



National Center for **Research** on
Rural Education (R²Ed)

R²Ed Working Paper 2014-4

Rural Parents and Teachers as Partners: Preliminary Results of a Randomized Trial¹

Susan M. Sheridan, Gina M. Kunz, Amanda Witte, Shannon Holmes & Michael
Coutts

January, 2014

¹Development of this working paper was completed at the National Center for Research on Rural Education (R²Ed), funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Educational Sciences (R324A100115). The paper was presented originally by the authors at the 2013 National Center for Research on Rural Education's Connect – Inform – Advance: Promoting Academic Success of Rural Students Conference. The statements made herein are those of the developers and are not meant to represent opinions or policies of the funding agency.

R²Ed working papers are available online at r2ed.unl.edu/resources_workingpapers.shtml

Recommended citation:

Sheridan, S. M., Kunz, G. M., Witte, A., Holmes, S., & Coutts, M. (2014). Rural parents and teachers as partners: Preliminary results of a randomized trial (R²Ed Working Paper No. 2014-4). Retrieved from the National Center for Research on Rural Education: r2ed.unl.edu

Introduction

It is clearly recognized that families have a significant effect on students' development, and the active engagement of parents is a positive predictor of academic and social-behavioral adjustment (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). The effects of programs aimed at supporting students who are struggling are enhanced when partnerships with families are integrated into the design and implementation of support programs, thereby creating connections and continuities across systems. Families in rural settings have particular challenges accessing care given problems with the availability and acceptability of services (DeLeon, Wakefield, & Hagglund, 2003). Although meaningful relationships with schools, access to effective services, and participation in these services are essential to address emotional/behavioral problems and promote learning, evidence-based family-school partnership interventions in rural settings have not been identified.

One model with empirical support is Conjoint Behavioral Consultation (CBC; Sheridan & Kratochwill, 2008). CBC is a structured indirect intervention with a dual focus on supporting students' social-behavioral and academic success, and promoting family-school partnerships to support student functioning across settings. Research on CBC has documented its positive effects on the behavioral, academic, and social-emotional functioning of students across diverse samples and settings (Sheridan et al., 2012; Sheridan, Clarke & Ransom, in press). However, the efficacy of CBC in rural settings, where access to services is limited, has not been examined.

Method

Participants and Procedures

Currently, a four-year randomized controlled trial (RCT) testing the efficacy of CBC in rural schools is being conducted in a largely rural Midwest state. U.S. Census Bureau definitions were used; both rural and towns comprised the sample. Preliminary results from the first two years of this study follow. The current sample contains 90 students (82% male) in grades K-3 and their parents, and 54 teachers from 20 schools. More than half of the sample (54%) lived at or below 150% of the poverty threshold. Two-thirds of the parents completed high school (or GED) as their highest degree; of these, 10% did not have a high school diploma. Consultants were trained individuals from outside the school district.

Measures

Student outcomes include measures of behavioral and social functioning. Parent and teacher outcomes include measures of parenting and classroom practices, parent and teacher relationship quality and engagement and participation in the consultation process. CBC was implemented in a small group format in rural classrooms with a teacher, parents of 1 to 3 students, and a consultant. In the CBC meetings each student's parents, teacher, and a consultant worked collaboratively to identify and define a target concern, determine data collection procedures, set behavioral goals, design an intervention using evidence-based procedures, and evaluate intervention effects. Methods to increase home-school communication, create continuity across settings, and establish meaningful partnerships between parents and teachers were employed.

Results

Preliminary outcomes suggest significant group differences in favor of CBC students on teacher-reported broadband internalizing and behavioral symptoms scales (see Table 1 for significant group differences at post-test). Significant changes over time are evident for treatment but not control students for these as well as externalizing problems, school problems and adaptive skills. At home, differences for CBC students were reported for arguing, noncompliance, and tantrums (p 's $< .05$ or greater; see Table 2 for significant gains for the CBC group). For teachers, statistically significant group differences are evident in favor of the CBC group for their relationship with parents, effective strategy use, and participation in problem solving (see Table 2). Significant improvements over time are evident for treatment but not control teachers in relationship quality with parents (p 's $< .05$ or greater). For parents, significant group differences in favor of CBC participants are evident in problem solving, engagement, and relationship with teachers. Significant gains over time were evident for their effective use of parenting strategies, relationship with teachers, engagement, participation in problem solving and self-efficacy for treatment parents only (p 's $< .05$ or greater). Only two years of implementation are represented and analyses fail to consider important design issues; thus, findings are interpreted with caution.

Discussion

Realities within rural communities influence the research being conducted on family-school partnerships. In some cases, the physical locations of school buildings, families' homes, and teachers' residences creates distance barriers for collaborative, relationship-building meetings. Small school size limits the number of students who can participate, often increasing the need for greater numbers of schools to fulfill sample requirements. Many of the families and teachers have long-standing relationships and histories of previous interactions (some predating current school situations) that influence their initial abilities to work together as partners. Families are sometimes reluctant to participate given the potential to associate services with "having a problem," particularly given the small size of the school and community. Small numbers of staff members in rural schools require the adoption of several responsibilities beyond typically defined requirements; thus, additional requirements associated with parental engagement and social-behavioral support may increase burden. On the other hand, school personnel in rural schools often have a "do what it takes" mentality and challenges are often usurped by individuals with the capacity to intervene early.

In addition to addressing questions of rurality, advances are being made in the area of family-school partnerships and social-behavioral interventions. Measures of engagement, participation, and family-school relationships are being collected. In addition, student behaviors at home and school are being positively impacted; methods to measure behaviors in a highly efficient manner (e.g., Parent Daily Reports) appear effective.

The practical issues associated with location, small size, staff resources, stigma, and personal histories/relationships contribute to challenges with several research activities. The cost associated with implementation of a relationship-based intervention (i.e., requiring many personal contacts including some that are face-to-face) is significant, particularly given few near-by personnel with the requisite background training to deliver the program. Data collection is

similarly challenging when individualized assessments or direct observations are indicated. Efforts at reducing costs by streamlining resources and developing sensitive but efficient measures are being pursued.

The long-term benefit of interventions in rural schools is dependent upon the capacity of the system to sustain evidence-based programs within its typical structures. That is, it is necessary that interventions identified as efficacious through grant-supported research programs in highly controlled conditions be tested within the context of natural school practices. The effectiveness of CBC for promoting social and behavioral competence and family-school partnerships given a rural school's available internal resources (i.e., once an externally-supported program "goes away") requires research attention. Research is needed to determine methods to deliver CBC in rural schools with greater efficiency, while maintaining integrity of the process and student-focused interventions.

References

- DeLeon, P. H., Wakefield, M., & Hagglund, K. J. (2003). The behavioral health care needs of rural communities in the 21st century. In H. B. Stamm (Ed.), *Rural behavioral health care: An interdisciplinary guide* (pp. 23-32). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Henderson, A. T., & 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.
- Sheridan, S. M., Bovaird, J. A., Glover, T. A., Garbacz, S. A., Witte, A., & Kwon, K. (2012). A randomized trial examining the effects of conjoint behavioral consultation and the mediating role of the parent-teacher relationship. *School Psychology Review*, 41, 23-46.
- Sheridan, S. M., Clarke, B. L., & Ransom, K. A. (in press). The past, present, and future of conjoint behavioral consultation research. In W. P. Erchul & S. M. Sheridan (Eds.), *Handbook of research in school consultation: Empirical foundations for the field* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group/Routledge.
- Sheridan, S. M., & Kratochwill, T. R. (2008). *Conjoint behavioral consultation: Promoting family-school connections and interventions*. New York, NY: Springer.

Table 1

Significant Group Differences at Post-Test

Measures	<i>n</i>	<u>Treatment</u>		<u>Control</u>		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>			<i>SD</i>
Student								
BASC-Teacher Report								
Anxiety	35	45.89	6.30	22	53.86	13.69	2.99**	0.75
Depression	35	53.97	9.97	21	62.33	16.23	2.39*	0.62
Atypicality	35	57.06	11.37	22	64.82	17.84	2.01*	0.52
Behavioral Symptoms Index	35	60.43	9.14	22	69.95	15.86	2.88**	0.74
Teacher								
PTRS-Teacher Version								
Communication to Other (Adaptability)	56	4.03	0.66	37	3.61	0.66	2.98**	0.62
TSQ	56	2.91	0.39	38	2.60	0.42	3.69**	0.77
TPPS	56	5.47	1.22	38	4.59	0.61	4.13**	0.86
TBAPI	34	5.07	0.44	24	4.78	0.43	2.51*	0.67
Parent								
PTRS-Parent Version								
Adaptability	51	4.44	0.58	24	4.07	0.68	2.42*	0.57
Joining (Cohesion)	51	4.70	0.42	24	4.45	0.54	2.15*	0.50
APQ								
Parental Involvement	51	4.13	0.48	24	3.86	0.43	2.34*	0.55
Corporal Punishment	50	1.37	0.34	24	1.63	0.52	2.56**	0.60
PPPS	51	5.06	0.41	24	4.52	0.65	4.40**	1.03
PECS	51	4.60	0.47	23	4.27	0.41	2.94**	0.69

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 2

Significant Gains for Treatment Group Only from Pre-Test to Post-Test

Measure	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<u>Pre</u> <i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<u>Post</u> <i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>r</i> ²
Student							
PDR-Parent Report							
Arguing	60	0.72	0.29	0.55	0.34	3.97**	0.21
Noncompliance	60	0.55	0.37	0.38	0.36	3.49**	0.17
Tantrums	60	0.27	0.34	0.14	0.23	3.35**	0.16
BASC-Teacher Report							
Hyperactivity	34	68.53	8.05	62.18	7.62	5.07**	0.44
Anxiety	34	48.94	8.66	45.97	6.38	2.86**	0.30
Depression	34	57.91	9.67	54.00	10.14	3.75**	0.46
Attention Problems	34	64.44	5.32	59.15	6.16	5.32**	0.16
Learning Problems	29	57.17	9.94	55.10	9.66	2.30*	0.17
Withdrawal	34	59.85	11.98	56.03	9.74	2.59*	0.12
Adaptability	34	40.88	7.80	43.29	8.62	2.06*	0.34
Social Skills	34	39.91	6.23	44.53	6.77	4.14**	0.26
Externalizing Problems	34	65.91	7.46	62.03	8.99	3.38**	0.26
Internalizing Problems	34	53.86	9.36	50.82	9.45	3.23**	0.24
School Problems	29	61.52	7.38	57.83	7.10	4.43**	0.41
Behavioral Symptoms Index	34	65.56	8.15	60.35	9.26	4.51**	0.38
Adaptive Skills	33	38.91	6.52	41.88	6.37	2.73*	0.19
Teacher							
PTRS							
Communication to Other (Adaptability)	54	3.46	0.67	4.03	0.67	6.87**	0.47
Parent							
PTRS							
Communication to Other (Adaptability)	49	4.05	0.92	4.43	0.58	3.79**	0.23
APQ							
Inconsistent Discipline	49	2.06	0.50	1.85	0.47	3.20**	0.18
PPPS	48	4.30	0.84	5.07	0.42	6.08**	0.44
PECS	49	4.30	0.57	4.59	0.48	3.47**	0.20
PEHCSS	49	4.57	0.58	4.79	0.58	3.13**	0.17

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$