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Abstract

Research suggests that parent engagement leads to positive student outcomes, such as academic achievement, attendance and level of motivation. Typically, the definition of parental engagement is dependent on parents, and teachers. Little research focuses on the students’ perceptions of parental support. Students’ perceptions of parental engagement need to be further researched in order to help validate research around parental engagement and its implication on student outcomes.

The intent of this quantitative study will be to investigate to what degree a relationship exists between middle school students’ perceptions of parental support and student outcomes, namely student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school.

Quantitative research questions and hypotheses will address the relationship between parental engagement and the outcomes of middle school students who attend a public kindergarten through grade 8 public school in a New York City school district. The Student Survey of Family and Community Involvement in the Elementary and Middle Grades survey instrument will be used to measure students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student attitudes toward school. Grade point average and attendance data were collected from Automate the Schools (ATS), a school based system that standardizes and automates the collection and reporting of data for all students in New York City public schools.
The survey was administered to seventh and eighth grade students after the instructional day over the span of one week. The study was correlational in natural and applied multiple regression analysis to analyze the data. Findings indicate that there is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ grade point averages (H1). Also, there is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attendance (H2). Lastly, there is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school (H3)

It is recommended that schools make explicit efforts to engage parents, thereby building family-school partnerships. The practical significance of this study will begin to fill the gap in parental engagement literature, as well as pave the way for future research surrounding students’ perceptions of parental engagement.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Education is a social system involving many stakeholders. Parents, educators, and the community all want students to achieve, since achievement equates to sustainability for the future. In a time when global competition is prevalent, it is essential students are equipped with the tools necessary for success. The right tools will ensure students are college, and career ready. Education is the vehicle through which such tools can be delivered. Teaching and learning are essential in the process of creating a sustainable future. The National Education Association (2011) stated, “We must educate our way to a better economy and give our students the support and tools they need to compete in the global marketplace” (p. 1).

Best practices have been investigated and identified in the field of education; a tremendous amount of literature exists pertaining to best practices and student achievement. Differentiating lessons for various learners, adding rigor to the classroom, discovery learning, backwards planning, reciprocal reading, and balanced literacy are just a few best practices that have been identified. The goal is always the same, producing academically competent students who will succeed in the workforce (National Education Association, 2011).

Parental engagement and its impact on student outcomes is also a topic that generates a great deal of discussion. There is a vast amount of research investigating the success of students whose parents are actively engaged in their education. In fact, many researchers have concluded that parental engagement impacts student outcomes.
(Bronstein, Ginsburg, & Herrera, 2005; Domina, 2005; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002, 2004; Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, & Doan Holbein, 2005; Lounsbury, 2004; Plunkett, Behnke, Sands, & Choi, 2009). However, the students’ perceptions and voices are typically left out of the debate. It is imperative to include in the dialogue the individuals most affected by this issue, the students (Antosca, 1996).

**Problem Statement**

There is no question that parental engagement is important. Research suggests parental engagement leads to positive student outcomes, such as academic achievement, attendance, and level of motivation. What is debatable is the definition of parental engagement, and more importantly, who is defining it. Many definitions and frameworks of parental engagement exist (Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Epstein, 2001; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995). Typically, the definition of parental engagement is dependent on parents, and teachers. Researchers and theorists develop definitions based on the perceptions of parents and the school community; yet, the child, the most important factor, is left out of the equation (Antosca, 1996).

The individuals directly impacted by parental engagement are not involved in the dialogue. Little research focuses on the students’ perceptions of parental support, although they are the ones receiving or not receiving the support. Ultimately, students are the receptors of stimuli (parental support) and their responses (behaviors or outcomes) are being measured; therefore, parental engagement discussions should include students’ voices. Students’ perceptions of parental engagement need to be further researched, as students’ voices will help validate research around parental engagement and its
implication on student outcomes. Without this student link, there will remain a gap in the literature (Antosca, 1996).

This study investigated to what degree a relationship exists between middle school students’ perceptions of parental support and student outcomes, namely student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. Specifically, the research question under study is: Is there a relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ achievement (grade point average), attendance, and attitudes toward school?

**Theoretical Rationale**

Theories offer understanding in a world that is constantly changing. Reeve, Albert, Kuper, and Hodges (2008) stated “Theories provide complex and comprehensive conceptual understandings of things that cannot be pinned down: how societies work, how organizations operate, why people interact in certain way” (p. 631). Theories can be used to help design a research question, guide the selection of relevant data, and interpret and propose explanations. They provide researchers with a myriad of lenses through which to view issues; thereby, facilitating applied and action research (Reeve et al., 2008).

Researching theories is beneficial when investigating whether or not a relationship exists between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student outcomes. In this case, grand, mid, and micro level theories were used to gain understanding of the dissertation topic. Through a theory-centric method, theories were utilized to guide the dissertation. Understanding significant theories and theorists in the field of child development further enhanced the study (Willis, 2013).
This study used theory as a lens for understanding how students’ perceptions of parental support impacts student outcomes. Using the analogy of a tree, the trunk represents Lev Vygotsky’s theory of child development, while the branches represent Urie Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory, and the leaves represent Joyce Epstein’s framework for parental engagement. Vygotsky, Bronfenbrenner, and Epstein contributed immensely to the understanding of the research and findings presented in this study.

The trunk. Lev Semyonovich Vygotsky was a Russian psychologist who contributed to the fields of child and social development. Vygotsky lived during the same time period as Jean Piaget, another renowned developmental psychologist. In fact, they were born in the same year, 1896. Vygotsky and Piaget had more in common than their birth year; however, they both took a major interest in child development and learning. Piaget’s theory focused on stage development, where the child advances through four stages of its life, developing more sophisticated cognitive skills as he or she progresses through the stages. Vygotsky did not pay particular attention to the stage or age of a child, but looked at the child as a whole (McLeod, 2007).

Vygotsky’s social development theory of learning has three components, including (a) social influences on cognitive development, (b) the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO), and (c) the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Vygotsky believed social interactions play a fundamental role in a child’s cognitive development. Vygotsky, (1978) stated, “Every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological)” (p. 57).
A second component of Vygotsky’s theory is the MKO. The MKO is anyone who possesses a higher level of understanding or more cognitive ability than the child. Vygotsky proclaims the MKO is significant to a child’s cognitive development (McLeod, 2007; Vygotsky 1978).

The ZPD is the distance between a child’s ability to perform a task under adult guidance and its ability to solve the problem, or perform the task independently. The ZPD is inherently related to the MKO component of Vygotsky’s theory. Both the MKO and the child create the ZPD. This relationship creates scaffolding for the child providing a support system for new knowledge and understandings (McLeod, 2007; Vygotsky 1978).

Vygotsky’s social development theory of learning received criticism during his short lifetime, and after his death. Much criticism surrounds his active construction of knowledge principle. Fox (1996) rejects Vygotsky’s notion of active construction, which deals with the MKO concept. Fox argues not all learning happens as a result of active construction or the presence of a MKO. Instead, he suggests learning can also occur through passivity, where people learn from their own experiences. In addition, Fox believes an individual’s perception of self plays a significant role in learning; thus scaffolding is not always essential to learning (Fox, 1996).

Although criticized by some, Vygotsky’s theory has also received a significant amount of support. Vygotsky has influenced many theorists, including Urie Bronfenbrenner, the creator of the ecological systems theory (Brendtro, 2006).

**The branches.** Urie Bronfenbrenner is a well-known scholar in the field of developmental psychology. He was a Russian born American Psychologist who was
fascinated with the development of children. Bronfenbrenner was a renowned professor of human development and psychology at Cornell University. In 1994, Cornell University named the Bronfenbrenner Life Course Center in his honor (Brendtro, 2006). Bronfenbrenner also co-founded the Head Start program in the United States, “an early intervention program designed to prepare children for school success” (Brendtro, 2006, p. 328).

Bronfenbrenner first introduced his ecological systems theory in the 1970s in response to a field dominated by psychologists who he believed did not understand the dynamics of child behavior (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). According to Bronfenbrenner, psychology during this time was “the science of the strange behavior of children in strange situations with strange adults for the possible periods of time” (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 513). He felt the field desperately needed new perspectives as a means to move forward; he charged himself with the responsibility of creating new understandings through research (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory “defines complex ‘layers’ of environment, each having an effect on a child’s development” (Paquette & Ryan, 2001, p. 1). His theory identifies and defines four types of systems that shape the development of a child, including (a) the microsystem, (b) mesosystem, (c) exosystem, and (d) macrosystem (Paquette & Ryan, 2001).

The microsystem is the family, classroom, or systems in the immediate environment in which a person is operating. The mesosystem is two Microsystems interacting, such as the connection between a child’s home and school. The exosystem is an environment in which an individual is indirectly
involved and is external to his experience, yet it affects him anyway i.e. a child’s parent’s workplace. The macrosystem is the larger cultural context. (Ahuja, 2005, p. 2)

Brofenbrenner’s ecological systems theory fulfills the role of a mid-level theory in the discussion of parental engagement. It fits under the umbrella of Vygostsky’s social development theory of learning, providing further insight into the influences on a child. Understanding the mesosystem helped to guide the research study. This theory identifies the significance of the parent and the school in a child’s life, and allows researchers to examine the family and school as agents that influence the development of a child. Both the teacher and parent are elements of the microsystem; however, the interaction of these two microsystems as they work together to educate a child becomes the mesosystem. It is this interaction that the study aims to examine through research (Paquette & Ryan, 2001).

In the ecological systems theory, the child is the body, and is impacted by inputs from her environment. These inputs influence the child’s behaviors. In the research study, the child and two prominent components of its microsystem, the parent and the school, were investigated to determine the correlation between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student outcomes.

**The leaves.** Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory has influenced the work of many theorists, including Joyce Epstein. In most of Epstein’s published studies and articles, Bronfenbrenner is cited and referenced as a contributing author. Epstein is a major contributor and researcher in the field of education. She is Director of the Center on School, Family and Community Partnerships. She is also Principal Research scientist
and Co-Director of the School, Family and Community Partnership Program of the Center for Research on the Students Placed at Risk (NNPS).

The Epstein Model (2001, 2009) is one of the most widely referenced frameworks for parental engagement. Epstein argues school, family and community are important “spheres of influence” on a child, and when these spheres work collaboratively, the development of the child is enhanced. Epstein encourages the overlapping of the spheres of influence as a way to improve student outcomes at school (Epstein et al., 2009).

Epstein understands that parental engagement is not one-size-fits-all. She identifies and describes six concrete types of parental engagement/engagement behaviors, including (a) parenting, (b) communicating, (c) volunteering activities, (d) learning at home, (e) decision making, and (f) collaborating with the community (Epstein et al., 2009).

Limitations of the Epstein Model exist. The school is still expected to inform parents of effective strategies that should be used within the home, and the role of the parent in the decision-making process is defined and created by the school (Epstein et al., 2009). However, when the school takes an active role in including parents, and creates an environment conducive to collaboration, students succeed (Ho Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996).

The Epstein Model has a direct relationship to the research problem. It provides a framework for understanding the many characteristics of parental engagement. Also, a survey instrument was developed using Epstein’s framework of parental engagement as a guide.
Statement of Purpose

The intent of this quantitative study was to investigate the relationship between parental engagement and student outcomes, namely, grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. Quantitative research questions and hypotheses addressed the relationship between parental engagement, and the outcomes of middle school students who attend a public intermediate school in a New York City school district. A survey instrument was used to quantify data that pertains to students’ perceptions of parental support, attendance, grade point average, and attitudes toward school.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following three research questions and null hypotheses guided this study:

1. To what extent do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a relationship to students’ grade point averages?
   
   \( H_0 \) There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ grade point averages.

2. To what degree do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a relationship to students’ attendance?
   
   \( H_0 \) There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attendance.

3. To what extent does a relationship exist between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and their attitudes toward school?
   
   \( H_0 \) There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school.
Potential Significance of the Study

This study is significant to the field of education. It allows students to be active participants and contributors to an area that directly impacts them. Often, students are left out of the conversations surrounding parental engagement and student achievement. The perspectives of parents, teachers, and community members are abundant in literature. In fact, a great deal of research focuses on how teachers’ and parents’ perceptions of parental support differ. Conversely, there seems to be a gap in the literature; there is very little research on students’ perceptions of parental support (Antosca, 1996). However, this study actively includes students in the discussion. In fact, students are at the focus of this study. In addition, the findings of this study either supported or rejected the existence of a correlation between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student outcomes; thereby, providing a basis for understanding schooling as a system. The findings of this study can be used to inform educators and parents with understandings about students’ perceptions and parental engagement. This may assist with program development in schools, and relationship building at home.

Definition of Terms

Attendance. For the purpose of this study, attendance was operationally defined as being present and attending school regularly during the 180-day school year (New York State Education Department, 2013).

Grade point average. For the purpose of this study grade point average was operationally defined as a number representing the average value of the accumulated grades earned in various classes over time. It is calculated by adding up all content area
final grades, and dividing the figure by the number of grades awarded (New York State Education Department, 2013).

**Parent.** Parents are taken to mean parents, caregivers and those with parental responsibility (National Governors’ Association, 2013). For the purpose of this study, Parent was operationally defined as the direct caregiver of a child. This individual may be a biological parent, family member, foster parent, or any legal guardian of the child.

**Parental engagement.** Any of the six concrete types of behaviors: parenting, communicating, volunteering activities, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community (Epstein et al., 2009). For the purpose of this study parental engagement was defined as the engagement of a parent in any of the six concrete types of behaviors: parenting, communicating, volunteering activities, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community.

**Parental expectation.** Clear communication where parents articulate goals and plans for their child, and engage in discussion about their child’s future (Fan & Chen, 2001). For the purpose of this study, parental expectation will be operationally defined as in Fan and Chen (2001).

**Student perception.** The personal recollections of experiences and the subjective conclusions drawn from those experiences as reported by the students (Antosca, 1996). For the purpose of this study, student perception was defined as the child’s self-reported beliefs regarding how engaged their parent is with their schooling.

**Student outcomes.** Education-related consequences of students’ educational experience (New York State Education Department, 2013). For the purpose of this study,
student outcomes were defined as grade point average, attendance, perception of school, and school motivation.

**Successful student outcomes.** For the purpose of this study, successful student outcomes were defined as outcomes where students are functioning on or above grade-level (New York State Education Department, 2013).

**Student attitudes toward school.** For the purpose of this study, student attitudes toward school, was operationally defined as students’ confidence in their ability to learn and succeed in school, and students’ sense of belonging at their school, such as feeling included, accepted and valued (Sheldon & Epstein, 2007).

**Middle school student.** A school intermediate between elementary and high school, usually encompassing grades 6 through 8 (New York State Education Department, 2013). For the purpose of this study, a middle school student was defined as a student attending an intermediate school in grades seven through eight.

**Chapter Summary**

The remainder of this study is organized as follows: Chapter 2 presents a review of literature related of parental engagement. Chapter 3 focuses on the methodology that was utilized throughout the study. Chapter 4 presents the results of the quantitative study, and chapter 5 identifies, summarizes, and analyzes significant and minor findings of the study. Chapter 5 also identifies limitations, delimitations, best practices, and next steps of the study.
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature

Introduction and Purpose

This chapter identifies the related review of literature surrounding parental engagement and adolescent development. The challenges middle school students face will be highlighted; social, emotional, physical, and academic difficulties is included in the literature. A historical context of parental engagement is provided, followed by definitions and frameworks of parental engagement. Literature that pertains to parent expectation and the school link is also included. The chapter culminates with literature that pertains to the benefits of parental engagement.

Topic Analysis

Middle school challenges. School can be a difficult time for any child, of any age. However, school for the middle school child is even more challenging. Middle school children are entering a stage of adolescence and are faced with many abrupt changes. Early adolescents have to undergo a transition from elementary to secondary education, at an age when they are also experiencing rapid physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development (Simons-Morton & Crump, 2003).

Young adolescents do not just get bigger; distinctively different bodies emerge from these growing years. More extensive physical and personal changes now occur than at any other time of life. While the physical changes are the most obvious, profound changes are taking place in mental, social, emotional, and moral development. (Lounsbury, 2004, para. 2)
In addition to developmental changes, many academic demands are created as well. Students are leaving an environment where they only had one or two significant teachers, and must enter a realm where they have multiple teachers— one for each subject. Thus, students must adjust to various teachers who may have different expectations and standards. Additionally, they must also navigate through the creation of new friend groups, a daunting process in itself. Davis and Lambie (2005) stated “Early adolescence is a period of intrapersonal and interpersonal transformation” (p. 144).

Coupled with the need to fit into a new environment and make new friends, middle school students also face academic challenges. The amount of work and its complexity increases. High stake assessments and obtaining the grades necessary to get into a competitive high school are added to the equation. Students who previously only worried about coloring in the lines, are now exposed to immense pressures at school (Lounsbury, 2004).

**Historical context of parental engagement.** Parental engagement is a concept that has been around for ages. Parents were the most important educators of their children since prehistoric times. Before history was recorded, evidence indicates parents were nurturers and educators of their children through modeling, care giving, and guidance. They imparted the skills, mores, and values of the time, which were influenced by their life experiences, the environment in which lived, and their culture. In primitive cultures, there was no education other than that offered by the extended family and clan (Berger, 1991). As civilization developed, the education of children moved from inside the home to outside of the home. The first formal education setting outside the home emerged in Egypt during the Middle Kingdom (Berger, 1991).
Greek society valued how children were reared. “In the sixth century B.C., there were regulations governing schools and parent responsibilities” (Berger, 1991, p. 210). Plato, Aristotle, and Locke viewed children as impressionable entities, in need of nurturing and cultivation (Berger, 1991). “Children were society’s hope for the future; they needed to be reared properly” (Berger, 1991, p. 210). Roman society also valued how children were reared. Nurturing and educating children was extremely important (Berger, 1991).

After the middle Ages, young children’s interaction with their parents was significant. John Locke stressed the importance of modeling appropriate behaviors and actions in front of children. “You must do nothing before him, which you would not have him imitate” (Berger, 1991, p. 211). Locke felt parenting was a duty that should not be taken lightly. “Those who could not participate should relinquish their rights because children needed an adequate environment in order to become productive adults” (Berger, 1991, p. 211).

Rousseau and Pestalozzi also valued the cultivation of children. “Plants are shaped by cultivation and men by education” (Rousseau, 1979, p. 38). According to Pestalozzi, the mother’s role is to educate the child. “As the mother is the first to nourish her child’s body, so should she by God’s order, be the first to nourish his mind” (Pestalozzi, 1951, p. 26).

In the United States during the 19th and 20th centuries, child rearing and parental engagement was significant. As a means to support families with child rearing practices, a myriad of parent programs, and educational organizations was developed. The American Association of University Women, the Congress of Parents and Teachers
PTA), and the National Association of Colored Women were a few organizations that aimed to study the child and spread good parenting practices. The emergence of Kindergarten and Head Start programs was also prominent during this time in the United States (Berger, 1991). By the end of the 20th century, parental engagement was still a recurring theme. Throughout the World Wars, Great Depression, and many educational reforms, parental engagement still remained at the forefront as a way to increase student academic outcomes (Berger, 1991).

Today, parental engagement is valued as a way to improve student outcomes. The link between the school and home is significant to the child. When all of a child’s spheres of influences are working together with a common goal, the child is nurtured and can succeed (Epstein et al., 2009).

U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, expressed the significance of the role of the parent during a speech to the Mom Congress. “Parents will always be a child’s first and most important teacher. Parenting is the most important job that every parent takes on. No other activity in our lives carries the same degree of responsibility or influence” (Duncan, 2010, para 29).

“There is little question that the engagement of parents in the schooling of their children is broader and more complex than most researchers previously believed” (Jeynes, 2011, p. 16). Traditional definitions of parental engagement make demands on parents, while reciprocal demands are not made of the school to ensure the success of their families (Abdul-Adil & Framer, 2006).

In addition to basic definitions, many theorists have created parental engagement frameworks. These multi-faceted models begin to “focus on how parental engagement affects students, why parents do and do not get involved in their children’s education, and what role schools and teachers can play in creating parental engagement” (Education Encyclopedia, 2014, para 3).

Grolnick, Benjet, Kurowski, and Apostoleris, (1997), Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994), Epstein (2001), Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995), and Bronfenbrenner (1994) provide frameworks “for exploring the precursors to and effects of parental engagement” (Education Encyclopedia, 2014, para 3). These frameworks have been used in much of the research conducted on parental engagement. Although similar, because of their structure which includes relationships between the school, family and community, each approach focuses on different variables affecting these relationships.

The Epstein Model (2001, 2009) is one of the most widely referenced frameworks for parental engagement. The Epstein model argues school, family and community are important “spheres of influence” on a child, and when these spheres work collaboratively the development of the child is enhanced. Epstein encourages the overlapping of the spheres of influence as a way for improving student outcomes at school (Epstein et al., 2009).
Epstein understands parental engagement is not one-size-fit-all. She identifies, and describes six concrete types of parental engagement/engagement behaviors: parenting, communicating, volunteering activities, learning at home, and decision making, and collaborating with the community (Epstein et al., 2009).

Epstein’s model (2009) places the responsibility on the school. The school community must facilitate activities and experiences within each of the six types of parental engagement. Type one- Parenting, allows schools to help families create home environments conducive to supporting children as students. Parenting activities should “illustrate how schools are working to increase families’ understanding of child and adolescent development” (Epstein et al., 2009, p. 58). The school can develop the following practices to support parenting: workshops, parent education courses or training for parents, and family support programs (Epstein et al., 2009).

Communicating allows parents and schools to be in continuous contact. “Communicating activities illustrate ways to increase two-way connections about school programs and students’ progress” (Epstein et al., 2009, p. 58). The school can develop the following practices to support communicating: conferences, availability of language translators, regular schedule of memos, phone calls, newsletters, and updated information on websites (Epstein et al., 2009).

Volunteering allows parents to actively participate in the schooling of their children. “Volunteering activities mobilize parents and others who can share their time and talents to support the school, teachers, and student activities at the school or in other locations” (Epstein et al., 2009, p. 58). The school can develop the following practices to
support volunteering, parent patrol, and designated parent/family resource room (Epstein et al. 2009).

Learning at home activities provide families with academic information, which includes student expectations and progress. These activities also provide parents the means to help their child with school work at home. Practices the school can develop to support learning at home activities can include “regular schedule of homework that requires students to discuss and interact with families on what they are learning in class” also, “calendars with activities for parents and students to do at home or in the community” (Epstein et al., 2009, p. 16).

Decision making activities enable families to participate in school related decisions that may impact their child. This type of parental engagement can creates parent leaders and representatives. Practices the school can develop to support decision making can include create active parent organizations, advisory councils, or committees (Epstein et al., 2009).

Collaborating with the community activities encourage the cooperation and collaboration of schools, families and community organizations. Resources are shared in all directions, through all three spheres of influence (Epstein et al., 2009). Practices the school can develop to support collaborating with the community can include alumni participation in school activities, and “service integration through partnerships involving school; civic, counseling, cultural, health, recreation, and other agencies” (Epstein et al., 2009, p. 16).

Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995), like Epstein et al (2009) understand parental engagement is complex. Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler created a multi-
A three-dimensional model of parental engagement that focuses on why parents become involved in their children’s education, and how this engagement has a positive effect on children’s educational outcomes (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995).

The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995) Model of Parental engagement consists of five levels. Level one is parental engagement decision, which is the parent’s positive decision to become involved. This level of parental engagement is influenced by the parent’s construction of the parental role, the parent’s sense of efficacy for helping the child succeed in school, and the general opportunities and demands for parental engagement presented by the child or the school (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995).

Level two of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler Model (1995) identifies parents’ choice of involvement forms. This choice is influenced by specific domains of parents’ skills and knowledge, the amount of time and energy a parent has when considering other family and employment demands, and the specific invitations and demands for involvement from the child and the school/teachers (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995).

Level three is the mechanisms through which parent involvement influences child/student outcomes. This includes modeling, reinforcement, and instruction via close-ended and open-ended questioning. Level four is tempering or mediating variables. This includes parents’ use of developmentally appropriate involvement strategies, and the fit between parents’ involvement actions and school expectations. Level five is child/student outcomes. This includes the parents’ skills and knowledge, and their contribution to their child’s efficacy for doing well in school (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995).
Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) conceptualize three dimensions of parental engagement. Their framework is based on parent-child interactions that affect students’ school experience and motivation. The first dimension is behavioral involvement, which refers to parents’ public actions. The second dimension is personal involvement. This dimension incorporates parent-child interactions that communicate positive attitudes about school to the child. Cognitive/intellectual involvement is the third dimension. This refers to behaviors that enhance the development of skills and knowledge within the child (Education Encyclopedia, 2014; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994).

Hornby is another theorist who developed a model of parental engagement. Hornby’s Hierarchy of Parental engagement (2000) is a model consisting of two pyramids, including one pyramid represents a hierarchy of parents’ needs, and the other a hierarchy of parents’ strengths or possible contributions. Similarly to the Epstein Model (2009), Hornby’s Hierarchy of Parental engagement focuses specifically on what teachers can do to improve parental engagement in their schools. The Parents’ Contribution pyramid, moving from the lowest to highest level, includes information, collaboration, resources and policy. The Needs of Parents pyramid, from high to low, includes communication, liaison, education and support (Hornby, 2000).

Bronfenbrenner (1977) describes his ecological systems theory as having multiple levels of influence on development in which the home and the school exert both unique and combined forces on the growth of an individual. Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory “defines complex ‘layers’ of environment, each having an effect on a child’s development” (Paquette & Ryan, 2001, p. 1). This theory identifies and defines four types of systems that shape the development of a child, including the (a)
microsystem, (b) mesosystem, (c) exosystem, and (d) macrosystem (Paquette & Ryan, 2001).

The microsystem is the family, classroom, or systems in the immediate environment in which a person is operating. The mesosystem is two Microsystems interacting, such as the connection between a child’s home and school. The exosystem is an environment in which an individual is indirectly involved and is external to his experience, yet it affects him anyway i.e. a child’s parent’s workplace. The macrosystem is the larger cultural context. (Ahuja, 2005, p. 2)

McNeal (2001) identifies four elements of parental engagement. One key element is parent-child discussion, which refers to how much time are spent discussing education issues at home. Parent involvement in parent teacher organizations is the second key element. McNeal’s third element is monitoring, which involves parents continuous knowledge of their child’s progress. The fourth element of parental engagement in McNeal’s model is direct involvement. This fourth element refers to the amount of time a parent spends at school involved in activities.

In an ethnographic study conducted by Ho Sui-Chu and Willms (1996), parental engagement was defined based on the analysis and evaluation of four variables. The variables of parental engagement included (a) home discussion, (b) school communication, (c) home supervision, and (d) school participation.

Parents also have many definitions of parental engagement. In a qualitative study conducted by Archer-Banks, and Behar-Horenstein (2008), parents describe what parental engagement looks like to them. Some parents reported being supportive of their
children’s interest as parental engagement, while others attributed parental engagement to attending basketball games and chorus productions. One parent reports, “My daughter tells me if she is struggling with a teacher, or [if] she is struggling with a subject area and I will help her or get her some tutoring. I also try to check on her assignments each week to make sure that she is getting them done and also turning them in (laughs)” (Archer-Banks and Behar-Horenstein, 2008, p. 147). Countless definitions and frameworks exist that describe parental engagement. However, regardless of the definition, parental engagement is crucial to a child’s successfulness (Bracey, 2001).

**Parental expectation.** A huge component of parental engagement is parental expectations. When parents set high expectations for their children, children are successful. Articulating goals and plans for their child and speaking about the future with the child is important. Fan and Chen (2001) performed a meta-analysis of the quantitative literature available on parental engagement. Their study found a meaningful relationship between parental engagement and student academic achievement. Moreover, their study found the strongest relationship existing between parental expectations and achievement. Even when parents were absent from school events but had high expectations, their children performed academically.

Fan and Chen’s study produced findings comparable to other studies. Parental aspirations and expectations were found to have a stronger relationship with achievement than other indicators of parenting normally associated with parental engagement, such as supervision at home, and volunteering at school (Fan, 2001; Trivette & Anderson, 1995).

However, parental expectations must be communicated in order for it to have a meaningful impact student achievement. Researchers emphasize the communication of
these expectations. Chen and Lan (1998), and Trivette and Anderson (1995) highlight the importance of verbally transmitting parental expectations. Communication about school should be consistent and plentiful.

Parents who have high expectations for their children are more likely to engage in other parental support behaviors, such as reading to their children, taking them on trips to libraries and museums, and purchasing supplemental educational materials for enrichment (Alexander & Entwisle, 1996). Research also links student academic achievement to the extent to which a child’s family creates an environment conducive to learning, communicating high but attainable expectations, and becoming involved in the school and the community (Ngeow, 1999).

**Schools link.** The original Epstein Model (2001) incorporates school support into the traditional definition of parental engagement. Epstein shifts some of the onus from the parents to the school community, acknowledging that communication is bidirectional. The school is accountable, and must play a central role in order for parental engagement to successfully exist. Barnard’s study found the implementation of this model produced an increase in student achievement (Barnard, 2004). Limitations of the Epstein Model exist. The school is still expected to inform parents of effective strategies within the home, and the role of the parent in the decision-making process is defined and created by the school (Epstein et al. 2009).

Effective parental engagement requires a strong, respectful partnership between students, parents, teachers, and members of the school community. All individuals involved in this relationship must have a willingness to work collaboratively (U.S Department of Education, 2000). A child spends most of its time at school and home. It
is in these two environments where the majority of learning and social and cognitive
development takes place. Therefore, it is imperative these two realms work together
(Coleman, 1991).

Schools must take an active role in engaging parents. Many researchers equate
successful schools with establishing practices that promote greater communication with
families; thereby, encouraging parental engagement. Ho Sui-Chu and Willms (1996)
argue schools that create an environment for parental engagement have higher levels of
positive schooling outcomes.

Schools that want to be successful must revisit the old African proverb, “it takes a
village to raise a child.” An exploratory study conducted by Epstein and Sheldon
suggests “elementary schools that are interested in improving or maintaining good
attendance will benefit from taking a comprehensive approach that includes students,
educators, parents, and community partners” (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002, p. 315).

If schools and families are to work collaboratively as partners, then schools must
provide families with the developmentally appropriate opportunities and support
necessary to promote and increase involvement in their students’ education.
Therefore, developing effective partnerships with families requires that all school
personnel (i.e., teachers, administrators, and student support personnel including
school counselors) create a school environment that is accessible, inviting, and
welcoming to caregivers. (Davis & Lambie, 2005, p. 144)

Federal laws also identify the link between families and schools as a meaningful
way to promote student success. “The No Child Left Behind Act and other school reform
efforts underscore the need for families, communities, and schools to work together to
produce healthy and academically successful students” (Michael, Dittus, & Epstein, 2007, p. 577). In order to better serve students’ families, schools and communities must work together, becoming community schools (Adelman & Taylor, 2002).

The Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) under the guidance of NCLB (2004) provides specific guidelines for school districts to follow. Districts and schools must develop effective parental engagement policies. In developing parental engagement policies, schools can increase parental engagement, thereby increase student success rates.

The National Coalition for Parental engagement in Education (2005) requests all schools receiving Title I funding, the largest federally funded program for elementary and secondary schools, must follow six specific guidelines. The guidelines include:

- Develop a written parent involvement policy. This policy must be written with and approved by parents. This policy must include steps the school will take to build capacity, engage families, address barriers to their involvement, and coordinate parent involvement in other programs.

- Notify parents and the community about this policy.

- Use at least 1% of the school's Title I funds to develop a parent involvement program. This money can be used to hire parent liaisons, hold workshops and meetings, provide transportation and childcare, and make home visits.

- Describe and explain the school's curriculum, standards, and assessments.

- Develop a parent-school covenant about how families and the school will collaborate to ensure children's progress.
• Give parents detailed information on student progress at the school.

**Benefits of parental engagement.** The nature of parental engagement is most beneficial to children changes as they reach adolescence. In interviews with students, teachers, and parents at four high schools, Saunders and Epstein (2000) found although adolescence wanted more independence than younger children, there was a great need for guidance and support from caring adults in the home school, and community during this important time in their lives.

Research on middle school consistently demonstrates family engagement is a powerful influence on students’ achievement in school. Gone are the days where family and school affairs are separate. A collaborative approach between family and school is supported by researchers in the field of education (Burkhardt, 2004).

Improving the performance of our schools requires improving the quality of life outside of school. Our view of education must encompass that broader concept. Formal schooling is an increasingly important factor in achieving a satisfying and productive life, but without the active support of informal schooling it will be insufficient. The education of our youth is America’s biggest and most important job. It calls for the active participation of all. (Lounsbury, 2004, para. 11)

**Student achievement.** In a mixed methods study, a Pearson statistical test was used to identify a correlation between parental academic engagement and grades. Parental engagement variables, such as monitoring, schoolwork help, educational advice, and academic engagement, served as independent variables, while student’s grades served as the dependent variable. All of the parental engagement variables were positively and significantly related to academic achievement (Plunkett et al., 2009).
Although the research hypotheses were supported by the findings, there were still limitations. Data were only collected from students from four schools in Los Angeles. In addition, 84% of the students were from the ninth grade. The results could change with a different sampling of schools, and/or grades (Plunkett et al., 2009).

A meta-analysis of 41 studies found a profound relationship between parental engagement, and the academic success of urban students. The more involved a student’s parent was, the higher that student’s grades were. Overall, students who were academically successful had parents who were actively involved in their schooling (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Jeynes, 2005).

Some researchers have identified little to no relation between parental engagement and academic performance. Other researchers have identified mixed findings, therefore not being able to entirely reject or support the notion that active parental engagement relates to student achievement. This discrepancy can be attributed to the utilization of nonstandard operational definitions of parental engagement and academic success (Englund, Egeland, Luckner, & Whaley, 2004).

A significant amount of studies reflect findings that link parental engagement to academic achievement. Parental engagement, at both home and school, has a significant relationship with student academic success. This relationship even exists across demographics, such as race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Research concludes that “parental engagement is an important predictor of children’s achievement in school” (Englund et al., 2004, p. 723).

**Student attendance.** Attendance is an important contributor to student academic success. When students attend school they have the opportunity to learn new things.
Research suggests a correlation between student attendance and academic success. Students with better attendance records outperform students with lower attendance records. Also, schools with an overall better attendance record produce higher performing students than schools with lower attendance records (Nicholes, 2003).

*Attendance matters.* The more often students attend school, the more information they are exposed to (Nicholes, 2003). Parental engagement has been linked to promoting student attendance. Typically, parents who are involved in their child’s schooling have students with better attendance records than parents who are not. In an empirical study, Sheldon compared two Ohio schools, one using a National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) program, and one without the program. Sheldon (2007) stated “As members of NNPS, schools receive tools and guidelines for establishing, maintaining, and improving school-wide partnership programs that reach out to families of all students” (p. 268). The NNPS program follows Epstein’s spheres of influence, and parental engagement framework (Epstein, 2001). The findings identify a relationship between parental/family engagement and student attendance. Students attending the NNPS had better attendance records than students at the other school. Although the effects were not large, and were actually moderate, parent engagement and partnerships with schools had a valid impact on student attendance (Sheldon, 2007).

An exploratory study conducted by Epstein and Sheldon (2002), suggests schools interested in improving or maintaining student attendance should design and implement a comprehensive approach, including students, educators, parents, and the community. Creating avenues that promote and facilitate parental engagement improves student attendance. “To prevent or minimize student dropout during high school, elementary
and middle schools need to focus on improving and maintaining student attendance and student motivation to learn” (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002, p. 317).

**School motivation.** Parents, teachers, and policy makers are concerned with declines in achievement motivation and performance of adolescent students; acting out behaviors is also a concern. Research emphasizes the link between students’ perceptions of school, and their level of achievement motivation (Simons-Morton & Crump, 2003). “Students who are well adjusted, engaged, and connected with school may be more motivated to achieve academically…” (Simons-Morton & Crump, 2003, p. 121).

Parental engagement may also be linked to student motivation towards school. Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, and Doan Holbein (2005) suggest an important relationship exists between parental engagement and specific motivational constructs. “When parents are involved, students report more effort, concentration, and attention. Students are more inherently interested in learning, and they experience higher perceived competence” (Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, & Doan Holbein, 2005, p. 117).

A study correlational investigating the impact of parental engagement on middle school students suggested that engaged parental behaviors have a long term effect on children’s levels of motivation during the transition to middle school. Children whose parents were actively engaged in their schooling in their 5th-grade year, “tended to show more extrinsic motivational orientation by 7th grade” (Bronstein, Ginsburg, & Herrera, 2005, p. 570).

In a longitudinal study, students’ intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and academic self-competence was measured. The findings identified a significant relationship between students’ perceptions of their parents’ values and achievement, and student level
of motivation and competence. Students, who perceived parents valued effort and academic success, placed a high priority on effort, academic ability, and grades. These students also perceived academic competence and self-efficacy. It appears students internalized their parents’ beliefs and values into their own learning traits (Marchant, Paulson, & Rothlisberg, 2001).

Fan and Williams (2010) confirmed the findings of the Marchant et al. (2001). Fan and Williams (2010) conducted a longitudinal study examining whether various dimensions of parental engagement predict 10th-grade students’ motivation. A finding of this study links parents’ educational aspirations for their children to students’ academic self-efficacy. “The findings indicate that students who perceived that their parents valued their education and had high expectations for their academic success were likely to feel interested and engaged and confident towards their academic endeavors” (Fan & Williams, 2010, p. 69).

In Domina’s (2005) longitudinal study, parental engagement was not found to independently improve children’s learning. However, this study did find a “link between parental engagement and children’s behavioral problems” (Domina, 2005, p. 245). Although not academic achievement, a decrease in behavioral problems is a positive outcome of parental engagement. A reduction in teachers having to address behavioral issues can lead to more instructional time, thereby indirectly improving student academic outcomes (Domina, 2005).

**Chapter Summary**

Middle school is an extremely challenging time for students. In order to ensure students are successful during their middle school years, all variables that may link to
positive outcomes must be identified. Parental engagement is the independent variable believed to have an impact on student outcomes. A great deal of research suggests active parental engagement is a contributing factor to student success (Epstein & Sheldon, 2004).

This study was conducted to contribute to field of parental engagement research. It focused on student perception of parental engagement, and how parental engagement helps students succeed in school. The findings of this study provided students a voice in the parental engagement conversation. Also, the results of this study may help educational leaders create and implement parental engagement programs; programs that may successfully improve student academic success.
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

This chapter describes the design and methodology of the study which examined students’ perceptions of parental support and its relationship to student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. This chapter presents information organized into six sections. Section one provides a general perspective for the research, highlighting the purpose of the research, research questions and hypotheses. Section two and three describes the research type and context. Sections four and five describe the research participants and instrument used to collect data. Section six presents a brief description of the statistical data analysis used during this study, and the final section presents a summary of the methodology.

General Perspective

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine to what degree a correlation exists between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student outcomes, namely grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school. The study examined the overall relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student overall, yearly grade point average, yearly attendance percentage and attitudes toward school. The study also identified and documented the extent to which individual relationships between six parental engagement typologies had a relationship on student grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school.
These typologies included: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home activities, decision making activities, and collaborating with the community. The research design for this study consisted of (a) determining the most appropriate method, (b) selection of participants, (c) distribution and use of the Student Survey of Family and Community Involvement in the Elementary and Middle Grades, (d) statistical analysis of the results of the student surveys, and (e) analyzing the degree to which students’ perceptions of parental engagement were related to student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school.

Three research questions and null hypotheses were used to guide this study. The research questions and hypotheses include:

RQ1: To what extent do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a relationship to students’ annual grade point averages?

H1 Null: There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ annual grade point averages.

H1 Alternative: There is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ annual grade point averages.

RQ2: To what degree do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a relationship to students’ annual attendance percentages?

H2 Null: There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ annual attendance percentages.

H2 Alternative: There is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ annual attendance percentages.
RQ3: To what extent does a relationship exist between students’ perceptions of parent engagement and students’ attitudes toward school?

\[ \text{H}_3^{\text{Null}}: \text{There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school.} \]

\[ \text{H}_3^{\text{Alternative}}: \text{There is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school.} \]

The quantitative study used the Student Survey of Family and Community Involvement in the Elementary and Middle Grades (Sheldon & Epstein, 2007). The questionnaire was developed to assess student attitudes and motivation in school, views of parent engagement, perceptions of partnership climate at their school, and individual and family demographics.

The study included the distribution and administration of the survey to all seventh and eighth grade students. As a delimitation, the researcher excluded sixth grade students; they were not identified or classified as middle school students for this study. The targeted participants represented the entire population of middle school from a public kindergarten through eighth grade school in Jamaica, New York. The projected population included 120 participants. Of the 120 students, represented by the population, 79 participated in this study. Correlational statistics were used to analyze the findings.

Students’ perceptions of parental engagement was the selected topic of research for several reasons. Minimal scholarly research existed on students’ perceptions of parental engagement. Typically, parental engagement research consists of the perceptions of parents, teachers and other school members; students are usually left out of the discussion. In addition, the findings of this study either supported or rejected the
existence of a correlation between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student outcomes; thereby, providing a basis for understanding schooling as a system. The findings of this study are used to inform educators and parents with understandings about students’ perceptions and parental engagement. This may assist with program development in schools, and relationship building at home.

**Research Type**

The research study was correlational in nature. “Correlational studies are designed to analyze the relationships between two or more variables, ordinarily through the use of correlation coefficients” (Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005, p. 42). They attempt to rationalize patterns of relationships between variables; thereby, possibly leading to theories. Correlational research is a form of inferential statistics. This study utilized inferential statistics, as it was the most practical form of statistics to address the given problem and research questions. Inferential statistics does not need to measure every member of the population, but merely a sample from which inferences and conclusions may be formulated. In addition, the population of interest can extend into the future. This means the results from this study can be applied to future students in the seventh and eighth grade. Ultimately, inferential correlational statistics can create assumptions that can be applied to the greater population (Huck, 2012; National service-Learning Clearinghouse, 2013).

**Research Context**

The proposed study took place in a public school in Jamaica, New York. The targeted school is a combination elementary and middle school that houses students in grades pre-kindergarten through eight. The school is located geographically in New
York City district 29. It is one of 18 middle schools in its district, and one of five that has the Pre-kindergarten through eight models. The school’s total population is 748 students, of which 352 (47%) are male and 396 (53%) are female. The school comprised of 67% Black or African American students (n = 498), 21% Latino or Hispanic students (n = 155), 7% Asian or Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander (n = 51), 2% White or Caucasian (n = 19), 2% American Indian or Alaska Native (n =15), 0% multiracial (n = 3), and 1% other (n =7). In addition 100% of students are eligible for free lunch. Displayed in Table 3.1 are frequency and percent statistics of the schools’ demographics, specifically students’ gender, ethnicity and school lunch eligibility.
Table 3.1

Frequency and Percent Statistics of Schools’ Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the school’s total population, 176 students are middle school students.

Middles school students are students in grades 6, 7 and 8. Of the 176 middle school students, 120 were eligible to participate in the study, as they were seventh and eighth grade students.
The proposed study took place between spring and summer 2014. The survey instrument was administered and collected during late spring, and data analysis began in summer 2014.

District and school access was assured, and was pre-approved by the district Superintendent (Appendix A) and school Principal (Appendix B). Saint John Fisher College (Appendix C) and the Department of Education IRB approvals (Appendix D; Appendix E) were also approved prior to the study beginning.

Research Participants

The total population of participants included 120 middle school students from a Jamaica public school in New York. These 120 students represented the entire seventh and eighth grade population. For the purpose of this study, middle school students were defined as students in grades 7 and 8. As a delimitation, the researcher excluded sixth grade students, as they were not identified nor classified as middle school students for this study. Thus the 120 participants represent the entire population of the middle school, as defined by the researcher. Of the total population of 120 students, 79 students participated and became the sample or respondent group. Student respondent’s ages ranged from 11 to 16.

Students who received parental consent (Appendix F) and gave their assent were included in the study. In order to receive parental consent and student assent, letters were sent home and phone calls were made via the telephone messenger system; this helped to inform parents and students about the purpose and significance of the study and their participation. Homeroom teachers distributed consent forms to their students. Participants had two options for returning consent forms. They either returned consent
forms in a stamped, pre-addressed envelope, or placed them in a sealed box with an opening on the top, located in the main office. Participants took the questionnaire in classrooms, after the regular school day. Students who received parental consent and gave assent received a schedule highlighting the time they were to report to the designated study classroom to complete their surveys. The questionnaire was administered over the course of one week.

**Instruments to be used in Data Collection**

The Student Survey of Family and Community Involvement in the Elementary and Middle Grades (Appendix G) were designed by Joyce L. Epstein and Steven Sheldon. Epstein and Sheldon are prominent theorists in the field of school, family and community partnership, and are research professors at John Hopkins University’s Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships.

The survey instrument was developed to “assess student attitudes and motivation in school, views of parent involvement, perceptions of the partnership climate at their school, and individual and family demographics” (Sheldon & Epstein, 2007, p. 7). It contains four sections, with seven questions, with a total of 53 items. All four sections of the survey instrument were individually tested for reliability.

Section A evaluates students’ perception of motivation and attitudes. It measures self-confidence and sense of belonging; its Cronbach Alpha scores are .753 and .681, respectively. Section B and C evaluate students’ views of parental engagement and the six parent engagement typologies. Section B has a Cronbach Alpha score of .806. Section C consists of various items used to evaluate parent engagement typologies. It measures students’ perceptions of how frequently their parents display the six typologies
of parent engagement. Its mean Cronbach Alpha scores is .761. Section D provides information about school and family connections. It measures welcoming climate and encouraging interactions on homework. Its Cronbach Alpha scores are 745 and 833, respectively.

The Cronbach Alpha is a measure of internal reliability or consistency of the items in an instrument, index or scale. It is expressed as a number between zero and one, and describes the extent to which all items in a test survey measure the same concept or construct; therefore, is connected to the inter-relatedness of the items within the survey. In most cases a Cronbach Alpha score of .700 or higher is accepted as an indication of reliability; however, scores slightly lower than .700, may be due to a low number of questions, as is the case with several of proposed survey instrument’s sections. Students’ attitudes, which have a Cronbach Alpha score of .681 only contained five items, and parental monitoring schoolwork at home, which has a Cronbach Alpha score of .697 only contained three items. Therefore, the scores are acceptable as indicators of internal reliability, especially since they are so close to .700 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

The structure of the survey instrument varies slightly. Sections A through C consists of likert scales, containing four response choices. Section A and C has a scale with the following choices: 4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. Section B has two sets of scales, one set with the aforementioned choices, and the other with the following choices: 4 = everyday/most days, 3 = once a week, 2 = once in a while and 1= never. Section D asked for students to fill-in basic and demographic information about themselves and their families.
Research question one and two were investigated using Section B- You and Your Family, and Section C- Your School and Family of the survey instrument. Section B and C consists of a total of 31 items. Each item was measured using a likert scale, where four indicated the highest score and one represented the lowest score per item. Therefore the range in scores was from 31 to 124. These 31 items measured students’ perceptions of the six typologies of parental engagement. The items were blended together to maintain validity. Table 3.2 illustrates the items and their corresponding typologies.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items and Respective Typologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology 1: Parenting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology 2: Communicating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology 3: Volunteering</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Item Letter</th>
<th>Response type (Likert)</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typology 4: Learning at Home Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SA, A, D, SD</td>
<td>I like having homework that asks me to talk with someone at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Read with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Work with you on science projects or science homework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Review and discuss the schoolwork you bring home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Help you with math homework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Go over spelling or vocabulary with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Help you with reading or language arts homework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Help you understand what you are learning in science?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M, OW, OIW, N</td>
<td>Help you prepare for math tests?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Typology 5: Decision Making** |
| 3 | Q | M, OW, OIW, N | Go to a school event or meeting (e.g., sports, music, drama, PTA) |

| **Typology 6: Collaborating with the Community** |
| 5 | A | SA, A, D, SD | My parent talks about my school with other parents. |
| 5 | B | SA, A, D, SD | My parent meets other parents at school activities. |

Note: SA = Strongly Agree; A= Agree; D= Disagree; SD= Strongly Disagree; M= Most days; OW= Once a week; OIW= Once in a While; N= Never

In addition to survey data, annual grade point average and attendance percentage data were collected for each student. Grade point average (GPA) and attendance data represented a student’s overall performance for the current school year. Grade point average is calculated by finding the mean of all classes taken by a student. As an example, a student whose (GPA) is 90 would have a compilation of scores for various classes that result in an overall average of 90 when combined. A student with a 90% attendance day would have been in attendance 90% of the time. An average school year is 180 days; therefore the student would have been present 162 of the 180 days. Grade point average and attendance data were collected from Automate the Schools (ATS). ATS is a school based system that standardizes and automates the collection and reporting of data for all students in New York City public schools. ATS provides grade
data as well as day-to-day percentages of students’ attendance (New York City Department of Education, 2013). Grade point average data was collected at the close of the school year, after all grades were submitted for all classes. Attendance data was generated on June 13, 2014, day 169 of 179 for the 2013-2014 school year.

Research question three was investigated using Section A- Your Ideas, Section B- You and Your Family, and Section C- Your School and Family of the survey. The combined score students obtained in Sections B and C were analyzed against the score students receive in Section A of the survey. Section A of the survey, measured students’ attitudes toward school, consisted of 10 items. Each item was measured using a likert scale where, 4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. Thus, the range of scores was 10 to 40.

The survey instrument was administered in paper form over the course of one week. Students completed the survey instrument in classrooms. The surveys were coded with a unique client number that corresponded to a particular student. The researcher inputted the data captured on each survey into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The researcher selected an individual who served as a designee researcher. The designee was trained to answer questions regarding the study and questionnaire. This individual enforced the adherence to the survey administration schedule in the researcher’s absence. The researcher was in continuous communication with the designee researcher in order to assure effective execution.

Data Analysis
Multivariate analysis, specifically multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data. Multiple regression analysis is a multivariate “statistical technique that uses several explanatory variables to predict the outcome of a response variable. The goal of multiple linear regression (MLR) is to model the relationship between the explanatory and response variables” (Investopedia, 2014a, para. 1). In this study, the independent variable- students’ perceptions of parental engagement were further broken-down into typologies. These typologies represented various activities or characteristics parents exhibit that demonstrate parental engagement. In essence, these typologies represented independent variables. In this study, the dependent variables were student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. Thus, multiple independent and dependent variables existed, allowing for the use of multiple regression analysis. Through this form of data analysis, the degree to which the six parental engagement typologies influence student grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school were evaluated in composite and independently.

The researcher surveyed respondents using the Student Surveys of Family and Community Involvement in the Elementary and Middle grades. The survey assessed student attitudes and motivation in school, views of parent engagement, perceptions of partnership climate at their school, and individual and family demographics. The results of each student were aggregated, entered into SPSS, and analyzed.

The proposed study employed inferential statistic for analyzing data. The several methods for analyzing the correlations in the data were used, including (a) scatter plots, (b) Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation, (c) coefficient of determination, and (d)
multiple regression analysis. All research questions were analyzed using inferential statistic methods.

Summary of the Methodology

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the relationship between students’ perceptions of parental support and student outcomes, specifically grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school. The survey instrument was designed by leading theorists in the field of school, family and community partnerships. The quantitative study incorporated the use of correlational statistics to analyze the data.
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter describes the results and findings of the study. This chapter presents demographic information of respondents, data analysis, and test of assumptions, which provide a multiple regression analysis for each research question. In essence, it identifies, and summarizes significant and minor findings of the study.

Problem Statement and Hypotheses

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine to what degree a correlation exists between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student outcomes, namely grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school. To examine this relationship, this study employed a multivariate form of data analysis: multiple regression data analysis. This data analysis technique was used to analyze the data that was collected from The Student Survey of Family and Community Involvement in the Elementary and Middle Grades that was designed by Joyce L. Epstein and Steven Sheldon. The survey instrument was administered to students in grades seven and eight in a public Pre-kindergarten through eighth grade school. The independent variable for this study was students’ perceptions of parental engagement, which comprised of six identified typologies, including (a) parenting, (b) communicating, (c) volunteering, (d) learning at home activities, (e) decision making activities, and (f) collaborating with the community parenting, and volunteering. The dependent variables for this study were
student overall yearly grade point average, student yearly attendance, and students’ attitudes toward school. Three research questions guided this study:

RQ1: To what extent do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a relationship to students’ grade point averages?

RQ2: To what degree do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a relationship to students’ attendance?

RQ3: To what extent does a relationship exist between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school?

Hypotheses for each of the aforementioned research questions were developed. These hypotheses were then tested in order to determine whether or not their claims should be supported or rejected.

**Hypotheses**

Three null and alternative hypotheses guided this study, including:

H1<sub>Null</sub>: There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ grade point averages.

H1<sub>Alternative</sub>: There is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ grade point averages.

H2<sub>Null</sub>: There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attendance.

H2<sub>Alternative</sub>: There is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attendance.

H3<sub>Null</sub>: There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school.
H3: Alternative: There is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school.

Demographics

Data was collected from a sample of 72 middle school students from a Jamaica public school in New York City. The sample consisted of 30 male students (42%) and 42 females (58%). Additionally, participants’ ages ranged between 12 and 15 years old. Specifically, 28% of the students were 12 years old ($n = 20$), 28% were 13 years old ($n = 20$), 36% were 14 years old ($n = 26$), and 8% were 15 years old ($n = 6$). Displayed in Table 4.1 are frequency and percent statistics of participants’ gender and age.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sample consisted of 2 Asian-American students (2%), 43 Black/African American students (59%), 1 White/Caucasian student (1%), 17 Hispanic/Latino students (23%), 1 Black and Hispanic student (1%), 1 other (1%), and 1 student who did not indicate a race/ethnicity (1%). Of the 72 participants, 66% of them indicated their family speaks English at home ($n = 48$), 16% indicated their family speaks Spanish at home ($n = 12$), 6% indicated their family speaks both English and Spanish at home ($n = 5$), 8%
indicated their family speaks a language other than the ones listed \((n = 5)\), and 1% did not respond to this question \((n = 1)\). Displayed in Table 4.2 are frequency and percent statistics of participants’ ethnicity and language.

Table 4.2

*Frequency and Percent Statistics of Participants’ Ethnicity and Language*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino(a)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which language does your family speak at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 72 participants, 37 were in grade 7 (51%) and 35 were in grade 8 (48%). Additionally, 22 participants were from class 701 (30%), 12 participants were from class 702 (16%), 22 participants were from class 801 (30%), 8 participants were from class 802 (11%), and 8 participants were from class 7/891 (11%), which is a bridge class that consists of both seventh and eighth grade students. Displayed in Table 4.3 are frequency and percent statistics of participants’ grade level and class.
Table 4.3

*Frequency and Percent Statistics of Participants’ Grade Level and Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/891</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of 72 middle school students, 3 reported their parents feel the school is excellent (4%), 11 reported their parents feel the school is good (15%), 30 reported their parents feel the school is okay (41%), 11 reported their parents feel the school is fair (15%), 15 reported their parents feel the school is poor (20%), and 2 students did not respond to this question (2%). Students were asked to report the number of adults with whom they reside, and 8% of the students live with 1 adult (n = 6), 30% of students live with 2 adults (n = 22), 30% of students live with 3 adults (n = 22), 16% live with 4 adults (n = 12), 12% live with 5 or more adults (n = 9), and 1% of students did not respond to this question (n = 1). Displayed in Table 4.4 are frequency and percent statistics of participants’ perception of their parents’ feelings of the school and the number of adults they reside with.
Table 4.4

*Frequency and Percent Statistics of Participants’ Perception of their Parents’ feelings of the School and the Number of Adults they reside with*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many adults live at home with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants responded to a survey question that asked them to indicate how much time they allot to completing homework each night. Three students reported spending no time (4%), 11 students reported spending about 5 minutes (15%), 13 students reported spending about 30 minutes (18%), 12 students reported spending about 45 minutes (16%), 10 students reported spending about an hour (13%), and 22 students reported spending more than an hour (30%) on their homework each night; 1 student did not respond to this question (1%). When asked how they were doing in school, 9% of students reported having mostly level 4s ($n = 7$), 2% reported having a combination of 3s and 4s ($n = 2$), 34% of students reported having level 3s ($n = 25$), 44% reported having level 2s ($n = 32$), and 8% reported having level 1s ($n = 6$) for the current school year. Additionally, participants were asked to identify their future level of educational
attainment. Specifically, 1% of students indicated they would complete some high school (n = 1), 5% indicated they would complete high school (n = 4), 6% indicated they would complete some college (n = 5), 25% indicated they would complete college (n = 18), 58% indicated they would complete more than college (n = 42), and 2% did not respond to this question (n = 2). Displayed in Table 4.5 are frequency and percent statistics of participants’ time allotted to completing homework each night, perception of current academic level, and perception of their future level of educational attainment.

Table 4.5

*Frequency and Percent Statistics of Participants’ time allotted to completing homework each night, perception of current academic level, and perception of their future level of educational attainment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About how much time do you spend doing homework each night?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 15 minutes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 30 minutes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 45 minutes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About an hour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than an hour</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are you doing in school this year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Level 4s (90s and up)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly 3s and 4s (85 average)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Level 3s (80-89)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly 2s (70-79)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly 1s (69 and below)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far do you think you will go in school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete high school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete college</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than college</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection and Instrumentation

Surveys were distributed and administered to all seventh and eighth grade students. The targeted participants represented the entire population of middle school students from a public kindergarten through grade 8, in Jamaica, New York. The projected population included 120 participants, but only 79 completed the survey. Correlational statistics were used to analyze findings.

Research question one and two were investigated using Section B- You and Your Family, and Section C- Your School and Family of the survey instrument. Section B and C consists of a total of 31 items. Each item was measured using a Likert scale, where four indicates the highest score and one represents the lowest score per item. Therefore, average scores ranged from 1-4. Therefore the range in scores can be from 31 to 124. These 31 items measure students’ perceptions of the six typologies of parental engagement. The items were blended, by construct, together to maintain validity.

Students overall, yearly grade point averages and yearly attendance percentages were generated from one of the school’s database systems called Automate the Schools (ATS).

Research question three was investigated using Section A- Your Ideas, Section B- You and Your Family, and Section C- Your School and Family of the survey. The combined score students obtained in Sections B and C l were analyzed against the score students received in Section A of the survey. Section A of the survey, which measures students’ attitudes toward school, consists of 10 items. Each item was measured using a likert scale where, Strongly agree represents four points, agree represents three points,
disagree represents two points, and strongly disagree represents one point. Thus, the range of scores is 10 to 40.

**Data Analysis**

Multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data. In this study the independent variable—students’ perceptions of parental engagement were broken-down into typologies. These typologies represented various activities or characteristics that parents can exhibit that equate to parental support. In essence, these typologies represented independent variables. In this study, the dependent variables were student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. Thus, multiple independent and dependent variables exist, allowing for the use of multiple regression analysis. Through this form of data analysis, the degree to which the six parental engagement typologies influence student grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school can be evaluated.

**Reliability analysis.** Reliability analysis allows one to study the properties of measurement scales and the items that compose the scales (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis procedure calculates a reliability coefficient that ranges between 0 and 1. The reliability coefficient is based on the average inter-item correlation. Scale reliability is assumed if the coefficient is $\geq .60$. Table 4.6 depicts summary statistics of the reliability analyses for the multi-item constructs used in the study.

Reliability coefficient for student attitudes was calculated and found to be .680. Reliability coefficients for four of the constructs associated with parental engagement were also calculated where: Parenting = .772, communicating, .773, home activity = .888,
and collaborating = .706. Alpha coefficients for volunteering and decision making were not calculated since each consisted of a single question on the survey.

Table 4.6

*Reliability Statistics for the Specified Constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>N-Listwise</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Attitudes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Activity</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 79, Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure, Two constructs had only 1 question meaning that reliability could not be run.

**Missing data and univariate outliers.** Missing data were investigated by running frequency counts in SPSS 22.1 and seven cases with a considerable amount of missing data were found and removed. These cases had values missing in more than 5% of the questions. In addition, eight additional cases were found with missing values in less than 5% of the questions, but these values were replaced with series mean to preserve sample size. Thus, for RQ1, 79 responses from participants were received and 72 cases were entered into the multiple regression model (N = 72).

A test for univariate outliers was conducted and none were found to exist within the distributions. Univariate outliers were sought by converting observed scores to z-scores and then comparing case values to the critical value of ±3.29, p < .001. Case z-scores that exceed this value are greater than three standard deviations from the normalized mean.
Mahalanobis distances were calculated for each case resulting in no cases exceeding the critical value for three predictor variables of 22.458. Mahalanobis distance is a measure of how much a case's values on the independent variables differ from the average of all cases. A large Mahalanobis distance identifies a case as having extreme values on one or more of the independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012).

Test of assumptions. Parametric assumptions were tested for multiple regression to ensure validity of results. Specifically, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity were tested per Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2012) recommendation.

Test of normality. The assumption of normality was assessed for the criterion (grade point average, attendance, and Student attitudes) and predictor variables (parenting communicating, volunteering, home activities, decision making, and collaborating) by examining deleted residuals. Specifically, deleted residual histograms were created from the regression tests to visually evaluate the normality assumption. Norusis, (2011) argues one can see departures from normality more easily with studentized deleted residuals than other types of residuals.

After review, the Studentized Deleted Residual histograms for GPA, parent engagement demonstrated no visual skewness. Visual evidence of normality was assessed by comparing frequency bars to the superimposed normal curve. However, to test if the distribution was significantly skewed the skew coefficient of -.144 was divided by the skew standard error of .283 resulting in a z-skew coefficient of -.509. The technique recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), states z-skew coefficients exceeding the critical value of ±3.29 ($p$>.001) may indicate non-normality. Thus, the Studentized Deleted Residual variable did not exceed the critical value. Z-kurtosis was
also evaluated using the same method and found not to be significantly kurtotic ($z$-kurtosis = .472). Since the studentized residuals did not exhibit significant deviations from normality, the distribution was assumed to be normally distributed.

The Studentized Deleted Residual histograms for attendance, parent engagement did demonstrate visual skewness and kurtosis. Specifically the Studentized Deleted Residual histograms were negatively skewed and kurtotic. Violation to this assumption is evident meaning a type 2 error is more likely. That is, it is more like to retain the null hypothesis when in fact it is false. This fact should be considered a limitation to the study.

The Studentized Deleted Residual histograms for student attitudes, parent engagement did not demonstrate visual skewness or kurtosis. Specifically the Studentized Deleted Residual histogram was normally skewed. As such, this test supports the assumption of normality.

**Linearity and homoscedasticity.** Results from the three test for linearity for each dependent variable and predictor variables were not significant at GPA $p = .050$, attendance $p = .599$, and student attitudes $p = .156$, indicating there was not a linear relationship between the variables. However, the test for deviation from linearity was also not significant at $p = .128$, $p = .599$, and $p = .156$; meaning, a nonlinear relationship did not exist between variables. Thus, although linearity was not statistically evident, the assumption of linearity was not rejected.

**Multicollinearity.** The assumption of multicollinearity was tested by calculating correlations between variables and collinearity statistics (Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor). Correlations between criterion and predictor variables were not too low
and correlations between predictor variables did not exceed .350. Tolerance is calculated using the formula \( T = 1 - R^2 \) and variance inflation factor (VIF) is the inverse of Tolerance (1 divided by T). Commonly used cut-off points for determining the presence of multicollinearity are \( T > .10 \) and \( VIF < 10 \). There were no correlational results violating this assumption; therefore, the presence of multicollinearity was not assumed.

Given the preponderance of evidence provided, normality of the criterion and predictor variables are affirmed. That is, after examining the Frequency Histograms, descriptive statistics, scatter plots and multicollinearity, the variables are assumed to meet parametric assumptions. Descriptive statistics for the criterion and predictor variables were presented in Table 4.7

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Z-Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Z-Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>74.59</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Percentage</td>
<td>64.80</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>93.11</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>-8.07</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Attitudes</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>-8.27</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Activity</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 72 \), Standard error skew = .283, Standard error kurtosis = .559

Multiple regression test for hypothesis 1. SPSS 22.1 analyze/regression/linear was used to test the relationship between the six combined predictors of parental engagement and grade point average. Based on results from the test there was a positive
The relationship between student’s perception of parental engagement and GPA; \( R = .413, \ R^2 = .071, F (6, 65) = 2.231, p = .051 \) (two-tailed). Table 4.8 provides a model summary of the multiple regression analysis. However the null hypothesis was not rejected given that critical alpha was set at \( p < .05 \). This means that a significant relationship between the criterion and predictors was not empirically established. As presented in Table 4.8, only home activity was found to significantly related to grade point average, \( t = 2.139, p = .036 \).

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.413(^a)</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>8.159</td>
<td>.051(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>59.981</td>
<td>6.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>-2.293</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>2.523</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Activity</td>
<td>4.645</td>
<td>2.171</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( b \). Dependent variable: Overall grade point average, \( N = 72 \), Critical alpha = .05; \( a \) Predictors: (Constant), Collaboration: Volunteer; Parenting; Decision; Communication; Home Activity; \( F = 2.231 \)

Figure 4.1 displays the scatterplot of combined predictor variables (parental engagement) by GPS for each case. The regression line depicts a positive relationship between the variables; albeit not significant at \( p > .05 \).
**Figure 4.1.** Scatter-dot plot of combined predictor variables by overall grade point average

**Multiple regression test for hypothesis 2.** SPSS 22.1 analyze/regression/linear was used to test the relationship between the six combined predictors of parental engagement and student attendance. Based on results from the test there was no relationship between student’s perception of parental engagement and attendance; \( R = .257, R^2 = .066, F (6, 65) = .766, p = .599 \) (two-tailed). Table 4.9 provides a model summary of the multiple regression analysis. However the null hypothesis was not rejected given that critical alpha was set at \( p < .05 \). This means that a significant relationship between the criterion and predictors was not empirically established. As presented in Table 4.9, no sub-constructs of parental engagement was found to be significantly related to student attendance.
Table 4.9

*Inferential Statistics Generated from Multiple Regression Analysis for H2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.257a</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>6.961</td>
<td>.599b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Constant)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.897</td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td>17.936</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>-1.302</td>
<td>2.102</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-0.705</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Activity</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>1.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>-1.465</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>-1.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. b. Dependent variable: Overall grade point average, N = 72, Critical alpha = .05; a Predictors: (Constant), Collaboration: Volunteer; Parenting; Decision; Communication; Home Activity; F = .766

**Multiple regression test for hypothesis 3.** SPSS 22.1 analyze/regression/linear was used to test the relationship between the six combined predictors of parental engagement and student attitudes toward school. Based on results from the test there was a positive relationship between student’s perception of parental engagement and student attitudes toward school; $R = .61$, $R^2 = .212$, $F (6, 65) = 2.919$, $p = .014$ (two-tailed).

Table 4.10 provides a model summary of the multiple regression analysis. The null hypothesis (H3) was rejected given the observed alpha was less than critical alpha of $p < .05$. This means that a significant relationship between the criterion and predictors were empirically established. As presented in Table 4.10, only communication was found to be significantly related to student attitudes toward school, $t = 3.202$, $p = .002$. 
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Table 4.10

\textit{Inferential Statistics Generated from Multiple Regression Analysis for H3}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>3.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Activity</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  b. Dependent variable: Overall grade point average, N = 72, Critical alpha = .05; a Predictors: (Constant), Collaboration: Volunteer; Parenting; Decision; Communication; Home Activity; \( F = 2.919 \)

Figure 4.2 displays the scatterplot of combined predictor variables (parental engagement) by student attitudes toward school for each case. The regression line depicts a significant positive relationship between the variables; \( p < .05 \).
Summary of Results

This chapter presented a synthesis of the results and expanded on the research findings. This study sought to determine the degree to which students’ perceptions of parental engagement was related to students’ overall, yearly grade point averages, yearly attendance percentages, or students’ attitudes towards school. The results presented in this chapter indicate that there is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ grade point averages (H1). Also, there is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attendance (H2). Lastly, there is a statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes toward school (H3). The next
and last chapter will analyze significant and minor findings of the study. Chapter 5 will also, identify limitations, delimitations, best practices, implications of the findings, and recommendations for professional practice.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

The final chapter reiterates the purpose and the significance of the study. It summarizes the results and discusses their implications for this study and future research. This chapter also, provides recommendations for professional practice, as well as policy and program recommendations. In addition it identifies the limitations, and delimitations of the study.

A review of related literature revealed that many variables impact how successful students are in school. In particular, the research focused on the link between parental engagement and student outcomes. A great deal of research exist that speaks to teachers’ perceptions of parental engagement, parents’ perceptions of parental engagement, and even schools’ perceptions of parental engagement, however few studies have examined students’ perceptions of parental engagement. Students are at the heart of the issue; therefore, need to be included in the discussion. This study creates an avenue for students’ voices to be heard. Through the data analysis from this study, recommendations can be made to improve student successfulness in school, as it relates to parental engagement. These recommendations can inform parents/families, teachers, schools, school districts, and policymakers about how students perceive parental engagement and how this relates to student achievement. More specifically,
recommendations can inform what aspects of school parents should be more involved in, and how teachers, and schools can facilitate this engagement.

Implications

Jagnandam (2012) stated “Throughout the United States, schools are being evaluated based on their students’ performance on standardized tests. Because of the No Child Left Behind Act (2002), schools and teachers are being held accountable based on students’ performance in more ways than ever” (p. 73). In fact, both teacher and school end of year ratings are comprised of the Measure Of Student Learning (MOSL). The MOSL is made up of both local and state assessments that measure student learning. This all results from the creation of Educational Law §3012-c, signed into effect by Governor Paterson on May 28, 2010. Under Educational Law §3012-c, “all school districts and BOCES are required to conduct annual professional performance reviews of…classroom teachers and building principals” (Educational Law §3012-c [1]). This law, more commonly known as Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR), is the basis for teacher and principal evaluation. A teacher or principal’s performance is based on classroom/building observations, state measures of student learning, and local measures of student learning; the respective percentage breakdown is 60%, 20% and 20% (Educational Law §3012-c).

With high demands placed on teachers, principals, and schools, it is imperative that everything is done to increase student achievement. Thus, evaluating variables that serve as predictors for student outcomes is essential. Predictors can be used as a means to identify and develop best practices for parents and schools to implement in order to
promote positive student outcomes; thereby creating globally competitive individuals and successful schools.

The focus of this study was to determine to what degree a relationship exists between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student overall, annual grade point average, annual attendance rate, and attitudes toward school. The consequent steps are to use results presented in this study to create recommendations for parents, teachers, schools, districts and policy makers regarding the benefits of parental engagement.

**Implications for multiple regression test for hypothesis 1.** Research question one investigates: to what extent do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a relationship to students’ grade point averages? The following null hypothesis was developed by the researcher to answer research question one: H1. There is no statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ grade point averages; $R = .413, R^2 = .071, F (6, 65) = 2.231, p = .051$ (two-tailed). After data collection and analysis it was determined that the null hypothesis should not be rejected given that critical alpha is set at $p < .05$. This means that a significant relationship between the criterion and predictors is not empirically established. However, although a significant relationship was not determined by the data analysis, there seems to be a slight correlation between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student overall grade point average. Specifically, home activity was found to significantly relate to grade point average, $t = 2.139, p = .036$.

Although not significant, the regression line in Figure 4.1 depicts a positive relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student grade point average. Therefore, employing strategies to improved students’ perceptions of
parental engagement and actual levels of parental engagement can only improve students’
grade point average. Increasing parental engagement may in fact continue to influence
student grade point average. Regardless of how minuscule the influence, an increase in
student overall grade point average is a positive outcome.

Implications for multiple regression test for hypothesis 2. Research question
two investigates: to what extent do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a
relationship to students’ annual attendance percentages? The following null hypothesis
was developed by the researcher to answer research question two: H1. There is no
statistical relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and
students’ annual attendance percentages. After data collection and analysis it was
determined that there is no relationship between student’s perception of parental
engagement and attendance; R = .257, R2 = .066, F (6, 65) = .766, p = .599 (two-tailed).
The null hypothesis is not rejected given that critical alpha is set at p < .05. This means
that a significant relationship between the criterion and predictors is not empirically
established. Even the sub-constructs (parental engagement typologies) of parental
engagement were not found to be significantly related to student attendance.

Implications for multiple regression test for hypothesis 3. Research question
three investigates: to what extent do students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a
relationship to students’ attitudes toward school? The following null hypothesis was
developed by the researcher to answer research question three: H1. There is no statistical
relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes
toward school. Based on results from the test there is a positive s relationship between
student’s perception of parental engagement and student attitudes toward school; R = .61,
R2 = .212, F (6, 65) = 2.919, p = .014 (two-tailed). The null hypothesis (H3) was rejected given the observed alpha was less than critical alpha of p < .05. This means a significant relationship between the criterion and predictors were empirically established. Students’ perceptions of parental engagement are significant in thinking about how students view school. Students attitudes toward school, as defined in this study, is students’ confidence in their ability to learn and succeed in school, and students’ sense of belonging at their school, such as feeling included, accepted and valued. Children who perceive their parent to be more engaged in their education, display more positive attitudes toward school than their counterparts, who perceive low parental engagement. Thus, when parents engage in their child’s education, and when schools facilitate this engagement, students’ attitudes toward school improve.

Implications for future research. The results of this correlational study suggest students’ perceptions of parental engagement have a greater correlation to students’ attitudes toward school than students’ grade point average or students’ attendance. The data analysis reveals students’ perception of parental engagement has the greatest significance of all dependent variables. In fact, student grade point average almost exposed significance, whereas student attendance demonstrated no significance at all. It may be practical to imply since a correlation exist between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and students’ attitudes towards school; an indirect one could also exist between students’ attitudes toward school and student grade point average and attendance. The researcher would challenge future research to be conducted in order to determine to what degree a relationship exists between students’ attitudes toward school and both student grade point average and attendance. It can be presumed a positive
relationship should exist between these variables. Students who are confident in their ability to learn and succeed in school, and feel a sense of belonging at their school, such as feeling included, accepted and valued, should exhibit positive student outcomes, namely higher grade point averages and annual attendance percentages, when compared to students whose attitudes toward school are lower.

This suggested future study can help to minimize the gap in literature in regards to students’ perceptions of parental engagement, while implicating the interrelatedness of this study’s dependent variables, including student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. This future research can create a trajectory, in an otherwise linear independent-dependent relationship, where dependent variables influence one another in a matrix of interdependency.

This study can be expanded upon in the future by conducting research investigating whether or not a difference exist in Black/African American students’ perceptions of parental engagement and White/Caucasian students’ perceptions of parental engagement, in relation to student grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school. This too, will assist in filling the gap of students’ perceptions of parental engagement literature.

**Limitations**

The basis for this study has limitations and delimitations that should be acknowledged. Limitations are factors or occurrences in a study that are beyond the control of the researcher (Simon & Goes, 2013). The first limitation is the study site is only one school; therefore, is representative of only that school. The participants were only taken from one New York City public school in district 29. In addition the
population in this school is 88.4% Black/African American and Latino/Hispanic with 100% of students eligible for free lunch. Hence, the generalizability of the study is low as the study sample is not representative of the school district, New York City, or New York State.

The second limitation of the study is only students with complete data sets were included in this study. Seven data sets were eliminated because they had values missing in more than 5% of the questions. Thus, the study sample size is reduced from 79 students to 72 students. The seven eliminated data sets could have impacted the results of the study.

Another limitation of the study is that a type two error was committed. The null hypothesis for research question one was supported, when in fact it could have been rejected. A type two error is known as a “false positive” or “not rejecting a null hypothesis when the alternative hypothesis is the true state of nature” (Investopedia, 2014b, para. 1). The critical alpha was set at p < .05, while the results from the test on student’s perception of parental engagement and GPA (H1) generated p = .051.

In addition, New York City IRB limited the scope of research to take place only during non-instructional time. Therefore, the study could only take place after school hours. This could have impacted the response and participant rate. The after school timeframe could have been an inconvenience for some parents, thus impacting the rate of parent consent and ultimately student participation.

**Delimitations**

A delimitation is the way in which a researcher narrows his/her study’s scope. These are parameters set by the researcher in an effort to control what will be studied
(Roberts, 2010). The first delimitation of the study is the selection to only work with seventh and eighth grade students. Sixth grade students make up the school’s middle school population; however, the researcher only included students from grades seven and eight.

Another delimitation is the researcher’s selection of variables. A great deal of literature exists that identifies various variables as being dependent on parental engagement. This study was delimited to examining students’ annual grade point average, annual attendance percentages, and attitudes toward school.

**Recommendations**

To improve student outcomes, namely students’ attitudes toward school, grade point average and attendance rates within in this New York City Public Kindergarten through grade 8 school, various recommendations are being made. The implementation of these systemic and research-based strategies will attempt to address the issue of parental engagement. The goal is to increase parental engagement, in return, increasing students’ perceptions of parental engagement; thus, positively increasing students’ attitudes toward school. Ultimately, when students’ acquire more positive attitudes toward school, other forms of student outcomes should also be positively impacted. Thus, student achievement should improve.

In order to be successful, all stakeholders must be involved in this parental engagement task force. Students, families, teachers, school personnel and community members must invest in this shared goal. Collaboration is crucial in educating children. However, the school and school personnel must be more proactive in extending a supportive arm to parents. The school is accountable, and must play a central role in
order for parental engagement to successfully exist (Barnard, 2004). Therefore, recommendations are being made at the school level, in an effort to hold the school accountable, and create a systematic model for building stronger family-school partnerships. The successful implementation of the following recommendations that are being made to the New York City public school:

1. Building trusting and respectful relationships with parents (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).
2. Develop programs and policies that include and guide families in supporting their children throughout the educational process (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).
3. Work with families to build their social and political capital (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).
4. Develop the capacity of school staff to work with families and community members (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 64).
5. Embrace a philosophy of partnership and be willing to share power with families (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 67).
6. Create a community school (Epstein et al., 2009; Henderson & Mapp, 2002)

**Trust and respect.** Collaboration between parents and school is essential. Respect and trust must be evident in order for a relationship to flourish. Teachers and school personnel must foster a sense of trust and respect within parents. Parents must feel they are wanted and appreciated within their children’s classrooms and schools. The school must facilitate the creation of this open and warm environment, a climate of respect, honest, caring and support.
This begins with recognizing all parents want the best for their children. “Always proceed on this assumption: All families can help improve their children’s performance in school and influence other key outcomes that affect achievement” (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 61). In addition, Henderson and Mapp (2002) advise:

- Adopt a no-fault policy. Refrain at all times from blaming families for their children’s low achievement. Never assume that families don’t care about their children. High expectations should apply not just to students, but to teachers, school staff, and families. Everyone is responsible for raising achievement, and together you can do it. (p. 61)

- Create ways to learn from parents. Ask parents about their expectations for their children’s educations, and successful strategies they employ at home to assist their children with learning. Listen to parents and make genuine attempts to meet their needs as well as the needs of their children. Listening is important to creating an environment of mutual respect and trust. Once parents can trust the school and feel respected by school personnel, the lines of communication develop. This is significant because parents will feel more comfortable coming into the school and engaging in conversations with school personnel.

**Program and policy development.** It is imperative the school offers programs to assist parents with understanding what their children are learning, in addition to programs that provide strategies to help parents support their children along this process. Programs should be provided in various forms, including (a) workshops, (b) seminars, (c) meetings, (d) conferences, and (e) networking events. Programs should also have flexible hours, to
allow as many parents to participate as possible. The design and development of programs should be based on the needs of parents.

After a line of communication has been developed, the school should gather information about what supports parents need in order to better assist their children. A needs assessment can be generated via survey instrument, interviews, panel discussions, or simple conversation. The objective is to develop programs that address the specific needs of the parents in this school. Need-specific programs will demonstrate the school is actively listening to parents, and will provide parents the support they need to assist their children in their learning. Standard programs, programs all parents can benefit from irrespective of school, should also be developed. Standard programs include (a) understanding curriculum, (b) test prep, (c) reading at home with your child, (d) helping your child make transitions, and (e) bullying, etc. “A full program of partnerships include activities for all six types of engagement so that families and community members may be involved at home, at school, and in other locations” (Epstein, 2001, p. 565).

The school should also create a school-family partnership policy with identified vision, mission, action steps, guiding principles, and core values. This policy should highlight the role of parents in children’s education. It should also identify expectations for both parents and the school community. Ideally, this policy should be developed by all stakeholders in order to ensure a shared vision and execution of the policy. The creation of this policy will demonstrate the importance of a family-school partnership in promoting student achievement.
Social and political capital. The school should work with parents in order to increase their (parents) social and political capital. Henderson and Mapp (2002) stated:  

The lack of social and political capital can seriously restrict families’ capacity to support their children’s learning and make sure they get a high-quality education. When parents feel they have the power to change and control their circumstances, children tend to do better in school. Their parents are also better equipped to help them. When schools work with families to develop their connections, families become powerful allies of the schools and advocates for public education. (p. 63)

Schools can help to build parents social and political connections in various ways. Henderson and Mapp (2002) suggest:

- Promote family connections with other families, school personnel, and community groups
- Translate all communications into the home languages of families
- Accommodate parents during major activities at school (i.e., provide childcare, meals, transportation, and giveaways)
- Ask for parent input when planning school events
- Involve parents in school decision making
- Create opportunities for parents to meet with important decision makers (i.e., Superintendent, Council Members, etc.)
- Keep parents informed and up-to-date with current educational information
- Involve parents in action research
- Allow parents to showcase their talents
- Invite parents to attend staff development workshops and meetings
• Offer workshops on topics suggested by parents (i.e., communicating with your child, talking to your child about drugs, dating, etc.)

Building parents’ social and political capital will instill a sense of efficacy within them. “Efficacy comes from feeling confident that they can help their children do well in school and be happy and safe. It also comes from feeling they can overcome negative influences on their children and have a positive impact on the school and neighborhood” (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 64).

**Staff capacity building.** Building a strong relationship between parents and school is an essential part of this recommendation. Empowering school personnel with the knowledge and information they need in order to communicate and collaborate effectively with parents is fundamental. Henderson and Mapp’s (2002) meta-analysis describes several studies in which “an intervention was introduced to teachers…that shifted the level and nature of the contact between themselves and families…these shifts changed the way families felt about the school, affected their relationships with teachers, and influenced how they were involved in the educational life of their children” (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 65).

It is the school’s responsibility to develop teachers and other school personnel with the essential skills they need to create dynamic partnerships with parents. This includes training staff on how to communicate with diverse families, finding valuable resources for families, and advocating for families. All school personnel should be accountable for fostering this partnership between the school and parents. In particular, the Parent Coordinator has a major obligation to empowering parents.
**Parent coordinator.** Parent coordinator, as described by the New York City Department of Education (2014), is part of the administrative team and reports directly to the principal. The parent coordinator works to engage parents in the school community.

The Parent Coordinators focuses on:

- Creating a welcoming school environment for parents
- Working with the principal to address parent issues and concerns at the school
- Conducting outreach to engage parents in their children’s education
- Strengthening parent engagement in their children’s education

Parent Coordinators maintain flexible work hours in order to meet the needs of parents, including early mornings, evenings and weekends. In addition, he/she may also be required to work at different sites during summer months (NYC DOE, 2014).

**Shared power.** Understanding student achievement, and school success depends on all stakeholders, is vital. “Embrace a philosophy of partnership and be willing to share power with families. Make sure that parents, school staff, and community members understand that the responsibility for children’s educational development is a collaborative enterprise” (Henderson & Mapp, 2002, p. 67). The school should develop an Action Team for Partnership (ATP) model, which is “the basic school structure for implementing an ongoing, comprehensive partnership program tailored to school improvement goals” (Epstein, 2001, p. 565). This ATP should act as the “action arm” and should be “responsible for turning general plans for involving families and communities in children’s education into detailed plans, implemented actions, and
evaluated practices in a comprehensive program of school, family, and community partnerships” (Epstein, 2001, p. 565).

Community school. The ultimate goal is to develop a community school. Epstein identifies the three spheres of influence in a child’s life as family, school, and the community. Epstein (2001) suggests a theory of “overlapping spheres of influence” in which a partnership exists between all three spheres. In this model, “teachers and administrators create more family-like schools” and “parents create more school-like families” (p. 405). “Communities…create school-like opportunities, events, programs that reinforce, recognize, and reward students for good progress, creativity, contributions, and excellence. Communities also create family-like settings, services and events to enable families to better support their children” (Epstein, 2001, p. 405).

The school can employ various strategies in order to promote a family-school-community partnership:

- Collaborate with community based organizations to offer academic programs
- Collaborate with community based organizations and agencies that can offer services to families (i.e., healthcare, family literacy, job training, recreation, etc.)
- Include community based organizations in school action research

In addition to implementing the aforementioned recommendations, the school should also find value in reviewing the New York City Department of Education’s Partnership Standards for School and Families (Appendix H).
**Additional recommendations.** The six school-wide recommendations described in this document are intended to improve the school and family link at the study site. It is proposed that over time, these recommendations will lead to the creation of a partnership school, and ultimately a community school. However, these recommendations only scratch the surface since they are intended for only one school. It is the goal of the researcher to improve school ad family relationships on a wider scale. This being said, the researcher proposes district and system wide recommendations.

**District level.** Districts as a whole must be actively involved in the school-family partnership initiative. Districts must develop programs and policies that support school-family partnerships, fund these programs, appoint key individuals to oversee and monitor these programs and policies, evaluate district and individual school’s success, and hold individuals and schools accountable for implementing programs and adhering to policies with fidelity. Involving districts in this initiative will create a bigger impact; an impact where schools will exponentially become partnership and community schools.

Once partnership schools and districts are created they must be maintained. Pre-service teachers must understand their responsibility to promote family and school partnerships. Districts and schools should be extremely transparent with what their expectations are for teachers, with regard to parental engagement and family-school partnerships. Districts and schools should interview candidates for teaching positions with these expectations in mind, and select individuals whose parent engagement philosophies align to the school and/or district’s parental engagement vision.

**Teacher preparation programs.** Teachers should be taught how to effective engage parents and families just as they are taught how to write lesson plans and
differentiate instruction. Many of the tools teachers develop come from being on the job, however teaching programs provide valuable information to teachers. In addition to provide a great deal of strategies and best practices, teaching programs identify topics of importance in education. Teaching programs should prepare teachers for their role in creating partnership schools. “Far too many educators initially do not have a clear understanding of the part they must play in developing and maintaining programs of partnership that inform and involve all families every year that the children are in school” (Epstein, 2001, p. 5). Some organizations understand the significance of preparing teachers to promote family-school partnerships. Accreditation entities have begun to set standards for both teacher and administrator education that include preparation and competence in working with families (NCATE, 1994). Undergraduate and graduate education should require students to take courses in school, family and community partnerships. “Simultaneously, it is important to encourage state leaders to improve certification requirements for educators by including competencies in conducting programs of partnerships” (Epstein, 2001, p. 8). Change must permeate the system from all angles in order for progress to be made. Together, school level, district level, and system wide change will create stronger partnerships between families, schools and communities.

Conclusion

In a time of heightened global competition, it is essential our students are superbly prepared in schools. In order to prove successful, our nation must produce individuals who are able to compete both nationally and internationally; individuals who can contend with others from around the world. This means our educational systems must be
effective in preparing students for this feat. Our nation’s success depends heavily on our educational system, for education equates to sustainability for the future.

It is our responsibility to assist the school system in any way necessary. Equipping schools with materials, resources, funding, and research based practices will aide in the development of globally competitive citizens.

Teachers, parents, school personnel, community groups, politicians, etc., want schools to succeed in producing successful individuals, as this creates a stronger nation. In an effort to increase student achievement best practices are continuously being researched, implemented and evaluated. Parent engagement is a topic of interest in education. A great deal of research exist that links parental engagement to positive student outcomes. In fact, many researchers have concluded that parental engagement impacts student outcomes (Bronstein et al., 2005; Domina, 2005; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Gonzalez-DeHass et al., 2005; Lounsbury, 2004; Plunkett et al., 2009).

Research on parental engagement is abundant. Studies have investigated parents’ perceptions of parental engagement in association with student outcomes and teachers’ perceptions of parental engagement in association with student outcomes. However, little research exists that investigates students’ perceptions of parental engagement. Students’ perceptions and voices are typically left out of the debate. It is imperative to include in the dialogue the individuals most affected by this issue (Antosca, 1996).

This study investigated to what degree a relationship exists between middle school students’ perceptions of parental support and student outcomes, namely student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. This study was significant
because it occupied a gap in literature regarding parental engagement. It allowed students to have a voice in the discussion, and be active participants in their learning.

This quantitative correlational study examined the degree to which a correlation exists between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student outcomes, namely annual grade point average, annual attendance percentage and attitudes toward school. The study examined the overall relationship between students’ perceptions of parental engagement and student yearly grade point average, yearly attendance percentage and attitudes toward school. The study also identified and documented the extent to which individual relationships between six parental engagement typologies had a relationship on student grade point average, attendance and attitudes toward school. These typologies included (a) parenting, (b) communicating, (c) volunteering, (d) learning at home activities, (e) decision making activities, and (f) collaborating with the community.
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THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LEON C. MURRAY, Community Superintendent

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 29 718.264.3166 ext. 2171
222-14 Jamaica Avenue Room 217-Queens Village, NY 11428

May 2014

Dear Ms. Malcolm,

It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to conduct your research within District 29 of the New York City Department of Education. I am aware that the New York City Department of Education Institutional Review Board has approved your research proposal. Thus, you have my permission to conduct the study. I look forward to speaking to you soon.

Best Wishes,

Lenon Murray
Superintendent
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Principal Letter

May 5, 2014

Dear Ms. Malcolm,

It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to do your study here at P. S./I.S. 116Q. You have my permission to conduct the study. I look forward to speaking to you soon.

Best Wishes,

Debra Farrow

Principal
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Dear Ms. Malcolm:
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I am pleased to inform you that the Board has approved your Expedited Review project, "Parent Link: A correlational analysis of students’ perceptions of parental support and student grade point average, attendance, and attitude toward school."

Following federal guidelines, research related records should be maintained in a secure area for three years following the completion of the project at which time they may be destroyed.

Should you have any questions about this process or your responsibilities, please contact me at (585)-5262 or by e-mail to commrvb@sjvc.edu, or if unable to reach me, please contact the IRB Administrator, Jamie Mowen, at 585-8318, e-mail jmowen@sjvc.edu.

Sincerely,
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Rieman M. Merges, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

St. John Fisher College
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______ Research & Risk
The proposed project has a research component and places subjects at risk. The proposal must be in compliance with Article 24-A.

Chairperson, Institutional Review Board ___________________________ Date: 1/6/14
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DOE IRB Approval Letter

Carmen Farina, Chancellor
Research and Policy Support Group
February 12, 2014
52 Chambers Street
Room 310
New York, NY 10007
1 212 374-7659 tel
1 212 374-5908 fax

Ms. Georgette A Malcolm
10409 209th Street
Queens Village, NY 11429

Dear Ms. Malcolm:

I am happy to inform you that the New York City Department of Education Institutional Review Board (NYCDOE IRB) has approved your research proposal, “Parent Link: A correlational analysis of students’ perceptions of parental support and student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school.” The NYCDOE IRB has assigned your study the file number of 609. Please make certain that all correspondence regarding this project references this number. The IRB has determined that the study poses minimal risk to participants. The approval is for a period of one year:

Approval Date: February 12, 2014
Expiration Date: February 11, 2015

Responsibilities of Principal Investigators: Please find below a list of responsibilities of Principal Investigators who have DOE IRB approval to conduct research in New York City public schools.

- Approval by this office does not guarantee access to any particular school, individual or data. You are responsible for making appropriate contacts and getting the required permissions and consents before initiating the study.
- When requesting permission to conduct research, submit a letter to the school principal summarizing your research design and methodology along with this IRB Approval letter. Each principal agreeing to participate must sign the enclosed Approval to Conduct Research in Schools/Districts form. A completed and signed form for every school included in your research must be emailed to IRB@schools.nyc.gov. Principals may also ask you to show them the receipt issued by the NYC Department of Education at the time of your fingerprinting.
- You are responsible for ensuring that all researchers on your team conducting research in NYC public schools are fingerprinted by the NYC Department of Education. Please note: This rule applies to all research in schools conducted with students and/or staff. See the attached fingerprinting materials. For additional information click here. Fingerprinting staff will ask you for your identification and social security number and for your DOE IRB approval letter. You must be fingerprinted during the school year in which the letter is issued. Researchers who join the study team after the inception of the research must also be fingerprinted. Please provide a list of their names and social security numbers to the NYC Department of Education Research and Policy Support Group for tracking their eligibility and security clearance. The cost of fingerprinting is $115. A copy of the fingerprinting receipt must be emailed to IRB@schools.nyc.gov.
• You are responsible for ensuring that the research is conducted in accordance with your research proposal as approved by the DOE IRB and for the actions of all co-investigators and research staff involved with the research.

• You are responsible for informing all participants (e.g., administrators, teachers, parents, and students) that their participation is strictly voluntary and that there are no consequences for non-participation or withdrawal at any time during the study.

• Researchers must use the consent forms approved by the DOE IRB: provide all research subjects with copies of their signed forms; maintain signed forms in a secure place for a period of at least three years after study completion; and destroy the forms in accordance with the data disposal plan approved by the IRB.

Mandatory Reporting to the IRB: The principal investigator must report to the Research and Policy Support Group, within five business days, any serious problem, adverse effect, or outcome that occurs with frequency or degree of severity greater than that anticipated. In addition, the principal investigator must report any event or series of events that prompt the temporary or permanent suspension of a research project involving human subjects or any deviations from the approved protocol.

Amendments/Modifications: All amendments/modification of protocols involving human subjects must have prior IRB approval, except those involving the prevention of immediate harm to a subject, which must be reported within 24 hours to the NYC Department of Education IRB.

Continuation of your research: It is your responsibility to insure that an application for continuing review approval is submitted six weeks before the expiration date noted above. If you do not receive approval before the expiration date, all study activities must stop until you receive a new approval letter.

Research findings: We require a copy of the report of findings from the research. Interim reports may also be requested for multi-year studies. Your report should not include identification of the superintendency, district, any school, student, or staff member. Please send an electronic copy of the final report to: irb@schools.nyc.gov.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Mary Mattis at 212.374.3913.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Mary C. Mattis, PhD
Chair, Institutional Review Board

cc: Barbara Dworkowitz
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DOE IRB Approval Letter Amendment

June 3, 2014

Ms. Georgette A Malcolm
10409 209th Street
Queens Village, NY 11429

Dear Ms. Malcolm:

I am happy to inform you that the following proposed modifications to your research study, "Parent Link: A correlational analysis of students' perceptions of parental support and student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school", file number 609, were approved by the New York City Department of Education Institutional Review Board.

The requested revision is with the study site. I would like to conduct my study at a different NYC public school. This school is within the same geographical district as the original school. Everything else about my study will remain the same. My participants will still be 7th and 8th grade students. I would like to change my study site in order to conduct research in a school with a smaller 7th and 8th grade population. Conducting research in a school with a smaller population will allow me to conduct my study more efficiently.

Sincerely,

Mary C. Mattis, PhD
Chair, Institutional Review Board

cc: Barbara Dworkowitz
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Parent Consent Form

Parent Consent Form

Title of study: Parent Link: A correlational analysis of students’ perceptions of parental support and student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school.

Name(s) of researcher(s): Georgette Malcolm

Purpose of study: This study is created to investigate how your child feels or what he/she thinks about parental engagement and how this may affect his/her grades, attendance, and attitudes toward school. This study will help schools and parents learn more about how students, families, and teachers can work together. Your ideas will be used to help improve school programs for you and your child.

Approval of study: This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the New York City institutional Review Board.

Place of study: The William C. Hughley School 116Q
Length of participation: May 2014- June 2014

Potential risks: There are no expected risks to participating in this study. Your child’s participation will be confidential. His/her identity will remain anonymous. All information provided will be maintained in a secure and safe location.

Potential benefits:
- The results of this study may help scholars, educators, parents, and policymakers understand how your child feels or what he/she thinks about parental engagement, and how this may affect his/her grades, attendance, and attitudes toward school.
- This study will give your child a voice. The results of this study will be used to help educators and parents learn about students’ feelings about parent engagement.
- This study may also help schools create new programs, and create strong relationships between parents and schools.

Method for protecting confidentiality/privacy: Your child’s names will be kept confidential and anonymous. Names will be coded with a number to protect privacy and confidentiality. All information will be stored and locked in the researcher’s office. No personal information will be used.

Your rights:
As the research participant’s parent, you have the right to:
1. Have the purpose of the study, and the expected risks and benefits fully explained to you before you choose for your child to participate.
2. Contact the school to see a full copy of the survey prior to giving your consent.
3. Withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.
4. Let your child know that he/she may refuse to answer a particular question without penalty.
5. Understand that if you child becomes uncomfortable he/she can ask for something to be done differently.
6. Find out the results of the study.

Consent for a minor child:

I, the parent of ________________________________, a minor, __________ years of age, consent to his/her participation in the study: Parent Link: A correlational analysis of students’ perceptions of parental support and student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school. I have read the above, received a copy of this form, and I agree to have my child participate in the above-named study. I understand that the results of this study may be presented at conferences and published in journals and give my permission for use of any data collected from my participation to be included in such presentations and publications. I understand that my child’s anonymity and confidentiality will be protected.

_______________________________      ________________________    ______________
Print name (Parent/Guardian)                     Signature                                    Date

_______________________________      ________________________    ______________
Print name (Child/Participant)                    Signature                                     Date

_______________________________      ________________________    ______________
Print name (Investigator)                             Signature                                    Date

By signing below, I give the principal investigator permission to access information about my child’s grade point average and attendance record.

_______________________________      ________________________    ______________
Print name (Parent/ Guardian)             Signature                                          Date

Please provide your child’s:
Student identification number____________________________________________
Birthdate: _________________________________________

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please contact the researcher listed above at (718) 526-4884 extension 553 during normal school hours.
Appendix G
Survey Instrument with Letter to Student

Parent Link:
A correlational analysis of students’ perceptions of parental support and student grade point average, attendance, and attitudes toward school.

Name: ___________________________________
Student ID #: _______________________________
Grade: ____________________
Class: ____________________
Date: ________________
Client #:__________________
Dear student,

I am a doctoral student in the Ed.D. Program in Executive Leadership at St. John Fisher College. I am conducting a study that will help schools and parents learn more about how students, families, and teachers can work together. Your ideas will be used to help improve school programs for you and your family.

Please answer the questions on the surveys. I hope you answer every one, but you are free to skip any question that you feel is too personal.

This is NOT a test. There are no wrong or right answers. The survey is NOT part of your school work and will NOT be marked by your teacher. Your name will not be used in my study or future publications. All your answers will be kept anonymous and confidential.

You are being asked to participate because you are a seventh or eighth grade student. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline or withdraw from this study at any time, for whatever reason. Should you decline or withdraw, there will be no risk or consequence associated with your decision. In the event that you choose to withdraw during the course of the study, any information you have already provided will remain completely confidential.

Thank you for your help in this study. Your contributions will be helpful to individuals interested in improving school and family partnerships. The information that participants provide for this study will result in findings and recommendations that will be shared with participants, educators, parents, school leaders, and policy makers.

Sincerely,

Ms. Malcolm
Doctoral Candidate
St. John Fisher College

A. YOUR IDEAS

1. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
   Circle ONE answer on each line to tell if you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I am good at my schoolwork.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>There is someone at this school I can talk to if I have a problem.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>I remember things easily.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>People at this school are friendly to me.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>I am just as smart as other kids my age.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>I feel like a part of this school.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>I can do the work in my classes.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel like I don’t belong at this school.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>We do many things in school that I can do well.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>I wish I were in a different school.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**B. YOU AND YOUR FAMILY**

2. **How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**
   Circle ONE answer on each line to tell if you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I enjoy having my parent help me with schoolwork.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I like to talk with my parent about school.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I like having homework that asks me to talk with someone at home.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Families do different things together. How often is your parent or guardian involved with you in the following ways?**
   Circle ONE answer on each line to tell if this happens Everyday or Most Days (1), Once a Week (2), Once in a While (3), or Never (4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often does a parent…</th>
<th>Everyday/Most Days</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Watch or talk about television with you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Read with you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Volunteer in the classroom or at your school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Work with you on science projects or science homework?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Review and discuss the coursework you bring home?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Help you with math homework?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Visit your school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h. Go over spelling or vocabulary with you?

i. Ask you about what you are learning in science?

j. Talk with your teacher?

k. Ask you about what you are learning in math?

l. Help you with reading or language arts homework?

m. Help you understand what you are learning in science?

n. Help you prepare for math tests?

o. Ask you how well you are doing in school?

p. Ask you to read something you wrote?

q. Go to a school event or meeting (e.g., sports, music, drama, PTA)?

r. Make sure all of your homework is done?
C. YOUR SCHOOL AND FAMILY

4. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Circle ONE answer on each line to tell if you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. This school is friendly to my parent.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My parent talks with my teachers by phone or at the school.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My math teacher gives homework that requires me to talk with a parent.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My parent feels welcome at this school.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My science teacher gives homework that requires me to talk with a parent.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My parent attended a parent-teacher conference this year.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. My reading/language arts teacher gives homework that requires me to talk with a parent.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My teachers know my parent.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements. Circle ONE answer on each line to tell if you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My parent talks about my school with other parents.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My parent meets other parents at school activities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. ABOUT YOU AND YOUR FAMILY

6. Please fill in your information for each question.

a. My parent thinks this school is:
   _____ Excellent
   _____ Good
   _____ OK
   _____ Fair
   _____ Poor

b. How are you doing in school this year?
   _____ Mostly Level 4s (90 and up)
   _____ Mostly Level 3s (80-89)
   _____ Mostly Level 2s (70-79)
   _____ Mostly Level 1s (69 & under)

c. Are you a (check ✓ one):  Boy _____   Girl _____

d. How old are you?  9  10  11  12  13  14  15  16

e. How many adults live at home with you?  0  1  2  3  4  5+

f. How far do you think you will go in school? (Check ✓ one)
_____ Some high school
_____ Complete high school.
_____ Some college
_____ College degree
_____ More than college (e.g., doctor, lawyer)

**g. How do you describe yourself?**

_____ Asian-American
_____ Black or African-American
_____ White or Caucasian
_____ Hispanic or Latino(a)
_____ Other (please list):

**h. Which language does your family usually speak at home?**

_____ English
_____ Spanish
_____ Hmong
_____ Other (please list):

**i. Which of the following items do you have at home?**  (Check ✓ all that apply)

_____ Telephone
_____ Television
_____ Cable TV
_____ Daily newspaper
_____ Computer
_____ Calculator
_____ VCR or DVD player
_____ 50 or more books
_____ A quiet place to study

**j. About how much homework do you do each night?**  (check ✓ one)

_____ None
_____ About 15 minutes
_____ About 30 minutes
_____ About 45 minutes
_____ About one hour
_____ More than one hour
7. Please describe a school activity that involves your parent that is useful or enjoyable for you.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

Appendix H

Partnership Standards DOE
# Fostering Communication

School and families engage in an open exchange of information regarding student progress, school wide goals and support activities.

## a. School develops an open, two-way dialogue with parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School has a consistent and clearly stated method for distribution of notices and important information for parents</td>
<td>• Parents read all school home communications and understand importance of all notices, newsletters and web posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critical communications are translated or explained to parents</td>
<td>• Parents understand the importance of getting forms to school and respond to requests from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School community consistently produces a newsletter or website</td>
<td>• Parents are responsive to requests for updated contact information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School has an established and proven system to ensure they have current parent contact information including parent’s preferred language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e.g.** School hosts weekly or bi-monthly meetings for the parents to sit with school administration and staff and ask questions or have conversations about the school and student achievement.

## b. School communicates high expectations for student achievement and offers supports to parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School staff has protocols for contact with parents to ensure parent inquiries and issues are addressed</td>
<td>• Parents understand how to move inquiries and issues up from classroom level to school administration and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School works with parents to ensure that all students (including English Language Learners) have equal access to Academic Intervention Services (AIS), reading remediation programs, counseling, and other types of support that accelerate all students’ learning</td>
<td>• Parents show interest in discussing and understanding curriculum, academic standards and student progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DOE Family Guides are distributed and discussed with parents</td>
<td>• Parents discuss their children’s development and academic achievements with school staff and work together to recognize their children’s unique learning styles as well as to provide supports in English and in the native language. Parents check child’s backpack or folder to be sure they receive all notices from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School consistently distributes important information about academic achievement to families in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e.g.** School offers age-appropriate activities to get students and families college and career ready such as career days, family fun learning nights, and for older students college visits and workshops for families on college application processes.
# Encouraging Parent Involvement

Parents have diverse and meaningful roles in the school community and in their children’s achievement.

## a. School provides opportunities for parents to be involved in creating a strong school community and a strong learning environment for all children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School has well developed policies for volunteers in the building</td>
<td>• Parents work with administration and parent leadership to find ways to be involved in the school and follow procedures for volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Leadership Team uses the Comprehensive Education Plan to assess parent roles through alignment with school needs</td>
<td>• Process for consensus building on School Leadership Team is well developed and utilized for maximum participation by all members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School recognizes volunteer efforts in regular and meaningful ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *School has a volunteer directory with names of parents who have time to give to the school. The directory lists the time parents have and what they would like to do so that teachers and staff can access volunteers.*

## b. Parent leadership roles in the school are active, effective and inclusive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School PA/PTA is functional, active and open</td>
<td>• Parents attend PA/PTA meetings and attend or volunteer at events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Leadership Team has balanced level of participation decision making</td>
<td>• Parents volunteer for leadership roles in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a Title 1 annual meeting (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *PTA /PA has a president, treasurer and secretary, holds monthly meetings, yearly elections and meets with the school administration quarterly. SLT has equal numbers of parents and school staff, meets every month and engages in shared decision making.*

## c. School encourages each parent’s involvement with their child’s education and provides supports for all parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Parents are often invited into classrooms for academic celebrations and showcases including Open School Week</td>
<td>• Parents understand their role in their children’s education and are active participants with their children in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School has well articulated and clear expectations for parent’s roles in their student’s academic achievement and has supports in place to help families understand student performance</td>
<td>• Parents attend in-classroom events and show interest in supporting the learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents communicate with the school about their student and their growth so that the school can look at the whole child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *School hosts curriculum events for parents to visit classrooms, meet with staff and learn about what the children are studying.*
### Creating Welcoming Schools

Creating a welcoming, positive school climate with the commitment of the entire school community.

#### a. School is welcoming, inclusive and respectful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Front entrance and door of school is clearly identifiable</td>
<td>- All parents sign in at security desk at all times following school, NYPD and DOE procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safety Officers are respectful, welcoming and follow NYPD, DOE and school policy</td>
<td>- Parents respect school staff and follow procedures for making appointments with administration or other staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parent room or space for parents is available with storage, computer and other available resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Q. School has a list of staff roles and contact information for parents and have a bulletin board near the front entrance or office with all staff members’ photos, roles and contact information for all members of the school community.*

#### b. School develops and engenders trust, enthusiasm and common identity within the school community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- School community has produced and implemented a shared mission/vision statement</td>
<td>- Parents participate in school mission/vision development and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School has a schedule for award ceremonies and school-wide events including celebrating academic success and social emotional growth</td>
<td>- Parents foster a sense of school pride in their students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parents attend ceremonies and events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Q. School has t-shirts (and other items) with school name and logo for sale to all members of the community and host “spirit” days where everyone wears common item, color, etc.*
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Creating Welcoming Schools continued...

c. School staff proactively involves and values all cultural and racial groups, and staff view difference as strengths upon which to build

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School staff welcomes all members of the school community and treats all with respect</td>
<td>• Parents respect other parents, even if the cultures within the building are diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School displays DOE’s Multilingual Welcome Poster</td>
<td>• Parents engender respect for all members of the community in the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School holds multicultural events to celebrate the diverse cultures that may co-exist in the building</td>
<td>• Parents understand and support Citywide Standards of Intervention and Discipline Measures in their school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School explains to parents the Citywide Standards of Intervention and Discipline Measures and implements them with parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. School hosts a variety of events and activities for community members around academic engagement and social-emotional growth of students and adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School is responsive to needs of the school community through diverse offerings to families</td>
<td>• Parents regularly attend events hosted by school community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School has opportunities for parents to support learning in classrooms on a regular and informal basis</td>
<td>• Parents come to school for in-class events, readings and celebrations as well as workshops and classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School allows and encourages informal gathering of parents to foster relationships between parents and grow a strongly connected community</td>
<td>• Parents build relationships with other parents around collaborations with school community and to foster a sense of support for the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. School hosts community-wide events such as festivals, cultural activities, carnivals, academic fairs and showcases and career days.
# Partnering for Student Success

School engages families in setting high expectations for students and actively partners with parents to prepare students for their next level.

## a. Homework is meaningful, policy and expectations are clearly explained to parents and supports are offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* School homework policy is well developed and clearly explained to all students and families*</td>
<td>* Parents understand that homework is not optional*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* School offers homework help for students and resources for parents*</td>
<td>* Parents attend workshops, curriculum nights and use supports offered by school*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* School hosts family fun learning events for all grades*</td>
<td>* Parents attend learning events at the school*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e.g. School offers homework help workshops for parents with guidelines that help parents help children even if parents do not know or understand the content of the work being done by the student.*

## b. Parent Teacher Conferences are well planned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* School notifies parents of dates for Parent-Teacher Conferences in advance*</td>
<td>* Parents know Parent Teacher Conferences dates and make every attempt to attend or schedule another time to meet with the teachers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* School gives parents and teachers clear instructions and expectations for Parent Teacher Conferences*</td>
<td>* Parents have clear and realistic expectations for the Parent Teacher Conferences*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* School utilizes free over-the-phone interpretation services offered through the Translation and Interpretation Unit*</td>
<td>* Parents are punctual for the meetings*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e.g. Schools utilize and distribute the 10 Questions for Better Parent Teacher Conferences and send notices about the conferences home early to allow parents to plan for the conferences.*
c. School faculty engage in reciprocal and ongoing discussions with parents about student achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School holds grade specific curriculum meetings or workshops for parents to connect to the learning of the students</td>
<td>• Parents attend meetings and workshops about student achievement and curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School provides progress, anecdotal or other interim reports to parents between report cards and distributes information about student achievement well in advance of Parent Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>• Parents know when reports are expected and know how to read all reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School uses on-line tools, including but not limited to ARIS, to keep parents updated on student progress and achievement and make sure all parents have access to these tools</td>
<td>• Parents are responsible for discussing academic reports with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* e.g. Schools provide interim progress reports to parents and have time scheduled for parents to speak with staff about the reports.

d. School community has clearly defined roles and responsibilities of parents, students and school staff in achieving good attendance for all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School helps students and families understand what good attendance means, has conveyed clear expectations about good attendance and offers supports so that students are in school every day to be able to engage in learning leading to achievement</td>
<td>• Parents get their students to school on time every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School and DOE calendar is distributed regularly</td>
<td>• Parents support their child’s overall health in order to reduce the number of absences due to illness, and ensure students are on time every day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* e.g. School has awards for perfect attendance and explains importance of being in school and on time to parents in meetings and through notices and reminders.
Collaborating Effectively

School community works together to make decisions about the academic and personal growth of students through school wide goals. School fosters collaborations with community-based organizations to create a vibrant, fulfilling environment for students and families.

### a. School policy is developed through open and inclusive discussions with all members of school community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- School ensures that all meetings are open and the dates are well publicized</td>
<td>- Parents are involved with the development of school policy by attending meetings and filling out surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School discusses school policy development at meetings with parents and staff and input is encouraged and evaluated fairly</td>
<td>- Parents read, understand policy and follow policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New families are given guidelines and/or have policies explained upon arrival to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. School has a handbook or guide for policy that is easy to understand and is given out (in hard copy and online) to all members of the school community.**

### b. School and parent needs are identified through quantitative and qualitative means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- School community uses the Learning Environment Survey to regularly evaluate strengths and weaknesses in school</td>
<td>- Parents participate in surveys, committees and meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School allows for ongoing input from all members of the community through school-based surveys, open sessions at meetings or suggestions boxes</td>
<td>- PA/PTA and parents are responsive to school needs via fundraising efforts and works with the administration to determine how to spend support money in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School brings budgets to parent meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. School creates a survey at the start of the year for all members of the school community to assess needs and collect resources from the community.**

### c. School partners with community groups and organizations to provide services and resources to students and families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- School has strong links between the school and the community, including community-based organizations, and is open to the community</td>
<td>- Parents help develop links in the school with local community based organizations and the greater community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School and community based organization are well integrated, share priorities and have identified needs in the school community around academic and social emotional growth during the day or after school</td>
<td>- Parents utilize offerings made by community based organizations in building and support community based organization efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parents work with students and school to give back to the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. School brings in local community based organizations, works with them to create a Memorandum of Understanding and invites the CBO to sit on the SLT to link the work to the school community and student's needs.**