues of missing data and the analytic strategies employed to answer each research question. I also provided sample characteristics including how measures were constructed and how they were to be used analytically. I then outlined the qualitative data that were collected in 2012 and 2013, including a discussion of the population, characteristics of the sample, how the sample was collected, and an overview of the coding schemas used to uncover trends in the narratives.

In chapter four I presented the results of three propensity score models that demonstrated that parents of students in schools with high levels of discipline and security are less likely to be formally involved than similar parents in schools with low levels of discipline and security. On the other hand, parents in schools with high levels of discipline and security were shown to be more likely to be involved due to behavioral

issues than parents in schools with low levels of discipline and security. Levels of academic involvement did not differ between the same parents. Continuing in chapter four, the results of a multi-level model showed that some measures of social capital and discipline/security related to varying types of parental involvement, which I address in the discussion section of this chapter.

In chapter five, I introduced interaction terms in each of the multi-level models. I found that a number of measures of social status and social capital interacted, and helped to explain parental involvement in schools. In the second half of chapter five, I used the qualitative data to better understand how parents experience school discipline with specific attention given to social capital and social status. Results showed that parents felt cheated, attacked, and frustrated and that race, social class, and marital status played important roles in understanding the parental experience in discipline

Finally, in chapter six, I explored the collateral consequences of school discipline by outlining four types of consequences caused by discipline. The different types of negative outcomes experienced by parents included financial consequences, physical consequences, family and family-emotional consequences, and future aspirational consequences. Parents reported feeling the financial burden of missing work and lost wages due to attending meetings or caring for their child as an outcome of school discipline. A handful of parents reported physical outcomes such as weight and hair loss. Parents also reported negative emotional affects that spilled over into the family. Finally, parents reported a decrease in future aspirations and expectations for their child.

This project adds to the growing criminological literature on the broader impact of punishment by extending the literature into understanding the impact of school discipline—as well as parental experiences within the disciplinary process—on parents. I now turn to a discussion of the key findings by placing the sum of the findings within the broader literature. I then discuss the importance of this project as it connects to other literatures, and then outline specific policy implications. Finally, I end with concluding thoughts on future research by outlining how this project can assist in informing future research projects.

7.1 Discussion

The question I first posed in the introduction was, “Does school discipline end with the child?” The results of this dissertation suggest that there is no reason to believe this is the case. School discipline does not end with the child. Discipline impacts parents and families, and disproportionately hurts working-class, racial and ethnic minority, single parents. Through an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, my findings suggest that we must remember that it is not simply the student that receives punishment. While we know that punitive discipline does have negative impacts on students, punishment of the student often has other negative effects on parents and families as well.

There are a number of specific findings worth discussing. First, my results show that a parent with a child in a school that exhibits high levels of discipline and security is less likely to be formally involved than a similar parent with a child in a school with low levels of discipline and security. I labeled this the “fortress effect” because we know that parents are less likely to be involved in school due to many factors such as race, class,

and the gender of the student (Crosnoe, 2001; Hill & Taylor, 2004; Noel et al., 2013; Overstreet et al., 2005). This finding suggests that parents may also feel less welcome in schools that exhibit high levels of discipline and security because this type of school mimics a fortress in that it keeps individuals (parents) out. At the same time, a parent in a high discipline and high security school environment is more likely to be involved due to behavioral issues with the child relative to a similar parent in a low discipline and low security school environment. Taken together with the qualitative findings, I suggest this is because parents are compelled to interact with the school due to the child's behavioral issues because the child may be placed at a greater risk for experiencing behavioral issues as the school is already oriented towards more punitive discipline. The narratives collected from parents in the qualitative sample show that these types of interactions are overwhelmingly negative for the parent and are generally stressful, emotional, and often difficult. Put differently, schools with high levels of discipline and security increase the likelihood of negative interactions while serving to prevent positive interactions for parents. On the other hand, I find no difference between levels of academic involvement among parents in either type of school, supporting prior research that finds parents, regardless of race, class, or gender, seek to be involved in the academic success of their child (Carlisle et al., 2005; Howard & Reynolds, 2008; Shriner et al., 2010).

To understand these trends in greater depth as well as to understand the operation of social capital and social status in parental involvement outcomes, I ran a series of multi-levels regression models on each type of parental involvement. The results of these models largely supported prior literature on the importance of social capital and status in

parental involvement within the school. For example, while I found that the presence of paid security within a school negatively related to formal parental involvement, while controlling for a host of individual- and school-level characteristics, I also found that measures of social capital and social status were also significant predictors of formal parental involvement. Levels of school discipline and total counts of school security measures within the school were not significant in the models, suggesting that while some individual measures of school security, such as the presence of a security guard, do relate to lower levels of formal involvement, measures of social status may be more robust predictors of formal parental involvement.

On the other hand, levels of school discipline did significantly relate to greater levels of behavioral parental involvement in school even while controlling for the influence of school crime, neighborhood crime, and student perceptions of rules, among others. I suggest this is because parents may be forced to become involved due to their child's behavioral issues because the child is more likely to get into trouble in school. Measures of social status played a role as well; Black and Hispanic students (relative to White students), and males (relative to females) were more likely to have parents involved in this capacity. At the same time, parents with higher socioeconomic backgrounds were less likely to report behavioral involvement, yet again suggesting the important role of social status in the disciplinary process. Next, interaction terms within the multi-level models assisted in providing a better understanding of the complex relationship between social capital, discipline, and parental involvement.

Unsurprisingly, I found that the joint influence of many measures of social capital and social status increased the likelihood of formal parental involvement. For example, the interaction between socioeconomic status and the quality of the parent-child relationship predicted greater levels of both formal and academic parental involvement, and lower levels of behavioral involvement, supporting prior research (Burton et al., 2004). The interaction between parental levels of efficacy and out-of-school suspensions were also significant in each model. I suggest that even when parents feel connected to other parents and the school (a form of social capital), but have a child who received an out-of-school suspension, they are then less likely to seek to become involved within the school. While I am unable to confirm the mechanisms by which this finding arises, it could be because levels of efficacy decrease when the child becomes the target of punitive discipline, which leads the parent to feel disconnected to the school. Through other interaction terms, I found that single, Black parents were significantly less likely to be formally involved within the school, supporting prior research (Diamond et al., 2004; Lareau, 2003; Noguera, 2003), all else equal.

Overall, the results of the quantitative analysis demonstrate that parents with children in schools with high levels of discipline and are less formally involved than parents with children in schools with low levels of discipline and security. Yet, parents with children in high disciplinary and high security schools are more likely to be involved due to behavioral issues than parents with children in low disciplinary and low security schools, and that dimensions of social capital and status aid in explaining these trends. To put this differently, a parent with a child in a school that has high levels of discipline

is not as likely to be involved in the school—in things like the PTA—as a parent with a child in a school with low levels of discipline and security. On the other hand, that same parent with a child in a high discipline school is really likely have to have negative interactions with the school concerning their child’s behavior. To illustrate this further, if one has a child in a school that uses security guards, metal detectors, and school suspensions, one is less likely to visit the school and become involved in some formal capacity because one wants to, but much more likely to have to become involved in the school because one’s child is punished. If one has a child in a school that limits the use of school security and suspensions, one is far less likely to have negative interaction with the school, and far more likely to have positive interactions with the school such as involvement with the PTA. Next, I sought to place the findings of the quantitative analysis within the context of qualitative narratives.

The qualitative findings mirrored the quantitative results. While the qualitative sample is limited in terms of the population from which it was collected, I believe it is especially important to this study as it represents the individuals that we would suspect would be most impacted by school discipline and security: working-class, single, Black, mothers. First, parents interviewed reported that they felt ignored and unwelcomed by school officials. Parents consistently reported that school officials did not want them involved, that officials actively worked to keep parents uninvolved, and did not take the parents’ opinions into consideration during the course of the disciplinary process. Not coincidentally, this led many parents to report feeling cheated because school officials often changed, or simply ignored, local laws governing the use of school discipline such

as suspensions or expulsions. In this vein, parents often felt that they were attacked because their children were mistreated by school officials. Parents reported that their children often became targets of school discipline, and that school officials bullied their children. Some parents even reported that school officials targeted parents because the officials knew there was little the parent could do to assist their child. Parents reported frustration because the school was not run properly, and parents expressed that school officials had little accountability. Schools, a form of local government, were ignoring the needs of the very population they are purported to serve.

Further complementing the quantitative findings, parents interviewed consistently highlighted the important role of social capital and status in this process. Many parents reported that race played a significant role and that Black children were targets of punitive disciplinary policies to a greater degree than White children. Parents also expressed that they lacked the socioeconomic capital to hire legal representation to assist them, and wished they could send their child to a private school or relocate to place their child in a different environment, but that they lacked the means to do so. Marital status played an important role, as well, in that single parents expressed that they often lacked a partner to help them within this process. Parents found it difficult to balance the needs of the family and the requirements of the school without a partner.

Finally, I sought to explore the collateral consequences parents and families face as a result of school discipline. In doing so, I moved from understanding how parents engaged, participated, or understood school discipline, into understanding how school discipline impacts parental outcomes. First, I found that many parents experienced

financial consequences due to discipline. Some parents had to take time off of work to take care of their child, attend disciplinary hearings, or to pick their child up from school as a result of their child being excluded. This often translated into lost wages, or even a loss of employment. Other parents sought to find night work, took their child with them to their workplace when possible, or adjusted their work schedule to accommodate these issues resulting in a financial burden. Parents also cited the physical consequences of encountering school discipline. Some parents reported weight loss, hair loss, and fatigue. Others reported upset stomachs and trouble sleeping. One parent even likened the experiences she encountered to posttraumatic stress.

The narratives also showed that school discipline leads to issues within the family and causes family-emotional consequences. Parents reported feeling nervous, stressed, angry, frustrated, and embarrassed about school discipline. However, for many, this was not the end of the consequence; parents reported that these issues had spill-over effects into the emotional wellbeing of the family and their children. Some parents reported that they couldn't help but put blame onto their child, in part, because the child was the source of this tension, even if they were not the cause of the strain between parent and child. Finally, and relatedly, parents reported a decrease in future aspirations for their child as a result of punitive discipline. Parents reported concern that their child would fail to complete school which could lead to other barriers later in life such as trouble securing a job or providing for a the family. Some parents also reported concern that their child had already experienced self-esteem issues and negative changes in identity.

The constellation of these findings taken together reveal a complex relationship between school discipline, parental involvement, parental outcomes, and social status. First, it is clear that social capital and social status play important roles in parental involvement, broadly supporting prior research (Crosnoe, 2001; Hampden-Thompson & Pong, 2005; Israel et al., 2001; Lareau, 2003; Mullis et al., 2003; Noguera, 2003; Pautulny & Svendsen, 2007). Second, it is equally clear that social status relates to school discipline and that parents who lack social status appear to be differentially impacted. Third, parents who lack social status actually recognize that their relative lack of social capital and status often precludes them from advocating for their child, and effecting outcomes in their child's favor. Finally, school discipline does have collateral consequences on parents, and these consequences have spill-over effects into the family more broadly.

7.2 Importance

The findings from this project break new ground by extending the literature on school discipline, security, and social outcomes onto parents and families. For example, we know that collateral consequences of punishment have negative effects on youth (Casella, 2001). Previous work shows that youth who receive punitive punishment are likely to drop out of school (Bowditch, 1993), fail to complete a diploma (Swanson, 2006), experience emotional distress and/or a decrease in self-esteem (Lawrence, 2007), have decreased employment prospects over time (Tuck, 2012), and are often placed at a greater risk of victimization compared to youth who do not receive punitive punishment in schools (Casella, 2001). Moving our understanding of these dynamics forward, what

my findings show is that parents can also suffer collateral consequences of school discipline through financial and physical distress, negative emotional and familial consequences, and also experience a decrease in future aspirations for their child. In turn, these types of negative consequences on the parent appear to have a negative impact on the family as well.

The negative impact on the family, moderated through the effect of school discipline on the parent, cannot be overstated. Prior research on family demonstrates that children who experience decreases in bonds with their parents over time are put at a higher risk for engaging in delinquency and other unwanted behavior (Schroeder & Mowen, 2014; Esmaceli and Yaacob, 2011). In my study, I find that parents often reported increased levels of conflict with their child because some partly blamed their child for experiencing the frustration or embarrassment of interacting with school officials over the course of the disciplinary proceedings. Although school officials maintain the goal of discipline is to correct unwanted behavior in the child, if it negatively impacts the parent-child relationship as my findings suggest, it may have far researching—and counterproductive—outcomes.

In addition to the experiences of parents and the collateral consequences of discipline on families, the results also show that there is an impact of discipline and security on parental involvement in schools more broadly. Parents with children in schools with greater levels of discipline and security are far less likely to be formally involved than similar parents in schools without these measures and dynamics. At the same time, parents are more likely to be negatively involved due to issues with their child

in the high discipline and security schools. The quantitative results further demonstrate that measures of social capital and social status help to explain these trends broadly.

These findings are important in light of the national conversation on school safety, discipline, and family. Though I discuss the policy implications in the subsequent section, it is important to note here that my research adds a different perspective to the conversation. When discussing school reform and discipline, researchers and policy-makers alike generally focus on student outcomes (see, for example, Fuentes, 2011; Skiba & Noam, 2001; Phaneuf, 2009). While this focus is certainly needed and warranted, my findings show that we must also consider the parent and family within this conversation. Parents and families are impacted by school discipline. School discipline and security may cause parents to be less formally involved in the schooling of their child than they might choose otherwise. It may also necessitate they become involved due to behavioral issues with their child. On the other hand, school discipline can cause a parent to miss work, lose wages, or face termination from their job, resulting in financial hardship. It can also decrease the quality of the relationship between the parent and the child, result in emotional and physical distress for the parent, and can also decrease a parent's aspirations and expectations for their child's future. The effect of school discipline moves beyond the student and into the family.

As I note in previous sections, the qualitative sample is not representative of the population in the United States. This sample, however, does represent a population of people that prior research suggests are most impacted by discipline (Harber, 2004; Noguera, 2003). For example, the results of my quantitative analysis demonstrate that

single, Black, working-class mothers are most impacted by the discipline of their child. And, parents in schools with high discipline and high security are less likely to be formally involved in positive means as opposed to becoming involved due to behavioral issues with their child. These findings demonstrate that my qualitative sample represents the experiences of some marginalized individuals who are likely to be most impacted by school discipline due to their lack of social capital and social status.

My research directly addresses the issue of racial inequality caused by disproportionate school discipline as well. Previous work finds that racial and ethnic minorities—and especially low income, Black males—are much more likely to receive harsh school discipline compared to middle- and upper-class white males (Jung et al., 2011; Irwin et al., 2013). My research extends these findings by moving beyond the experiences of the student to examine the impact of school discipline on parents and families. My findings demonstrate that racial and ethnic minority parents perceive that they are disproportionately impacted by school discipline. Working-class, Black, single mothers reported severe disruptions in their daily routines, and negative financial and emotional effects of school discipline. Parents reported difficulty maintaining employment, lost wages, and difficulty finding childcare. Parents overwhelmingly reported being excluded from the school and highlighted an inability to affect the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings in favor of their child. As a result, some parents reported losing their child to the streets (as one respondent put it), while others reported a decrease in the belief that their child would experience normal milestones like finding a job or completing high school. In this way, school discipline continues to exacerbate

social inequality both inside, and outside, of the classroom. The use of a nationally-representative sample also demonstrated the racial and social class issues as well.

Previous research clearly highlights the racial imbalances of school discipline at both the individual and school levels. For example, Welch and Payne (2010) highlight that schools with a greater proportion of Black students are more likely to be punitive in discipline than predominately White schools. Taken together with my findings, this harsh and punitive approach at the school-level clearly impacts students, and therefore parents, to a greater degree as well. The racial imbalances in school discipline results in low income, single, and Black parents experiencing a greater degree compared to their middle- of upper-class counterparts due to the consequences of school punishment. This negative consequence of school discipline has not yet been studied from either a quantitative or qualitative approach and is something my study contributes to this growing body of literature.

7.3 Policy Implications

These findings should be of interest to policy makers given the recent national-level conversations about the role of discipline and security in U.S. public schools. For example, following a 2014 summit to address the issue of punitive school discipline, the Obama Administration released a “dear colleague” published by the Department of Education and made available to every public school in the United States. This publication highlights the racial issues in school discipline, the school-to-prison pipeline, and the negative effects of school discipline on youth (Department of Education, 2014). Within this document, the Department of Education makes a call to end these issues and

inequalities in school discipline by calling for a more restorative focus. Equally important, this policy document includes a discussion of parents, youth, and schools. Take, for example, the following passage on the inclusion of parents in the disciplinary process:

...when specific disciplinary incidents arise, the school should have established protocols and due process requirements that specify when the school will notify parents and guardians to ensure their prompt notification and involvement in the disciplinary process... (Department of Education, 2014, p. 13)

While this passage highlights that schools recognize the important role parents must take in the discipline of their child, this paragraph underscores the issue of the current orientation towards parents within the setting of school discipline. That is, when parents are discussed, the assumption is that school officials and parents work together in order to assist the child in the disciplinary process. Taken as whole, the document assumes parents and school officials share common goals, and that schools and parents operate as a team in promoting student achievement and reducing unwanted behavior.

Yet, the results of my dissertation show that parents and schools can often be at odds, and that schools may promote a hostile environment for parents. Some of the parents I interviewed did receive, “prompt notification,” but very few, if any, received any true “involvement in the disciplinary process.” The policy implications of this project are clear: schools must recognize that in many ways, the current orientation to school discipline is one that excludes many parents, especially working-class, single, and minority parents. School officials and policy makers must recognize this disjuncture between guidelines of school punishment and the lived reality some parent’s experience.

My findings also suggest that policy-makers must include parents in setting guidelines for the disciplinary process. It does not make analytical or logical sense for schools to impose strict guidelines on when and how parents can engage with schools in the discipline of the child without parental input. Some possible remedies may include school- or community-based outreach programs that seek to involve parents in the decision making process, though the mechanisms by which this process might occur largely depends upon the social capital of schools, parents, and communities. For example, the parents I interviewed overwhelmingly cited a lack of social capital in engaging with the school during the course of the disciplinary proceedings. Prior research shows that parents—and communities—without social capital have limited means by which to generate the social capital (Marika, 2011) to become involved with the school. Because of this, the onus of responsibility of including parents within the decision making process should begin with the school, but community organizations should also seek to become involved in the process as well. Schools and parents should work together and the development of policy should be oriented to this goal.

There is also another reason this research should be of interest to policy-makers and practitioners. Recent research has shown that parental involvement within schools has been declining since the mid-2000s (Noel et al., 2013), yet most parties involved (e.g. parents, teachers, policy-makers, and school officials) consistently call for more parental inclusion at all levels of education (e.g. NSTA, 2009). My findings show that harsh discipline and security practices paradoxically suppresses certain forms of parental involvement, and particular populations of parents from becoming involved. In order to

increase parental involvement, the seemingly unintended consequences of harsh discipline and security and the negative impact on parental involvement should be considered within this process.

7.4 Limitations

As with all projects, this study is not without important theoretical and methodological limitations. First, this study is unable to establish casual ordering. The cross-sectional nature of the data does not allow firm conclusions about whether or not school discipline and security cause lower levels of parental involvement in schools. This is a limitation present in all cross-sectional studies, but is important to underscore in this study using the ELS data. The multi-level model used does not satisfy the issue of temporal ordering. At the same time, propensity score modeling—used to address Research Question One—is used to approximate an experiment because the matched pairs are nearly identical with the exception of the treatment. This results in the assumption that any difference between pairs is due to the variation in the treatment variable (discipline and security), thereby approximating an experiment in an attempt to begin to establish causality. Yet, because of the cross-sectional nature, I can only attempt to approximate a causal relationship and not establish a causal connection due to a lack of temporal ordering. In addition, the use of multiple imputation is not supported by propensity score modeling and, as a result, the sample size is reduced relative to the multi-level models. Therefore, there are two different samples analyzed and, although the findings are consistent, this has the potential to introduce bias into the results.

There are other methodological limitations as well. The ELS data are well over a decade old, and much has changed concerning the policy and use of school discipline and security since the data were collected. Unfortunately, there is not—to my knowledge—a comprehensive data set like the ELS data that contain measures of school discipline, security, and parental involvement that is more recent. Given other public events that have harmed children in schools or gained ascendancy into the national media (e.g. Newtown, CT), it is possible that parental support for school discipline and security has changed since 2002 and that this may relate to how discipline and security impact parental involvement in schools as a result.

Another methodological consideration concerns how particular incentives may impact school's use of security and disciplinary measures. Due to the nature of the data, I am unable to account for the economic situation of the school. It is possible that schools with greater economic resources may be more likely to adopt school security measures. At the same time, we also know that federal and state tax incentives may motivate schools to use strict discipline and security when they otherwise would not use them (see Casella, 2006). Therefore, the economic climate of the school may relate to the use of punitive discipline. In this manner, it could be the actual budget of the school (and not disciplinary structures) that impact parental involvement. While I attempt to control for these by including economic measures of the student within the school, I am unable to account for the budget of the school.

There are important theoretical limitations to consider, too. In this study, it is not possible to explicitly identify the theoretical mechanism by which parental involvement

is impacted by school security. For example, it may not be that the presence of a security guard deters parents from the school, and although I control for a host of other individual- and school-level effects, there are other theoretical explanations. It could be that there are simply other school-level factors that are more robust that I am unable to account for in the study. Perhaps schools that use security guards are qualitatively different than schools who do not, but that the security guard is simply a symptom of a larger undemocratic or unwelcoming atmosphere. While I suggest this is largely part of the explanation, it is likely there are other dimensions that also play an important role not explained by this theoretical orientation.

In addition, it could be that school-level decisions about security and discipline are only part of the story. For example, many decisions about school policy, including decisions about school discipline, security, and how/when to involve parents, occur at the district-level. Therefore, the theoretical mechanism by which we can understand parental involvement within schools and the relationship to these factors may actually need to occur at a higher level. Additionally, it is difficult to determine where the actual support for school security and discipline originates. If, as some scholars suggest (e.g. Addington, 2009), parents support the use of discipline and security in schools, it could be the case that they choose not to become formally involved in the school because they feel their child is safe. In this way, school security would not actually deter parents from becoming formally involved in a negative way at all, but instead, might reflect a parent's complacency in the safety of their child because they support these punitive approaches.

7.5 Directions for Future Research

With a growing attention from researchers, policy-makers, and the general public on school reform and disciplinary issues in schools, future research must assess how changes in school disciplinary policy impacts parents. While youth outcomes will, and should, continue to remain a priority for school officials, my results indicate that it would be remiss to overlook parents and families within the changing landscape of the school discipline discourse. Future projects should also explore the extent to which parents have influence on setting and changing school disciplinary policy. For example, we know parental support for discipline and invasive security measures in schools tends to increase immediately following a nationally-covered school shooting (Addington, 2009). But what we don't know is how this support varies by demographic factors, and why parental support changes over time. Future research should investigate these dimensions, and should especially explore class and racial differences in parental support of school discipline and security.

Future research must assess how school discipline impacts families and parents in other populations, qualitatively. While many respondents I spoke to indicated middle- and upper-class, married, White parents have the ability to intervene successfully for their child, there is no research that demonstrates this is true. My findings do suggest that social status and social capital play an important role, but the extent to which those with social status and social capital can negate the consequences of discipline and successfully advocate for their child remains unclear. Future research should explore the impact of school discipline on parents and families in other populations.

Additional research should also extend this framework to move outside of the family and into the community. Largely, we know that communities can be significantly impacted by punitive policing and criminal justice policies (see Rose & Clear, 1998). Rose and Clear (1998) show that communities that experience disproportionately high levels of punishment within the population experience negative community outcomes such as social disorganization. Criminal justice policies—forms of punitive punishment—actually contribute to increases in crime rates as a result. In a similar vein, as schools in the United States are largely comprised of families within the school communities (Kozol, 1994), it is possible that school punishment could also present similar community-level issues. Because of this, there is reason to suggest that some communities may also be impacted by school discipline, especially because the results of my analysis demonstrate that the most vulnerable populations are heavily impacted, which is likely similar to the effect of broader trends in discipline and social control.

Finally, my project is limited to exploring the effect of school discipline on parents within a sample of public schools in the United States. Yet, many of the parents I interviewed expressed that they wished they had the economic capital to place their child in private school, and many parents suggested that private schools do not have the same types of issues with discipline and punishment. At this point in time, there is little to no research on school discipline in private schools and the effect on youth, parents, or families. Future research should investigate how discipline impacts members of the school, family, and community within the private school setting.

7.6 Conclusion

There is some evidence that punitive disciplinary practices in some schools are changing. For example, the Department of Education and the Department of Justice have recently called for an increase in restorative justice in schools (Department of Education, 2014). There is also some work showing that some local and state-level movements have been mildly successful in reducing out-of-school suspensions (for a review, see Evans & Didlick-Davis, 2012). Yet, the extent to which these efforts will result in substantive change remains unclear. What is clear is that understanding the consequences of school discipline on parental, family, and community outcomes will remain increasingly important, especially as potential change occurs within school disciplinary policy over time.

The results of this project clearly demonstrate that school discipline does not end with the child, and it is clear that many parents are also impacted. To encapsulate this finding within a recent anecdote, in early 2014, there was a headline in the news that read, “6-year-old suspended for kissing girl, accused of sexual harassment” (Wallace, 2014). What is interesting is that the 6-year-old old child probably does not recognize the significance of being accused of sexual harassment, but there is certainly someone that does: the child’s parent. When schools employ punitive disciplinary policies and invasive security measures, they begin to look more like a fortress than a public school. My results suggest that a fortress may very well be a great way to keep parents out of school, especially when parents lack the social capital and social status in which to intervene.

REFERENCES

- Addington, L.A. (2009). Cops and Cameras in Public School Security as a Policy Response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(10), 1426-1446.
- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17–40.
- Altheide, D. L. (2009). The Columbine shootings and the discourse of fear. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(10), 1354-1370.
- Barton, A. C., Drake, C., Perez, J.G., St. Louis, K., & George, M. (2004). Ecologies of parental engagement in urban education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(4), 3–12.
- Becker, S.O., & Ichino, A. (2002). Estimation of average treatment effects based on propensity scores. *The Stata Journal*, 4, 358-377
- Bracy, N. (2011). Student Perceptions of High-Security School Environments. *Youth & Society*, 43, 365-395.
- Bowditch, C. (1993). Getting rid of troublemakers: high school disciplinary procedures and the production of dropouts. *Social Problems*, 40, 493-509.
- Bower, H., & Griffin, D. (2011). Can the Epstein Model of Parental Involvement work in a High-Minority, High-Poverty Elementary School? A case study. *Professional School Counseling*, 2, 77-87.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In John Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory*

- and research for the sociology of education (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Braman, D. (2004). *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Christian,
- Carlisle, E., Stanley, L., & Kemple, K. M. (2005). Opening doors: Understanding school and family influences on family involvement. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33, 155–162.
- Casella, R. (2001). Zero tolerance policy in schools: Rationale, consequences, and alternatives. *Teachers College Record*, 105(5), 872-892.
- Casella, R. (2003). The false allure of security technologies. *Social Justice*, 30, 82-93.
- Casella, R. (2006). *Selling us the Fortress: the promotion of techno-security equipment for schools*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis: New York, NY.
- Clear, T. R. (2008). The effects of high imprisonment rates on communities. *Crime and Justice*, 37, 97-132
- Coleman, J. (1988). Social Capital and Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.
- Coon, J.K. (2007). *Security Technology in U.S. Public Schools*. KFB Scholarly Publishing: New York, NY.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria.” *Qualitative Sociology*, 13, 3-21.
- Cotton, K., & K. R. Wikelund. 2001. Parent involvement in education. School Improvement Research Series. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational

- Laboratory. Available at: www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/3/cu6.html.
- Cripps, K., & Zyromski, B. (January 01, 2009). Adolescents' Psychological Well-Being and Perceived Parental Involvement: Implications for Parental Involvement in Middle Schools. *Rmle Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, 33, 4.
- Department of Education. 2014. Guiding Principles: A resource guide for improving school climate and discipline. U.S. Department of Education.
- DePlanty, J., Coulter-Kern, R., & Duchane, K. (2007). Perceptions of parent involvement in academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100, 361–368.
- Dee, T., Ha, W., & Jacob, B.A. (2007). The effects of school size on parental involvement and social capital: Evidence from the ELS: 2002. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy 2006/2007*, 77-97.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications Inc: Washington, DC.
- Devine, J. (1996). *Maximum security: The culture of violence in inner-city schools*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Diamond, J.B., Wang, L., & Gomez, K. (2004). African American and Chinese-American parent involvement. The importance of race, class, and culture. *Harvard Family Research Project*.
<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/fine/resources/digest/race.htm006Cxz>
- Durant, T. J. (2011). The utility of vulnerability and social capital theories in studying the impact of hurricane Katrina on the elderly. *Journal of Family Issues*, 32(10), 1285-1302

- Eccles, J.S., & Harold, R.D. (1993). Parent-School Involvement during the Early Adolescent Years. *Teacher's College Record* 94, 566-587.
- Eitle, T.M., & Eitle, D.J. (2004). Inequality, segregation, and the overrepresentation of African Americans in school suspension. *Sociological Perspectives*, 47(3), 269–87.
- Evans, M.P., & Didlick-Davis, C.R. 2012. Organizing to End the School-to-Prison Pipeline: An Analysis of Grassroots Organizing Campaigns and Policy Solutions. <http://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/COE/About/Projects/Organizing%20to%20End20the%20School.pdf>
- Evans, K. R., & Lester, J. N. (2012). Disturbing distractions: Speaking back to racialized school discipline practices. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies*, 12(3), 220-224.
- Fabelo, T., Thompson, M., Plotkin, M., Carmichal, D., Marbanks, M., & Booth, E. (2011), *Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement*. New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center and Public Policy Research Institute. Available at: http://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Breaking_Schools_Rules_Report_Final.pdf
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13, 1, 1-22.
- Ferguson, R. F. (2002, December). *Addressing racial disparities in high achieving*

- suburban schools*. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Policy Issues #13.
- Fieldhouse, E., & Cutts, D. (2010). Does diversity damage social capital? A comparative study of neighbourhood diversity and social capital in the US and Britain. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(2), 289–319.
- Fowler, D. (2011). School discipline feeds the "pipeline to prison". *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(2), 14-19.
- Fuentes, A. (2011). *Lockdown High: When the Schoolhouse becomes a Jailhouse*. NY, New York: Verso Publishers.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2001). Gang Problems and Gang Programs in a National Sample of Schools. City, MD: Gottfredson Associates.
- Graham, T. M., & Glover, T. D. (2014). On the fence: Dog parks in the (un)leashing of community and social capital. *Leisure Sciences*, 36(3), 217-234
- Hampden-Thompson, G., & Pong, S.-L. (2005). Does family policy environment moderate the effect of single-parenthood on children's academic achievement? A study of 14 European countries. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 36, 227–248.
- Harber, C. (2004). *Schooling as Violence: How Schools Harm Pupils and Societies*. New

- York: Routledge Falmer, Taylor and Francis.
- Heitzeg, N. A. (2009). Education or incarceration: Zero tolerance policies and the school to prison pipeline. *Forum on Public Policy*. 2, 1-22
- Henderson, A., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Hill, N., & Taylor, L. (2004). Parental school involvement and children's academic achievement: Pragmatics and Issues. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 161-164.
- Hill, N. E., Castellino, D. R., Lansford, J. E., Nowlin, P., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J., (2004). Parent academic involvement as related to school behavior, achievement, and aspirations: Demographic variations across adolescence. *Child Development*, 75(5), 1491–1509.
- Hirschfield, P. (2008). Preparing for Prison? The Criminalization of School Discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology* 12: 79–101.
- Hofmann, D.A., & Gavin, M.B. (1998). Centering Decisions in Hierarchical Linear Models. *Implications for Research in Organizations*, 24(5) 623-641.
- Hollander, S. (2013). Private Schools Balance Open Culture with Need for Security, *The Wall Street Journal* np. Available at:
<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303722604579111540771558798>
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. & Sandler, H. (1995). Parental involvement in children's

- education: Why does it make a difference? *Teachers College Record*, 97, 310–331.
- Insley, A. (2001). Suspending and Expelling Children from Educational Opportunities: Time to Reevaluate Zero Tolerance Policies. *American University Law Review*, 50: 1039-1074.
- Israel, G.D., Beaulieu, L.J., & Hartless, G. (2001). The influence of family and community social capital on educational achievement. *Rural Sociology*, 66, 43-68.
- Jeynes , W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, 42 (1), 82-110
- Jiang, Y., & de Bruijn, O. (2014). Facebook helps: A case study of cross-cultural social networking and social capital. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(6), 732-749.
- Johnna R. (2004). Exploring the Effects of Incarceration on Communities. PhD diss., School of Criminal Justice, University at Albany-Christian.
- Jung, S. (2007). Understanding racial-ethnic disparities in internal school suspension and identifying compensatory and protective factors. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 67, 2753-2910.
- Jung, M.K., & Bonilla-Silva, C. (2011). *State of white supremacy: Racism, government, and the United States*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kaplan, T. N. (2013). Multiple Dimensions of Parental Involvement and its Links to

- young Adolescent Self-Evaluation and Academic Achievement. *Psychology in the Schools*, 50, 6, 634-649.
- Kerbow, D., & Bernhard, A. (1993). Parental Involvement in the School: The Context of Minority Involvement. Pp. 115-146 in Schneider, B & Coleman, J., (Eds) *Parents, Their Children, and Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Koonce, D. A., & Harper Jr., W. (2005). Engaging African American parents in the ‘schools: A community-based consultation model. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 16(1-2), 55-74.
- Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage Inequalities: Children in America’s Schools*. Harper Collins Publishers: New York, NY.
- Kupchik, A., & Ellis, N. (2008). School discipline and security: Fair for all students? *Youth & Society* 39: 549-574.
- Kupchik, A., & Monahan, T. (2006). The New American School: Preparation for post-industrial discipline. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27: 617-631.
- Kupchik, A. C. (2010). *Homeroom Security: School Discipline in the Age of Fear*. NYU Press: New York, NY.
- LaRocque , M., Kleiman, I., Darling, S.M. (2011). Parental Involvement: The Missing Link in School Achievement. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 55:3, 115-122.
- Lareau, A. (1989). *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education*. New York: Falmer Press.

- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. University of California Press.
- Lareau, A., & Horvat, E. (1999). Moments of Social Inclusion and Exclusion: Race, Class, and the Cultural Capital in Family-School Relationships. *Sociology of Education*, 72, 37-53
- Lassiter, W.L., & Perry, D.D. (2009). *Preventing violence and crime in America's schools: from put-downs to lock-downs*. Praeger: Santa Barbara, CA.
- Lawrence, R. (2007). *School Crime and Juvenile Justice*. Oxford Press, New York, NY.
- Letki, N. (2008). Does diversity erode social cohesion? Social capital and race in British neighbourhoods. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 99–126.
- Lyons, W., & Drew J. (2006). *Punishing Schools: Fear and Citizenship in American Public Education*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Marschall, M., & Stolle, D. (2004). Race and the city: Neighborhood context and the development of generalized trust. *Political Behavior*, 26(2), 125–154.
- Meier, D. (1996). The Big Benefits of Smallness,” *Educational Leadership*, 54, 12-15.
- Morris, M. (2013). *The challenges of creating social capital and increasing community participation in a diverse population: Implications for theory, policy and practice based on a case study of a Canadian housing co-operative*. (Order No. AAINR70561, *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, , 1069
- Morris, E.W. (2013). “Tuck in that Shirt! Race, Class, Gender, and Discipline in an

- Urban School in J.H. Ballantine & J. Z. Spade (Eds) *Schools and Society*, 4th Edition. Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Morrow, V. (1999). Conceptualising social capital in relation to the well-being of children and young people: A critical review. *The Sociological Review*, 47(4), 744–765.
- Mowen, T., and Visser, C. (2014). Drug Use and Crime after Incarceration: The Role of Family Support and Family Conflict. *Justice Quarterly*, 32, 337-359
- Moudatsou, M. M., Kritsotakis, G., Alegakis, A. K., Koutis, A. and Philalithis, A. E. (2014), Social capital and adherence to cervical and breast cancer screening guidelines: a cross-sectional study in rural Crete. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 22, 395–404.
- Muller, C. (1998). Gender Differences in Parental Involvement and Adolescents' Mathematics Achievement. *Sociology of Education*, 71, 336-356.
- Muschert, G.W., & Peguero, A.A. (2010). The Columbine Effect and School Antiviolence Policy. *Research in Social Problems & Public Policy* 17: 117-148
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002. Washington, DC.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). Concentration of Public School Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch. *The Condition of Education*. Available at: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_clb.asp
- National Research Council. (2014). *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States:*

Exploring Causes and Consequences. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

The National Science and Teacher Association. (2009). Parental Involvement in Science Learning. *List of Position Statements.* Available at:
<http://www.nsta.org/about/positions/parents.aspx>

Newman, K.S. (2004). *Rampage: The social roots of school shootings.* New York: Basic Books.

Noel, A., Stark, P., Redford, J., & Zukerberg, A. (2013). Parent and family involvement in education, from the National Household Educational Surveys Program of 2012 (NCES 2013-028), Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Table 2. Available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013028.pdf>

Noguera, P. (2001). The role of social capital in the transformation of urban schools in low income communities. In S. Saegert, P. Thompson, & M. Warren (Eds.), *Social Capital and poor communities A volume in the Ford Foundation series on asset building.* New York Sage.

Noguera, P. (2003). *City Schools and the American Dream Reclaiming the Promise of Public Education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Nolan, K. (2011). *Police in the Hallways: Discipline in an Urban High School.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (2003). *Black American students in an affluent suburb: A study of academic engagement.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Overstreet, S., Devine, J., Bevans, K., & Efreom, Y. (2005). Predicting parental involvement in children's schooling within an economically disadvantaged African American sample. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42, 101–111.
- Peguro, A. A., & Shekarkhar, Z. (2011). Latino/a student misbehavior and school punishment. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 33(1), 54-70.
- Peguro, A.A., Popp, A.M., Latimore, L.T., Shekarkhar, Z., & Koo, D.J. (2011). "Social Control Theory and School Misbehavior: Examining the Role of Race and Ethnicity." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 9, 259-275.
- Reyes, A.H. (2006). *Discipline, Achievement, and Race: Is Zero Tolerance the Answer?* Rowman & Littlefield Education: Lanham, MD.
- Robers, S., Zhang, J., Truman, J., & Snyder, T. (2013). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2013*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics and US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Available at: <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/iscs12.pdf>
- Roberts, D. (2004). The social and moral cost of mass incarceration in African American communities. *Stanford Law Review*, 56(127), 1271-1305.
- Rocque, M. (2012). Exploring school rampage shootings: Research, theory, and policy. *The Social Science Journal*, 49, 304-313.
- Rodriguez-Pose, A., & Berlepsch, V. (2014). Social capital and individual happiness in Europe. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(2), 357-386
- Rosenbaum, P.R., & Rubin, D.B. (1983). The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects. *Biometrika*, 70, 41-55.

- Rose, D. & Clear, T. (1998). Incarceration, social capital and crime: implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology*, 36,441-479.
- Parker-Jenkins, M. (1999). *Sparing the Rod: Schools, discipline and children's rights*. Trentham Books Limited: Staffordshire, England.
- Pate, P. E., & Andrews, P.G. (2006). Research summary: Parent involvement. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association (NMSA). Available online at: www.nmsa.org/Research/ResearchSummaries/ParentInvolvement/tabid/274/Default.aspx
- Phaneuf, S.W. (2009) *Security in Schools: Its Effect on Students*. LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC, El Paso: TX.
- Patulny, R. V., & Svendsen, G. L. H. (2007). Exploring the social capital grid: Bonding, bridging, qualitative, quantitative. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 27(1/2), 32–51.
- Polakow-Suransky, S. (2001). America's Least Wanted: Zero Tolerance Policies and the Fate of Expelled Students. In *The Public Assault on America's Children: Poverty, Violence and Juvenile Justice*. Polakow, V (Editor). 101-39. New York: Teacher's College Columbia University.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York, Simon and Schuster.
- Saegert, S., Thompson, P., & Warren, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Social Capital and poor communities*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Sampson, R. J., Winship, C., & Knight, C. (2013). Translating Causal Claims: Principles

- and Strategies for Policy-Relevant Criminology. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 12, 587-616
- Schneider, B., & Coleman, J. (1993). *Parents, Their Children, and Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Shriner, M., Mullis, R. L., & Schlee, B. M. (2009). The usefulness of social capital theory for understanding the academic improvement of young children in stepfamilies over two points in time. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 50(7), 445-458
- Shriner, M., Mullis, R. L., & Shriner, B. M. (2010). Variations in family structure and school-age children's academic achievement: A social and resource capital perspective. *Marriage & Family Review*, 46(6-7), 445-467.
- Skiba, R. J., Peterson, R. S., & Williams, T. (1997). Office referrals and suspensions: Disciplinary intervention in middle schools. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 20, 295-315.
- Simon, J. (2007). *Governing Through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skiba, R.J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. (2000). *The Color of Discipline: Source of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment* (Rep. No. SRS1). Bloomington, IN: Indiana Education Policy Center.
- Skiba, R.J. (2000) *Zero tolerance, zero evidence: An analysis of school disciplinary practice*. Indiana: Education Policy Center, Research Report #SRS2.
- Skiba, R.J. & Noam, G.G. (eds) (2002). *Zero tolerance: Can suspension and*

- expulsion keep schools safe?* New York: Jossey Bass.
- Skiba, R.J., Reynolds, C.J., Graham, S., Sheras, P., Conoley, J.C., & Garcia-Vazquez, E. (2006). *Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations* (Report by the American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Smith, J., Stern, K., & Shatrova, Z. (2009). Factors Inhibiting Hispanic Parents' School Involvement. *Rural Educator*, 29, 8-13.
- Steinberg, L., Brown, B., & Dornbusch, S. (1996). *Beyond the Classroom: White School Reform Has Failed and What Parents Need to Do*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Sughrue, J., (2003). Zero Tolerance for Children: Two Wrongs Do Not Make a Right. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 39, 238-258.
- Townsend, B.L. (2000). The Disproportionate Discipline of African American Learners: Reducing School Suspensions and Expulsions. *Exceptional Children*, 66, 381-391.
- Travis, J. (2002). *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*. The New York Press, NY: New York.
- http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1000557_invisible_punishment.pdf
- Uslaner, E. M. (2002). *The moral foundations of trust*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Verdugo, R.R. (2002). Race-ethnicity, social class, and zero-tolerance policies: The cultural and structural wars. *Education and Urban Society*, 35, 50-76.
- Visher, C., & Travis, J. (2003). *Transitions from prison to community: Understanding*

- individual pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 89-113.
- Wadsby, M. & Svedin C.G., (1996). Academic Achievement in Children of Divorce. *Journal of School Psychology*, 34, 325-336
- Walsh, P. (2010). Is parental involvement lower at larger schools? *Economics of Education Review*, 29, 959-968.
- Warner, C. (2010). Emotional Safeguarding: Exploring the Nature of Middle Class Parents' School Involvement. *Sociological Forum*, 25, 703-721.
- Way, S. M. (2011). School Discipline and Disruptive Classroom: The moderating effects of student perceptions. *Sociological* 4, 52(3), 346-375.
- Welch, K., & Payne, A. (2010). Racial Threat and Punitive School Discipline. *Social Problems*, 57, 25-48.
- Welch, K., & Payne, A. (2012). Exclusionary school punishment: The effect of racial threat on expulsion and suspension. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 10(2), 155-171.
- Wike, T.L., & Fraser, M.W. (2009). School shootings: Making sense of the senseless. *Aggression & Violent Behavior*, 14, 162–169.
- Wolff, N., & Draine, J. (2004). Dynamics of social capital of prisoners and community reentry: Ties that bind? *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, 10(3), 457–481.

Appendix A

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON SCALE CREATION

Scale: Formal Parental Involvement

In this school year, do you or your spouse/partner do any of the following? (Yes or no)

1. Belong to the school's parent-teacher organization
2. Attend meeting of the parent-teach organization
3. Take part in the activities of the parent-teach organization
4. Act as a volunteer at the school

Scale: Academic Parental Involvement

Since your tenth grader's school opened last fall, how many times have you or your spouse/partner contacted the school about the following? (None, once or twice, three or four times, more than four times)

1. Your tenth grader's school program for this year
2. Your tenth grader's plans after leaving high school
3. Your tenth grader's course selection for entry into college, vocational, or technical school after completing high school

Scale: Behavioral Parental Involvement

Since your tenth grader's school opened last fall, how many times have you or your spouse/partner contacted the school about the following? (None, once or twice, three or four times, more than four times)

1. Your tenth grader's poor performance in school
2. Your tenth grader's poor attendance record at school
3. Your tenth grader's problem behavior in school

4. Information on how to help your tenth grader at home with specific skills or homework

Scale: Parent/Child Activities

Looking back over the past year, how frequently did you and your tenth grader participate in the following activities? (Never, rarely, sometimes, frequently)

1. Attending school activities (sports, plays, concerts, ect...)
2. Working on homework or school projects
3. Attending concerts, plays or movies outside of school
4. Attending sporting events outside of school
5. Attending religious services
6. Attending family social functions (party, wedding)
7. Taking day trips or vacations
8. Working on a hobby or playing sports
9. Going shopping
10. Going to restaurants/eating out
11. Spending time jjust talking together
12. Doing something else fun together

Scale: School Crime Levels

How often are the following a problem at school? (Happens frequently, happens at least once a week, happens at least once a month, happens on occasion, and never happens)

1. How often is class cutting a problem at the school?
2. How often physical conflicts a problem at the school?
3. How often is vandalism a problem at the school
4. How often is the use of alcohol a problem at the school
5. How often is the use of illegal drugs a problem at the school
6. How often do students use drugs/alcohol at the school
7. How often is the possession of weapons a problem at the school?
8. How often is physical abuse of teachers a problem at the School?
9. How often is student bullying a problem at the school?
10. How often is verbal abuse of the teachers a problem at the school?
11. How often is disorder in the classrooms a problem at the school?
12. How often is student disrespect for the teachers a problem at the school?
13. How often is gang activity a problem at the school?

Scale: Parental Discipline Involvement

1. Do you have a process to get parent input on discipline policies? (yes/no)
2. Do you have a program to train parents to deal with problem behavior
3. Do you have a program that involves parents in school discipline?

Scale: Parental Efficacy

1. Parents have an adequate say in setting school policy (Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)
2. Parents work together in supporting school policy (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)

Scale: Student Victimization

1. Had something stolen at school (never, once or twice, more than twice)
2. Someone offered drugs to you
3. Someone threatened to hurt you at school
4. You got into a physical fight at school
5. Someone hit you at school
6. Someone forced money/things from you at school
7. Someone damaged your belongings at school
8. Someone bullied or picked on you at school.

Appendix B

LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Thank you for meeting with me. As you know, I want to talk to you about your experiences with school discipline, both in terms of how you interacted with the school and how it has affected you.

1. How many children do you have, and what grades are they in?
2. Which of them have been punished at school?
3. For now, let's focus on the most severe punishment one of your children received. Tell me about that:
 - a. Which child was that?
 - b. What was the punishment?
 - c. And what did they say that [child's name] did?
 - d. Is that what you think really happened?
 - e. How were you notified of the incident and of the punishment?
 - f. What were you told?
 - g. Did anyone from the school follow-up with you after that, or have other discussions about it later?
 - h. Did you ever have a chance to give your opinion about the punishment?
 - i. If yes, what happened?
 - ii. If no, did you try?
 - i. Do you think that the punishment was fair?
 - j. Did [name of child] think the punishment was fair?
4. In general, do you think the school values parents' opinions when they decide on student punishment?
 - a. Do you believe the school considers how punishing students will affect their parent, like having to take time off of work?
5. Have you ever contacted the school about other school punishment issues, like if you child was punished, or if you wanted to complain about another student?
 - a. If yes: please tell me what happened
 - b. Were you satisfied with how you were treated?
6. Are you comfortable talking to school staff about how they treat your children? Why or why not?
7. Does [name of child]'s school have security measures, like metal detectors or police officers?

- a. Does the presence of these affect you in anyway? (probe: do you like them, indifferent, make you nervous)
 - b. Do you believe these measures make the school safer?
 - c. Do believe these measures affect your child?
- 8. Let's go back to when [child's name] got in trouble at school. I'm interested in how it affected you in different ways
 - a. Who watched [child's name] when he/she was suspended/expelled/sent home? (probe about work time, shifting schedules, getting babysitting, etc.)
 - b. Did it change how you get along with his/her teachers?
 - c. Did it change how you think about the school?
- 9. If [child's name] has siblings: Did it have any effect on [child's name]'s brothers and sisters? What did they think of it, and how did they respond?
- 10. How did it affect [child's name]?
 - a. Did it change how he/she thinks about school?
 - b. Was he/she able to return to school?
 - c. Did anything change for him/her in how he/she gets along with students or teachers at school?
 - d. If [child's name] missed school time: what did he/she do during that time?
 - e. Did he/she get into any trouble while being punished?
- 11. In general, what do you tell your children about school?
- 12. How far in school do you expect them to go?
- 13. Other than dealing with school punishment, do you do anything interactive with the school like volunteering, going to PTA meetings, parent-teacher meetings, etc.?
- 14. Have your children's experiences with school discipline changed how you think about the school in any way?
- 15. Have these experiences with school punishment changed how you think about teachers in any way

Finally, I have just a few questions for you about you and your family:

- 16. How old are you?
- 17. Do any of your children have any learning disabilities or require special education?
- 18. Are you employed? If so, what do you do, and how long have you done that for work?
- 19. Are you married?
- 20. Does the father/mother of your children live with you? If no, how often do your children see their other parent?

Appendix C

FULL MODELS WITH INTERACTION TERMS

Table C.1: Formal Parental Involvement A

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.051	.036
Hispanic Student	-.089*	.037
Asian Student	-.900*	.399
Other Race Student	.020	.044
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.014	.023
OSS	-.032	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.186***	.016
ParentChild	.063***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.100***	.010
Single	-.134*	.053
Separated	-.094*	.044
Divorced	-.151***	.033
No English	-.152**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table C.1: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.013***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.143	.144
Metal Detectors	-.032	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.078	.049
Sign In	-.062	.042
Dogs	-.045	.042
Interaction		
SES x Hispanic Student	-.228***	.042
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

Table C.2: Formal Parental Involvement B

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.041	.037
Hispanic Student	-.080*	.039
Asian Student	-.910*	.398
Other Race Student	.022	.041
Female Student	-.009	.193
ISS	-.015	.022
OSS	-.041	.027
Got in Trouble	.001	.011
Victimization	-.004	.003
SES	.179***	.018
ParentChild	.071***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.103***	.011
Single	-.135*	.052
Separated	-.091*	.044
Divorced	-.149***	.025
No English	-.147**	.049
Rules Not Fair	-.033*	.013
Punishment is Equal	-.003	.011

Table C.2: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
	-	
School Crime	.012***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.030	.026
Urban	.138**	.050
Rural	-.173**	.051
ParDisInvo	.038**	.014
West	-.007	.064
South	.243***	.055
Northeast	-.138*	.064
School Size	-.039*	.014
Paid Security	-.154**	.050
Emergency Button	-.132**	.041
Contraband	-.017	.052
Drug Test	-.016	.056
Clear Books	-.114	.054
Student IDs	-.020	.055
Strict Dress	-.028	.042
Metal Pass	.139	.155
Metal Detectors	-.030	.110
Cameras	.059	.048
Fencing	.077	.049
Sign In	-.061	.044
Dogs	-.040	.043
Interaction		
SES x No English	.284***	.056
Between Effect (SD)	.370	.015
Within Effect (SD)	1.009	.008

Table C.3: Formal Parental Involvement C

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.050	.036
Hispanic Student	-.089*	.037
Asian Student	-.898*	.399
Other Race Student	.019	.044
Female Student	-.011	.198
ISS	-.014	.023
OSS	-.032	.028
Got in Trouble	.002	.013
Victimization	-.006	.005
SES	.191***	.016
ParentChild	.063***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.100***	.010
Single	-.141*	.053
Separated	-.094*	.044
Divorced	-.151***	.033
No English	-.152**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table C.3: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.013***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.143	.144
Metal Detectors	-.032	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.078	.049
Sign In	-.062	.042
Dogs	-.045	.042
Interaction		
SES x Single Parent	-.224**	.080
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.008	.007

Table C.4: Formal Parental Involvement D

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.049	.036
Hispanic Student	-.081*	.037
Asian Student	-.900*	.399
Other Race Student	.021	.044
Female Student	-.009	.200
ISS	-.013	.023
OSS	-.030	.026
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.197***	.019
ParentChild	.073***	.009
Parent Efficacy	.109***	.018
Single	-.109*	.048
Separated	-.094*	.044
Divorced	-.151***	.033
No English	-.152**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table C.4: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.014***	.003
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.049
Rural	-.172**	.055
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.131**	.038
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.052
Clear Books	-.119	.059
Student IDs	-.014	.053
Strict Dress	-.021	.041
Metal Pass	.140	.143
Metal Detectors	-.029	.099
Cameras	.061	.040
Fencing	.074	.051
Sign In	-.063	.043
Dogs	-.043	.042
Interaction		
SES x Parent Child	.013***	.002
Between Effect (SD)	.368	.015
Within Effect (SD)	1.008	.008

Table C.5: Formal Parental Involvement E

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.051	.036
Hispanic Student	-.080*	.037
Asian Student	-.900*	.399
Other Race Student	.020	.044
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.015	.023
OSS	-.032	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.004	.005
SES	.191***	.018
ParentChild	.063***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.112***	.019
Single	-.135*	.053
Separated	-.095*	.044
Divorced	-.149***	.033
No English	-.150**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table C.5: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.012***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.031	.025
Urban	.135**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.032**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.233***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.015
Paid Security	-.152**	.052
Emergency Button	-.125**	.037
Contraband	-.017	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.117	.066
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.141	.142
Metal Detectors	-.031	.100
Cameras	.061	.044
Fencing	.078	.048
Sign In	-.062	.041
Dogs	-.043	.041
Interaction		
SES x Parent Efficacy	.027*	.013
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

Table C.6: Formal Parental Involvement F

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.044	.035
Hispanic Student	-.095*	.031
Asian Student	-.899*	.391
Other Race Student	.018	.041
Female Student	-.011	.197
ISS	-.014	.022
OSS	-.030	.028
Got in Trouble	.002	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.186***	.016
ParentChild	.059***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.099***	.017
Single	-.130*	.057
Separated	-.101*	.042
Divorced	-.159***	.038
No English	-.169**	.039
Rules Not Fair	-.040*	.012
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table C.6: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.014***	.005
Neighborhood Crime	-.033	.026
Urban	.139**	.047
Rural	-.178**	.055
ParDisInvo	.034*	.019
West	-.005	.067
South	.264***	.059
Northeast	-.139*	.063
School Size	-.035*	.019
Paid Security	-.159**	.055
Emergency Button	-.133**	.091
Contraband	-.014	.057
Drug Test	-.012	.059
Clear Books	-.111	.064
Student IDs	-.015	.055
Strict Dress	-.031	.040
Metal Pass	.142	.148
Metal Detectors	-.033	.101
Cameras	.061	.049
Fencing	.077	.047
Sign In	-.062	.040
Dogs	-.045	.042
Interaction		
Hispanic Student x No English	-.234**	.091
Between Effect (SD)	.368	.019
Within Effect (SD)	1.011	.008

Table C.7: Formal Parental Involvement G

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.059	.036
Hispanic Student	-.077*	.037
Asian Student	-.902*	.399
Other Race Student	.021	.044
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.014	.023
OSS	-.032	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.198***	.016
ParentChild	.060***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.102***	.010
Single	-.134*	.053
Separated	-.090*	.044
Divorced	-.138***	.033
No English	-.159**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.042*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table C.7: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.013***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.143	.144
Metal Detectors	-.032	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.078	.049
Sign In	-.062	.042
Dogs	-.045	.042
Interaction		
Single x Black	-.267**	.103
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

Table C.8: Formal Parental Involvement H

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.054	.034
Hispanic Student	-.077*	.035
Asian Student	-.901*	.397
Other Race Student	.017	.041
Female Student	-.018	.202
ISS	-.015	.025
OSS	-.031	.027
Got in Trouble	.002	.012
Victimization	-.009	.012
SES	.177***	.015
ParentChild	.058***	.009
Parent Efficacy	.098***	.008
Single	-.121*	.057
Separated	-.100*	.058
Divorced	-.162***	.037
No English	-.160**	.045
Rules Not Fair	-.042*	.011
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.009

Table C.8: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.014***	.003
Neighborhood Crime	-.033	.022
Urban	.139**	.051
Rural	-.159**	.059
ParDisInvo	.028**	.019
West	-.006	.069
South	.261***	.055
Northeast	-.145*	.063
School Size	-.037*	.015
Paid Security	-.154**	.055
Emergency Button	-.129**	.65
Contraband	-.017	.051
Drug Test	-.015	.055
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.019	.055
Strict Dress	-.027	.041
Metal Pass	.142	.133
Metal Detectors	-.032	.101
Cameras	.059	.044
Fencing	.077	.051
Sign In	-.061	.043
Dogs	-.044	.042
Interaction		
Victimization x ParentChild	-.002***	.001
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

Table C.9: Formal Parental Involvement I

Black Student	.051	.036
Hispanic Student	-.084*	.037
Asian Student	-.900*	.399
Other Race Student	.020	.044
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.014	.023
OSS	-.044	.038
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.006
SES	.186***	.016
ParentChild	.063***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.118***	.021
Single	-.134*	.053
Separated	-.094*	.044
Divorced	-.151***	.033
No English	-.152**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.010

Table C.9: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.013***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.143	.144
Metal Detectors	-.032	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.078	.049
Sign In	-.062	.042
Dogs	-.045	.042
Interaction		
ParentEfficacy x OSS	-.037*	.022
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

Table C.10: Formal Parental Involvement J

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.052	.036
Hispanic Student	-.088*	.036
Asian Student	-.905*	.400
Other Race Student	.021	.046
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.015	.023
OSS	-.033	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.012
Victimization	-.005	.004
SES	.191***	.009
ParentChild	.066***	.005
Parent Efficacy	.099***	.011
Single	-.135*	.053
Separated	-.100*	.044
Divorced	-.150***	.033
No English	-.139**	.038
Rules Not Fair	-.025*	.015
Punishment is Equal	-.003	.011

Table C.10: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.015***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.033	.024
Urban	.135**	.049
Rural	-.168**	.049
ParDisInvo	.039**	.017
West	-.006	.062
South	.245***	.052
Northeast	-.137*	.061
School Size	-.034*	.015
Paid Security	-.150**	.052
Emergency Button	-.131**	.041
Contraband	-.018	.051
Drug Test	-.016	.054
Clear Books	-.120	.063
Student IDs	-.016	.054
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.138	.145
Metal Detectors	-.031	.099
Cameras	.060	.045
Fencing	.080	.050
Sign In	-.060	.041
Dogs	-.042	.040
Interaction		
Urban x School Size	-.051**	.023
Between Effect (SD)	.370	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.008	.008

Table C.11: Formal Parental Involvement K

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.051	.036
Hispanic Student	-.090*	.037
Asian Student	-.900*	.399
Other Race Student	.020	.044
Female Student	-.010	.198
ISS	-.014	.023
OSS	-.032	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.186***	.016
ParentChild	.063***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.100***	.010
Single	-.134*	.053
Separated	-.094*	.044
Divorced	-.151***	.033
No English	-.152**	.047
Rules Not Fair	-.031*	.014
Punishment is Equal	-.004	.012

Table C.11: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.013***	.006
Neighborhood Crime	-.032	.025
Urban	.133**	.048
Rural	-.171**	.050
ParDisInvo	.035**	.016
West	-.007	.062
South	.246***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.036*	.014
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.143	.144
Metal Detectors	-.032	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.078	.049
Sign In	-.062	.042
Dogs	-.045	.042
Interaction		
ParentEfficacy x School		
Delinquency	-.006***	.002
Between Effect (SD)	.371	.016
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.007

Table C.12: Formal Parental Involvement L

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.049	.037
Hispanic Student	-.087*	.036
Asian Student	-.900*	.401
Other Race Student	.019	.044
Female Student	.009	.199
ISS	-.013	.023
OSS	-.033	.028
Got in Trouble	.001	.013
Victimization	-.005	.005
SES	.187***	.016
ParentChild	.064***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.100***	.010
Single	-.1345*	.054
Separated	-.108*	.044
Divorced	-.148***	.033
No English	-.137**	.037
Rules Not Fair	-.022*	.012
Punishment is Equal	-.002	.010

Table C.12: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	-.015***	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.033	.024
Urban	.135**	.049
Rural	-.168**	.049
ParDisInvo	.039**	.017
West	-.006	.062
South	.245***	.052
Northeast	-.139*	.062
School Size	-.051*	.021
Paid Security	-.152**	.051
Emergency Button	-.133**	.040
Contraband	-.018	.050
Drug Test	-.015	.054
Clear Books	-.119	.064
Student IDs	-.018	.055
Strict Dress	-.030	.041
Metal Pass	.138	.141
Metal Detectors	-.031	.100
Cameras	.060	.044
Fencing	.080	.051
Sign In	-.060	.040
Dogs	-.042	.040
Interaction		
ParentEfficacy x School Size	-.011*	.005
Between Effect (SD)	.372	.017
Within Effect (SD)	1.007	.008

Table C.13: Academic Parental Involvement A

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.123*	.042
Hispanic Student	.053	.043
Asian Student	-.060	.047
Other Race Student	.129*	.052
Female Student	-.051*	.023
ISS	.054*	.026
OSS	.042	.033
Got in Trouble	.019	.016
Victimization	.016**	.005
SES	.170***	.019
ParentChild	.042***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.004	.012
Single	.017	.062
Separated	-.029	.053
Divorced	-.009	.038
No English	.063	.056
Rules Not Fair	.017	.017
Punishment is Equal	-.023	.014

Table C.13: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.002	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.053*	.025
Urban	.033	.048
Rural	-.079	.050
ParDisInvo	.007	.016
West	.155*	.062
South	.040	.051
Northeast	-.063	.062
School Size	-.049***	.013
Paid Security	.022	.051
Emergency Button	-.055	.040
Contraband	-.040	.046
Drug Test	-.036	.054
Clear Books	.008	.063
Student IDs	.082	.055
Strict Dress	.029	.042
Metal Pass	.046	.145
Metal Detectors	-.054	.100
Cameras	.040	.044
Fencing	.018	.050
Sign In	.020	.042
Dogs	-.075	.042
Interaction		
SES x Parent Child	.008**	.002
Between Effect (SD)	.342	.017
Within Effect (SD)	1.193	.008

Table C.14: Academic Parental Involvement B

Individual Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.120*	.041
Hispanic Student	.051	.042
Asian Student	-.055	.049
Other Race Student	.119*	.050
Female Student	-.040*	.021
ISS	.061*	.024
OSS	.044	.033
Got in Trouble	.025	.016
Victimization	.018**	.005
SES	.171***	.020
ParentChild	.044***	.002
Parent Efficacy	.001	.014
Single	.012	.060
Separated	5	.055
Divorced	-.011	.038
No English	.067	.054
Rules Not Fair	.022	.017
Punishment is Equal	-.025	.012

Table C.14: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.001	.004
Neighborhood Crime	-.054*	.026
Urban	.039	.048
Rural	-.055	.050
ParDisInvo	.012	.018
West	.157*	.059
South	.041	.050
Northeast	-.062	.057
School Size	-.055***	.015
Paid Security	.022	.052
Emergency Button	-.066	.044
Contraband	-.041	.042
Drug Test	-.044	.057
Clear Books	.003	.067
Student IDs	.080	.052
Strict Dress	.030	.040
Metal Pass	.042	.131
Metal Detectors	-.051	.101
Cameras	.033	.049
Fencing	.027	.051
Sign In	.018	.044
Dogs	-.070	.046
Interaction		
ParentEfficacy x OSS	-.067*	.026
Between Effect (SD)	.340	.015
Within Effect (SD)	1.191	.007

Table C.15: Behavioral Parental Involvement A

Individual Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.221***	.050
Hispanic Student	.239***	.052
Asian Student	-.251***	.031
Other Race Student	.094	.061
Female Student	-.148***	.021
ISS	.312***	.030
OSS	.225***	.041
Got in Trouble	.185***	.029
Victimization	.061***	.004
SES	-.001	.021
ParentChild	.019***	.005
Parent Efficacy	-.091***	.012
Single	.200*	.077
Separated	.150*	.069
Divorced	.141*	.048
No English	.021	.071
Rules Not Fair	.065***	.022
Punishment is Equal	-.005	.020

Table C.15: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.010	.003
Neighborhood Crime	.008	.029
Urban	.123*	.059
Rural	-.153*	.062
ParDisInvo	.060**	.020
West	.244*	.081
South	-.123	.062
Northeast	-.051	.074
School Size	-.035	.019
Paid Security	-.045	.066
Emergency Button	-.050	.053
Contraband	-.028	.060
Drug Test	-.055	.068
Clear Books	-.064	.079
Student IDs	-.040	.071
Strict Dress	.019	.066
Metal Pass	.196	.191
Metal Detectors	-.064	.136
Cameras	-.045	.071
Fencing	.011	.068
Sign In	.067	.058
Dogs	-.021	.057
Interaction		
SES x Parent Child	-.013***	.003
Between Effect (SD)	.433	.019
Within Effect (SD)	1.56	.011

Table C.16: Behavioral Parental Involvement B

Individual Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.228***	.055
Hispanic Student	.234***	.056
Asian Student	-.264***	.060
Other Race Student	.099	.066
Female Student	-.164***	.030
ISS	.325***	.034
OSS	.226***	.043
Got in Trouble	.183***	.021
Victimization	.036***	.007
SES	-.002	.024
ParentChild	.016***	.003
Parent Efficacy	-.089***	.016
Single	.207*	.081
Separated	.154*	.068
Divorced	.118*	.050
No English	.034	.072
Rules Not Fair	.079***	.022
Punishment is Equal	-.009	.019

Table C.16: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.005	.005
Neighborhood Crime	.001	.031
Urban	.132*	.061
Rural	-.173*	.064
ParDisInvo	.062**	.021
West	.245*	.079
South	-.125	.065
Northeast	-.056	.079
School Size	-.032	.018
Paid Security	-.044	.064
Emergency Button	-.056	.051
Contraband	-.024	.059
Drug Test	-.065	.069
Clear Books	-.070	.080
Student IDs	-.039	.070
Strict Dress	.019	.063
Metal Pass	.197	.184
Metal Detectors	-.062	.128
Cameras	-.040	.056
Fencing	.015	.063
Sign In	.078	.054
Dogs	-.034	.053
Interaction		
ParentEfficacy x OSS	-.121***	.034
Between Effect (SD)	.431	.021
Within Effect (SD)	1.55	.010

Table C.17: Behavioral Parental Involvement C

Individual Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
Black Student	.218***	.056
Hispanic Student	.230***	.059
Asian Student	-.262***	.062
Other Race Student	.101	.067
Female Student	-.167***	.029
ISS	.333***	.033
OSS	.221***	.042
Got in Trouble	.187***	.025
Victimization	.039***	.005
SES	-.002	.024
ParentChild	.013***	.004
Parent Efficacy	-.031***	.013
Single	.198*	.089
Separated	.142*	.072
Divorced	.101*	.055
No English	.022	.075
Rules Not Fair	.067***	.024
Punishment is Equal	-.010	.013

Table C.17: Continued

School Level Main Effects	Coef.	S.E.
School Crime	.003	.007
Neighborhood Crime	.002	.030
Urban	.139*	.065
Rural	-.183*	.060
ParDisInvo	.077**	.019
West	.265*	.082
South	-.133	.067
Northeast	-.062	.076
School Size	-.043	.017
Paid Security	-.032	.067
Emergency Button	-.066	.052
Contraband	-.012	.055
Drug Test	-.032	.064
Clear Books	-.064	.081
Student IDs	-.040	.066
Strict Dress	.021	.065
Metal Pass	.199	.185
Metal Detectors	-.052	.129
Cameras	-.031	.051
Fencing	.022	.061
Sign In	.075	.050
Dogs	-.032	.052
Interaction		
Divorced x OSS	.226***	.117
Between Effect (SD)	.430	.020
Within Effect (SD)	1.52	.009