

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2011

Perceived parental involvement among Mexicans

Jose Rosas Hernandez

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hernandez, Jose Rosas, "Perceived parental involvement among Mexicans" (2011). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3931.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3931>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

PERCEIVED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AMONG MEXICANS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

by
Jose Rosas Hernandez
September 2011

PERCEIVED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AMONG MEXICANS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by

Jose Rosas Hernandez

September 2011

Approved by:



Dr. Thomas Davis, Faculty Supervisor
Social Work



Paul L. Pence, Manager
Rubidoux Drive-In & Swap Meet



Dr. Rosemary McCaslin
M.S.W. Research Coordinator

6/7/11

Date

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to conduct a descriptive analysis of the effect of parental involvement on educational engagement among Mexican children. This study utilized a sample of 50 Mexican parents to examine parental involvement in their child's education. A quantitative data analysis was used to examine the relationship between parental involvement and educational engagement among Mexican children. Research findings revealed a significant difference in parental involvement between male and female parents. Future research conducted on this topic should consider the income and education of parents as key factors in parental educational involvement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude goes out to Dr. Thomas Davis who facilitated his time and energy to put forth this project. I am also especially grateful to my wife, Heather, who supported and encouraged me from the start. I am further grateful to my colleagues Norma Rosas, Daniel Chavez, Angela Carlos, Lisa Otero, Jandely Eich, Irma Silva, Michael Chavez, Yvette Robles, Kenia Rivas, Franceen Rosales, and Monica Wettengel who assisted me in collecting the data. Lastly, I want thank John Mahoney, Bill Le Noble, and Lydia Zendejas for keenly educating and mentoring me as a high school student, and I am deeply thankful for the words of encouragement that endlessly kept me grounded to continue my education.

DEDICATION

First and foremost, this project is dedicated to my wife, Heather, who believed in my abilities and who pushed me to pursue a higher education. Going through this master's program has been an honor and I am glad to have shared this journey with her. In addition, this project would not have been possible without the courage and bravery from my parents who immigrated to the U.S. for a better quality of life in a foreign country. This project is also dedicated to ethnic minorities who struggle in the phase of poverty and still manage to thrive and make education a priority for their children.

Para mis padres José y Mariá que me ayudaron hacer un buen hombre de familia. Los quiere y estima mucho su hijo José.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Problem Statement	1
Policy Context	4
Practice Context	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Project for Social Work	6
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	8
Parental Involvement	8
Theories Guiding Conceptualization	12
Systems Theory	12
Ecological Approach	13
Empowerment Theory	14
Summary	15
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	
Introduction	17
Study Design	17
Sampling	18

Data Collection and Instruments	18
Defining Perceived Parental Involvement	19
Subscales: Meaning of Scores	19
Procedures	23
Protection of Human Subjects	24
Data Analysis	25
Summary	26
 CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	
Introduction	27
Presentation of the Findings	27
Multivariate Tests	31
Summary	36
 CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	
Introduction	37
Discussion	37
Unanticipated Results	39
Limitations	41
Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy and Research	43
Conclusions	44
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE	45
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE (SPANISH VERSION)	50
APPENDIX C: AGENCY APPROVAL LETTER	55

APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT	57
APPENDIX E: INFORMED CONSENT (SPANISH VERSION)	59
APPENDIX F: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT	61
APPENDIX G: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT (SPANISH VERSION)	63
REFERENCES	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Age by Category	28
Table 2.	Gender	28
Table 3.	Ethnic Background	29
Table 4.	Preferred Language	29
Table 5.	Education Obtained	30
Table 6.	Income Level	31
Table 7.	Gender and Experience with Schools	31
Table 8.	Income Level and Transportation Issues	33
Table 9.	Education Obtained and Parental Rights	34
Table 10.	Education Obtained and Perception about Teachers	35
Table 11.	Education Obtained and Preferred Language	36

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Chapter one includes a brief synopsis of the problem of lack of parental involvement in their child's education, explanation of the research focus, and the perspective that helped to shape the focus of the study. The next part of the chapter explains the core elements involved in policy, micro and macro practices that are associated with parental involvement. The chapter concludes with a description of how social work practitioners will benefit from the research findings at both the micro and macro levels.

Problem Statement

Research is being conducted to understand the reasons behind the lack of parental involvement of low income Mexican parents with schools and their children. In spite of educator's attempt to make school appealing to parents, the ability of schools to engage parents and the ability of parents to engage schools has varied overtime. Delgado-Gaitan (1990) states that in order for parents to actively participate in their child's school, parents should be informed about "the school system and

how it functions, parental rights in obtaining information about their children, and their parental responsibilities for supporting their children through school" (p. 119). The rationale here is that well informed parents can persuade their children to participate more in school by teaching their children about the rules of the school (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990).

Spindler 1995, 1982; Trueba, 1987 argue that one main reason that could explain why parents rarely participate in schools is that parents do not have access to school resources possibly because schools have a White predominate culture (as cited in Delgado-Gaitan, 1990). Brown et al., 1980; Rumberger, 1983, 1987 say that another reason as explained could be that low income Mexican families are reluctant to speak to school officials because these parents are less proficient in the English language (as cited in Delgado-Gaitan, 1990).

Comer 1994; Griffore and Boger 1986 report that over the last decade, parent involvement has acquired the attention of policy makers. Studies show according to that parent participation with school is highly associated with academic achievement (as cited in Delgado-Gaitan, 1990).

The U.S. Census Bureau (2010) estimated that 11,750 Hispanic students dropped out in the year 2008. Furthermore, the California Dropout Research Project (2007) found in comparing three national surveys, that students dropped out because they were failing school or had missed too many school days to complete the school requirements. Applied Materials (2009) reported that non-high school graduates, in comparison to high school graduates, were encountered with more life challenges and were more "dependent on public assistance, have lower earning wages, have poorer health, have higher rates of unemployment, have a higher mortality rate, engage in more criminal behavior, and are incarcerated more frequently" (p. 5). For example, the Alliance for Excellent Education (2006), reported that close to 75% of prison inmates in the U.S. failed to graduate from high school. And according to Harlow (2003), the number of prison inmates without a high school diploma is increasing (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2006). This puts a great financial burden on the U.S. economy, at the national, state, and local levels that cannot be ignored (Sirin, 2005). The National Research Council (1999) state that at the local level, "[families] [of]

SES in the United States is the most important [factor] of school financing" (as cited in Sirin, 2005, p. 445). Therefore, during the current economic hardship, parents' motivation to engage in schools and improve the academic lives of their children is critical.

Policy Context

Timar, Biag, and Lawson (2007) argues that students may feel discouraged because of their inability to pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) that was implemented by the Federal Government in 2001 under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) as a way to measure and monitor proficiency levels. In addition, the NCLB proficiency levels continue to pressure public schools to raise students' academic performance. For example, teachers have become overwhelmed and are no longer providing well rounded education because they are teaching to the CAHSEE test (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

Another issue that low income parents are encountering is their lack of awareness on policies regarding English Language Learners (ELLs). According to the California Office of Administration Law code 11301, Knowledge and Fluency in English, parents have the right

to remove their children from a program such as English as a Second Language (ESL) and enroll them in mainstream English only classrooms at any time of the year (U.S Department of Education, 2009). Valdes (1996) found that Mexican parents with very low education (first or second grade) tend to be embarrassed and feel incompetent to carry out a conversation regarding school, and as a result, are unable to communicate their concerns.

Practice Context

A lack of cultural awareness continues to reside among social workers particularly in understanding the cultural values of low Mexican families in association to schooling. The role of the social worker is to become the mediator by helping Spanish speaking parents to bridge the communication gap between parents and teachers. But first, social workers must become knowledgeable in the areas that underscore the elements of non-parental involvement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to compare different types of parental involvement such as aspirations, expectations, supervision, beliefs about the school,

communication with teachers among low income Mexican parents and find out whether their education obtained and income level is correlated with parent involvement. According to Comer 1984; Griffiore and Boger 1986 the level of parental involvement needs to be investigated because research studies show that parental involvement is associated with academic achievement (as cited in Delgado-Gaitan, 1990). This study will allow professionals, schools, and government officials to gain awareness on the level of parental involvement within Mexican parents of low socioeconomic status.

Significance of the Project for Social Work

There is a great misconception that Mexican parents do not care about their children's education because they do not communicate with teachers, or do not participate in school events. This study provides social workers with information about the areas that parents get involved and in areas they do not. In addition, the study briefly provides a rationale to explain why Mexican parents participate less in school events than their non-Hispanic counterparts. Given this information, social workers may have greater insight as to where they should

invest their time to advocate for programs that will help to increase parental involvement and academic achievement within this population.

The engagement phase of the generalist model is clearly stated in this study. Studies indicate that parents and teachers do not engage with each other because of poor cultural awareness by both parties. For example, parents do not know what American schools expect from them and teacher's definition of parent involvement is different from that of the parents. Often, engagement does not take place and misunderstandings surface. Despite the poor engagement among parents and teachers, this study examined the engagement between the parent and the child. Therefore, the hypothesis for this study is that parents who obtain a higher education and higher income are more involved with their children than those who obtain a lower education and have lower income.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review in chapter two discusses previously gathered information on parental involvement in their child's education followed by theories that help conceptualize the ideas about parenting.

Parental Involvement

In comparison to parent education, the study of parental involvement is fairly new (Sparks, Johnson, & Akos, 2010). According to Headden (1997), researchers are looking more into this subject due to the increase in the dropout rate among the Mexican population. Research studies have found that parents impose a great deal of influence over their children regarding their academic achievement (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990). In addition to parental involvement, schools also have a responsibility in helping parents become more involved in children's education. However, the difference in how schools and parents define or see parent involvement is important to note. Valdes (1996) reports that parent involvement with schools is not recognized possibly due to how teachers

define parental involvement. For example, Valdes (1996) found that out of five families, one parent from each family attended an open house event but were unaware of the main purpose and meaning behind the visit, to meet the teacher and discuss the child's educational progress. Rather, parents saw it as an opportunity to visit their children's classroom and see their schoolwork. In addition, Delgado-Gaitan (1990) reports that verbal communication from the parents is a better indicator of parental involvement rather than simply visiting the classroom. Delgado-Gaitan (1990) explains the situation by stating "...although some parents... physically visit the school, some teachers would label [non approaching] parents as non-cooperative due to their lack of communication" (p. 47). Morton (1993) says that this lack of communication from the non approaching parents sometimes prevents teachers from reaching out to help the parents become more involved. Morton (1993) also argues that parents may not want to engage with school personnel because parents see the school system as a bureaucracy that is run by non-Hispanic people who know what they are doing and should not be questioned.

Administrators and teachers misread this non-involvement of parents as not caring for their child's education and therefore, both parties end up mutually mistrusting each other (Morton, 1993). Young and Pedroza (1999) report that this is particularly true when parents are involved in informal activities at home such as "checking homework assignments, reading and listening to children read, obtaining tutorial assistance, providing nurturance, inculcating cultural values, talking with children, and sending them to school well fed, clean, and rested" (as cited in Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991, p. 37). Another view of parent participation, according to Young and Pedroza (1999), is involvement in formal activities such as school events and meetings, or working as a teacher assistant or tutor (as cited in Delgado-Gaitan, & Trueba, 1991, p. 37). More specifically, Young and Perdoza (1999) say that "teachers view parent involvement as improving the child's academic achievement, [while] parents see their involvement in terms of supporting the total well-being of their children" (as cited in Delgado & Trueba, 1991, p. 37).

The different level of involvement viewed by parents and teachers affects the child's academic performace. To

date, programs have been implementing parent education programs which are mostly didactic as a form to increase parental involvement with schooling (Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA, 2003). For example, low income Mexican parents have traditional ideas about child rearing practices that include parents providing a child's physical and emotional needs and teachers meeting the child's cognitive needs (Gonzales, 1992). According to Dinkmeyer and Mccays (1985), this approach is not working and should try other alternatives such as mutual support groups that are less threatening to the parents' beliefs and values (as cited in Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA, 2003). For the most part, mutual support groups are cost effective and do not require professionals to run the group which according the Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA (2003), can be less intimidating and may cause less resistance from parents.

In contrast to the traditional parent education practice, which mainly focuses on teaching, Powell (1998) say that mutual support groups are support-centered where parents can self-identify, share their experience, and build a relationship with other group members (as cited in Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA, 2003).

Moreover, Valdes (1996) states that intervention programs should approach families with care and consideration about their beliefs in raising children and not coerce them into changing their old childrearing practices. These support groups should also give alternatives and explain how the program can bring unexpected consequences. These support groups can improve parents' ability to engage and be proactive about being involved in their child's education and with the schools by having open discussions with other individuals in mutual support groups.

Theories Guiding Conceptualization

Systems Theory

Brueggemann (2006), argues that it is imperative to see the system as a process in which the following components of a system intertwine with one another: Input, system maintenance, and outputs. For example, each component has a function that influences the performance of that system. More specifically, Brueggemann (2006) argues that "[changes] in one [branch] of the system can [produce] changes in other [areas] of the system" (p. 347). The family system, for example, often includes the

immediate or extended family of the student who live in close proximity such as the mother, the father, all brothers and sisters, aunts, uncles and grandparents. Each family member has a role within the family system whether they recognize their role or not. Some may be part of the input process such as parents contributing to the financial welfare of the family. In the system maintenance, grandparents may have the role of babysitters and mentors. The output is the outcome as part of parent's effort to and what it entails to financially provide for the family.

Ecological Approach

In addition, to the systems approach, it is also important to know that the family system is part of a greater system referred to as the ecological system model. Hepworth, Rooney, Rooney, Gottfried, and Larsen (2010) says that "individuals constantly engage [with] [other] [individuals] and other systems in the environment and that these individuals and systems reciprocally influence each other" (p. 15). For example, Hepworth et al., (2010) reports that students may not have effective learning if there is a lack of "adequate schools, competent teachers, parental support, adequate

perception and intellectual ability, motivation to learn, and positive relationships with teachers" (p. 15). Similarly, parents may not want to become involved because teachers are not forthcoming, and school personnel do not include parents in school events. If there are limitations in the environment, the individual will not be able to fulfill their needs and it will be more likely that this will lead to stressful situations (Hepworth et al., 2010, p. 16).

This macro view of research provides a wide insight on the key factors that could influence parental involvement by examining the interaction among them. Moreover, this approach recognizes that changes in one part of their system can increase or decrease the parent's level of involvement that can further affect the academic performance of their children. For this reason, the study is tailored to gather information from the areas that the parents come in contact with in the process of advocating for their children in the academic arena.

Empowerment Theory

The empowerment model represents the idea that human lives can be improved through the process of giving power

to people who are disempowered (Hepworth et al., 2010). Educators currently view power as rooted in social interaction, however, Hepworth et al., (2010) reports that power can be better defined in terms of how people influence each other. They further say that this influence is the basis to comprehend how empowerment unfolds within people. For instance, parents can be empowered when teachers, counselors, and principals decentralize their authority by sharing this power with the parents. This be done by encouraging and helping parents to participate when decision-making opportunities arise (e.g., there is an important decision we need to make, what should we do?). This will empower them to take ownership and get more involved in their child's education.

Summary

Although parents do not require the assistance of school personnel to initiate and maintain parental involvement, it is important for teachers, counselors and principals to provide them with support. This will increase communication, enhance their social skills, give them self confidence, inform parents about important

events, gain knowledge about their child's academic performance, build rapport with school personnel and most importantly, it will convey that parents do care about their child's education.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

This chapter explains the rationale and implications of using a quantitative approach. Also discussed are how data was gathered, and a brief description of what the assessment tool entails. Furthermore, it includes how participants were selected and the process for getting the agencies' approval. Finally, it gives details of how the data was analyzed and the measures used to ensure confidentiality.

Study Design

The purpose of the study is to compare different types of parental involvement such as aspirations, expectations, supervision, experience with schools, and communication with teachers among low income Mexican parents and examine how much parents are getting involved in their child's education. Data was gathered using quantitative measures. Parents took a parental involvement self-assessment survey (PISAS) that measured their level of involvement (Appendix A, B).

This approach was chosen over qualitative because it is frequently researched and there are numerical data available from previous studies. Also, this was the best approach to find trends on parental involvement.

One of the limitations in using a quantitative approach particularly in analyzing the data, is that minor numerical errors can produce statistical significant results. This was addressed by carefully implementing the information in the Predictive Analytics SoftWare program (PASW).

Sampling

Participants were selected using the convenience sampling approach. This approach was selected in guidance of the research focus which is to look at Mexican parents with low SES. Approximately 50 parents were surveyed at the Rubidoux Swap Meet in Rubidoux California. Only parents who identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino were included in this study.

Data Collection and Instruments

Parental involvement is first defined followed by the meaning of scores in each subscale and the question(s) that pertain to that subscale.

Defining Perceived Parental Involvement

Perceived parental involvement consists of expectations, supervision, experience with the school, and communication with teachers.

Subscales: Meaning of Scores

1. Parental Rights: Lower scores indicate that parents have the right to ask about their child's education.
2. Language: Lower scores indicate greater perceived language barriers.
3. Transportation: Lower scores indicate greater perceived transportation issues.
4. Perceptions about Authority: Lower scores indicate that parents believe they should not have academic discussions with teachers about their child because teachers know what they are doing.
5. Communication with Teachers: Lower scores indicate greater perceived communication with teachers.
6. Beliefs about School: Lower scores indicate greater perceived negative experience with schools and teachers.

7. Expectations: Lower scores indicate greater perceived expectations.
8. Supervision: Lower scores indicate a greater perceived level of supervision.

Parents took a parental involvement self-assessment survey (PISAS) that measured their perceived level of parental involvement. First included in the survey are demographic questions measured nominally such as age, gender, income, education attained, ethnicity, and primary language.

There are three independent variables: combined income of the family with five levels (\$9,000 or less; \$10,000 to \$19,000; \$20,000 to \$29,000; \$30,000 to \$39,000; and \$40,000 or more), education obtained by the parent with five levels (did not graduate from high school, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, masters degree and doctoral degree) and primary language spoken by the parent with three levels (Spanish, English, or Bilingual).

There are three dependent variables in the design: Perceived parental involvement, aspiration, and expectations. However, parental involvement was the dependent variable of most importance for this study.

Parental involvement was measured with parent's response to 11 questions that were broken into the following four categories also referred to as subscales 1) parent expectations 2) monitoring outside of school activities 3) experience with schools, and 4) communication with teachers and five non-categorized questions.

In each one of these subscales there are multiple questions that examine the parent's level of perceived involvement based on the parent's expectations, level of supervision, their experience with schools, and their communication with teachers. Parent expectations include the following questions: 1) I will not allow my child (ren) to get anything less than a B for a grade, 2) I have discussed with my child(ren) about the importance of having a good education, and 3) I know my child(ren) will graduate from high school. Parents level of supervision include: 1) My child(ren) is/are not allowed to play unless their homework is completed, 2) I expect my child(ren) to let me know how he/she/they plan to spend(s) his/her/their free time, 3) My child(ren) has/have a specific time and place at home to do their homework, and 4) I talk to my child(ren) about following the dress code policy. Parents experience with schools:

1) I do not visit my child's(ren's) school because of how I am treated, 2) My experience with schools has led me to believe they do not care about my opinion(s), and 3) I feel that getting involved with school activities such as, parent-teacher conference and back to school night would be unproductive in my child's(ren's) education. Finally parents' communication with teachers: 1) I have talked to the teacher about my child(ren) in the last month to see how my child(ren) is/are doing in school.

Academic aspirations and expectations were measured with a scale that was crated by the researcher that asked parents to place an X to the one that best represented the level of educational attainment that they would like their children to obtain: 1) high school diploma, 2) associate degree, 3) bachelor degree, 4) masters degree, and 5) doctoral degree.

In addition to the four categories above, the following five individual questions measured at the ordinal level, also examined their perceived parental involvement. The first question is about their perceived right to ask, or not ask questions about the child, the second question examines their perception about teachers, the third question looks at perceived issues of

transportation, and the final two questions look at their perceived language barriers. Parents had to respond in a Likert scale format, for example, strongly agree, agree, does not apply, disagree, and strongly disagree. Six questions were withdrawn from the study due to their irrelevancy.

The questionnaire was created based on the information gathered in the literature review. The survey was tested multiple times for reliability by using volunteers who fit the criteria but did not take part in the study. The downside to this survey is that participants may not respond truthfully. Also, questions in this survey have been pre-selected and controlled by the researcher and may exclude possible areas of significant concern.

Procedures

Before the survey was distributed to parents, the researcher met with Paul, the manager of the Rubidoux Swap Meet, to explain the purpose and procedure of the study. After his approval (Appendix C), the researcher was allowed to set up a table and dispense the surveys with the following conditions: 1) "all researchers must

stay in the space provided and may not direct Swap Meet patrons to visit the space where research is being conducted and 2) no gratuities such as food, drinks or candy may be displayed or offered" (P. Pence, personal communication, January 24, 2011).

Only people who approached the table to ask about the raffle were asked if they would like to participate in the study. These participants were then given an informed consent (Appendix D, E) and further verbal instruction was provide about the process. The debriefing statement (Appendix F, G) was detached form the survey and given to them explaining where they could get more information about the study if desired.

Protection of Human Subjects

The assessment tool, the informed consent and the debriefing statement were reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to ensure that anonymity and confidentiality of human subjects was achieved by inspecting the appropriateness, accuracy, and sensitivity of the questions. The questionnaire includes a short synopsis reinforcing confidentiality by stating that no identifying information will be recorded. Finally, a

debriefing statement was given to each subject explaining the purpose of the study and where they can get a full report of the research findings that will include the title, short synopsis, focus of the problem, the literature review, research methods used, discussion, and interpretation of findings, with a list of the references.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis was processed through the Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW). Demographics such as age, gender, ethnicity, household size, education obtained, and parents combined income were examined through a univariate analysis of central tendency and dispersion such as calculating the frequency, mean, median, mode, and standard deviation.

A multivariate analysis was conducted using both the independent samples t-test and the one-way ANOVA. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the mean of gender (independent variable) and parental involvement (dependent variable) using all subscales.

A one-way ANOVA was used to test for perceived parental involvement using four questions that measured

language barriers, transportation issues, perception about teachers, and parent's right to ask about their child's education among five income levels and their education obtained.

Summary

Parent who participated in the study completed a survey that was created by the researcher based on the literature review and shared their perceived parental educational involvement regarding their children and the school their children attend. Participants were selected by using a convenience sampling method in order to represent the research focus. Necessary measures were taken to ensure that the privacy of the participants was achieved.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

Included first are demographics of the participants that were in the study. They all represent key elements that help understand the purpose of the study.

Also included are bivariate tests that examine how participants responded to the subscale question(s) by looking at their level of education obtained and income level.

Finally, multivariate tests were conducted to compare the mean of gender and parental involvement using all the subscales. Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA was used to test for perceived parental involvement and four independent questions measuring language barriers, transportation issues, perceptions about authority and parents right to ask about their child's education among five income levels.

Presentation of the Findings

The following tables represent key information in the study that was used to examine the parent's involvement with their child's school and their children.

In Table 1 ages range from 18-74 with the mean age of 36. On the youngest side of the spectrum, 12% ranged from 18 to 25 years of age. Participants ranging in age 36 to 49 were the largest group represented at 40%, followed by the age group of 26-35 who represented 36% of the population. Finally, only 6 participants reported to be 50 years or older.

Table 1. Age by Category

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18-25	6	12	12	12
26-35	18	36	36	48
36-49	20	40	40	88
Over 50	6	12	12	100
Total	50	100	100	

For this particular sample 50% of the people were male and 50% were female.

Table 2. Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	25	50	50	50
Female	25	50	50	100
Total	50	100	100	

The following table shows that Mexicans represented 92% of the entire sample population where only 2% were Native American, and 6% identified themselves as other or did not specified their ethnic background.

Table 3. Ethnic Background

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Hispanic/Latino	46	92	92	92
Native American	1	2	2	94
Other	3	6	6	100
Total	50	10	10	

Table 4 shows that 24% of the population was Spanish speaking only compared to 8% who were English speaking only, and 68% were comfortable taking the survey either in Spanish or in English.

Table 4. Preferred Language

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Spanish	12	24	24	24
English	4	8	8	32
Bilingual	34	68	68	100
Total	50	100	100	

Table 5 reports that 50% of parents were non-high school graduates compared to 24% who reported they did receive their high school diploma. Both, parents who went to college and were college graduates, represented 12% of the sample population.

Table 5. Education Obtained

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No Diploma	25	50	50	50
High School Graduate	12	24	24	74
Some College	6	12	12	86
College Graduate	6	12	12	98
Master Degree	1	2	2	100
Total	50	100	100	

The following table consists of parents' level of income in four categories. 32% of parents earned less than \$9,000 per year combined and 54% made fewer than \$39,000. Finally, only 14% reported to make more than \$40,000.

Table 6. Income Level

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
\$9,000 or Less	16	32	32	32
\$10,000-\$19,000	12	24	24	56
\$20,000-\$29,000	8	16	16	72
\$30,000-\$39,000	7	14	14	86
\$40,000 & Over	7	14	14	100
Total	50	100	100	

Multivariate Tests

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the mean of gender (independent variable) and parental involvement using all subscales (dependent variable). There was a significant difference in scores between females and males on their perceived experience with schools ($t(48) = -2.323, p < .05$), with females reporting a higher ($M = 3.89, SD = 1.79$), than males ($M = 3.38, SD = 0.74$). The results suggest that females have a greater perceived negative experience or image about schools than males (Table 7).

Table 7. Gender and Experience with Schools

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Sig (2-tailed)
Male	25	3.3867	.79162	.15832	.05
Female	25	3.8933	.74981	.14996	

A one-way ANOVA was used to test for perceived parental involvement with four independent questions measuring language barriers, transportation issues, perception about teachers and parent's right to ask about their child's education among five income levels.

Table 8 presents that perceived transportation issues differed significantly across the five income groups, $F(3.891) = 4, p = .008$. Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the five income levels indicate that people who made \$9,000 or less ($M = 3.25$) had more perceived transportation issues compared to their counterparts that made \$10,000-\$19,000 ($M = 4.333$) per year. Also, people who made \$9,000 or less reported to have more perceived transportation issues than those who made \$30,000 and over ($M = 4.57$). This affects parent's ability to attend school events such as assembly awards, plays, and sporting events.

Table 8. Income Level and Transportation Issues

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig (2-tailed)
\$9,000 or Less	16	3.25	1.39044	3.891	.008
\$10,000-\$19,000	12	4.333	.65134		
\$20,000-\$29,000	8	4	.75593		
\$30,000-\$39,000	7	4.571	.53452		
Over \$40,000	7	4.571	.78680		
Total	50	4	1.0879		

A one-way ANOVA was used to test for perceived parental involvement using four independent questions that measure that measure the parent's language barriers, transportation issues, perception about teachers, and parent's belief about the right to ask about their child's education among the levels of education attained.

Parental perceived rights $F(3.247) = 3, p = .03$, perception about teachers $F(4.512) = 3, p = .008$, and language $F(3.638) = 3, p = .02$ differed significantly across four levels of education.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four levels of education indicate that parents who obtain a high school diploma ($M = 1.00$) more strongly agree that they have the right to ask about their child's education as compared to non-high school graduates ($M = 1.84$).

Table 9. Education Obtained and Parental Rights

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig (2-tailed)
No Diploma	25	1.84	1.17898	3.247	.03
High School Graduate	12	1	0		
Some College	6	1	0		
College Graduate	6	1.3333	.5164		
Total	49	1.4694	.93768		

Table 10 shows that parents who went to college or graduated from college (M = 4.27) more strongly agree that parents should not assume that teachers know best when it comes to their child's education, and therefore parents should ask more questions about their schooling compared to high school graduates (M = 3.50).

Table 10. Education Obtained and Perception about Teachers

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig (2-tailed)
No Diploma	25	3.5	1.38684	4.512	.008
High School Graduate	12	2.5833	1.72986		
Some College	6	5	0		
College Graduate	6	4.3333	1.63299		
Total	49	3.5306	1.58248		

The following table illustrates that parents who did not receive their high school diploma (M = 3.34) reported to have more language barriers than parents who did not graduate from high school (M = 4.66). This affects the parent's ability to communicate with teachers. It also shows that parents who did not obtain a high school diploma having more difficulty helping their children with homework assignments than parents who attended college or graduated from college.

Table 11. Education Obtained and Preferred Language

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig (2-tailed)
No Diploma	25	3.34	1.17898	3.638	.02
High School Graduate	12	3.5833	.70173		
Some College	6	4.25	.98742		
College Graduate	6	4.6667	.40825		
Total	49	3.6735	1.07311		

Summary

This chapter presents general demographic information about participants as it pertains to the study. Also found are areas that were statistically significant regarding the parent's education and income. Findings show that parents who went to college or are college graduates had fewer perceived barriers when it comes to their child's education than high school and non-high school graduates.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This section discusses the research findings and the limitations of the research study. Following are recommendations for social work practice, policy, and research as they pertain to academic parent involvement. This section concludes with thoughts about the research study.

Discussion

The hypothesis for this study states that there is a statistical significance between the following four subscales that measure parental involvement and the education and income levels of parents: 1) parent's expectations, 2) supervision at home, 3) personal experience with the school and 4) communication with teachers. Specifically, the study predicted that parents with a higher education and parent's who obtained higher annual wages, would considerably supervise their children outside of school, have higher expectations, have better experiences with the school, and contact their child's teacher more frequently.

The ANOVA analysis revealed that there is no correlation between the subscales and how much parents get involved with their children and the school their child attends. One reason could be possibly due to the fact that the questions were created to conform to the predominately American culture.

More specifically, Valdes (1996) argues that a possible explanation for the lack of parental involvement among low income Mexican parents in research could be due to the fact that teachers see parental involvement differently than parents. For example, according to Delgado-Gaitan (1990), some teachers report that parents do not care about their child's education because parents rarely communicate with teachers about the progress of their children, and as a result, this is often seen as not being actively involved in the education of their children. This different view of parental involvement causes studies to report less participation by parents.

Also, the cultural values such as parent expectations of children from the parents were not investigated in this study. According to Sirin (2005), working-class parents have lower expectations for their children regarding school due to their economic level

status. For example, Sirin (2005) found that "socioeconomic status such as parental education, income, and occupation [is] a strong predictor of academic achievement for White students [but] [not] [so] [much] for minority students" (p. 445). Furthermore, this could be because White families value personal achievement more than traditional Mexican families. Valdes (1996), found through interviewing immigrant families that parents viewed personal success in terms of being able to preserve close family constellation.

This study indicates that although the majority of parents reported to be bilingual, as compared to Spanish or English speaking only, parents who reported helping their children less with homework assignments also perceived to have more language barriers (Table 11). It is no surprise, that parents who have a language barrier would feel uncomfortable speaking to their child's teacher, when these parents also struggle helping their child with homework.

Unanticipated Results

Unexpected findings include the following questions: 13 (assignment comprehension), 27 (perception about discussions with teachers), 29 (communicating with

teachers), and 31 (transportation issues) arose when comparing them with the education and income levels of the parent.

It was found that parents with higher education strongly believe that having academic discussions with teachers despite of whether parents saw teachers as competent or incompetent was of great importance when compared to their less educated peers. Also, parents with a lower education level reported having more difficulty in helping their children with homework assignments than parents who attended college or graduated from college. Finally, parents with a higher education reported having fewer issues with transportation.

The correlations found here are of no surprise. Studies show that parents who do well academically also have higher levels of self-esteem, have a more sophisticate vocabulary, have more awareness of how American schools run, and have more financial stability than parents who do poorly in school (Harriett & Falbo, 1996). This is critical in understanding why parents of low SES lack in the area of parental involvement.

An independent sample t-test showed that there was a significant difference on how females and males responded to questions 22 (treatment by the school), 26 (experience with the school), and 28 (participation in school activities) from Table 7 that indicates that females perceive to have a greater negative experience or image about the school their child attends. However, a reason that can explain this difference could be the notion that females more frequently contact their child's teacher. Also, according to Gonzales (1982), traditional ways of motherhood and wifhood continue to be instilled in females who generally marry, have children and stay at home to raise the children.

Limitations

One of the limitations in the study includes what is referred to as the Hawthorne effect. Vinzant and Crothers (1998), state that when participants are observed by the researcher, participants may not genuinely share their opinions. Therefore, confidentiality was not exercised, however, participants were given anonymity. Another element that put strain on the study was the San Bernardino University logo required

by the Institutional Review Board printed on the front page of the survey. The observed reactions of participants as the researcher displayed the survey in front of them was that of a fight or flight reaction. Many potential participants would leave immediately after seeing the survey. To address this problem, multiple observations took place to assess for factors that were driving participants away. For example, in the initial data collection phase, the research site had a formal appearance that included a table with surveys, pens, advertisement boards and passing out complimentary magnets to the parents.

An implication was in the results produced by one-way ANOVA. The results do not show the how the means differ we only know that the means are not equal to each other. Another limitation is that conducting multiple tests increases the likelihood to obtain a statistically significant result accidentally. This implies that one of the test results may be invalid. Finally, the sample does not represent all the issues involved in parental involvement with Mexican parents.

Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy and Research

Studies show that language continues to be a barrier for Spanish speaking parents. In chapter two it was discussed that teachers define parent involvement in terms of how much parents engage in verbal communication with teachers. The research also discussed that this lack of communication is not an absolute representation of how much parents actually get involved with their children. Although communication is vital for both parties to convey their concerns, alternative methods of communication should be implemented to avoid isolation of parents and feeling incompetent as they attempt to get involved.

Studies also show that the education obtained by parents is closely attached to the meaning of power (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991). Furthermore, as parent's becomes more educated, their level of confidence also increases. This gives parents a new perspective about the school system and how they should be treated in school. Delgado-Gaitan (1990) argues that people who are more educated feel better about themselves than those who are less educated. Professionals that deal with low

income Mexican parents should examine how they come across when talking to this population. For example, a strong authoritative approach can explain why parents feel uncomfortable talking to their child's teacher.

Finally, future research conducted on this topic should consider the income and education of the parents as a key element to the contribution of their child's education, however, they should also include the cultural values and beliefs of the family.

Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to develop a better understanding of the areas that low income Mexican parents are involved in or are not involved in with schools and the academic life of their children. The results suggest that there is no statistical significance between education or income and perceived parental involvement. However, individual questions examined through bivariate tests reported that parents with a higher education more strongly believe they were encountered with fewer barriers when it came to the education of their child.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Parent,

This survey is an attempt to understand how academic performance can be improved. By carefully filling out this questionnaire, you will help us gain a better understanding of these problems and improve future educational programs. **There is no "right" or "wrong" answers to these questions. Simply try to answer each question as honestly and accurately as possible. The information you provide will remain anonymous.**

PLEASE FOLLOW THESE DIRECTIONS:

- A. Read each question carefully and answer it to the best of your knowledge.
 - B. Be sure to answer each question. Where there is a space _____, enter the word or figures requested. Where there are brackets (), fill in with an X.
-

1. What is your age? _____
2. Gender: () male () female
3. What is your ethnicity? _____
4. Household size: _____
5. What is your occupation? _____
6. What is your level of education?
() Did not graduate High School () College Graduate
() High School Graduate () Master Degree
() Some College () Doctorate Degree
7. What is your level of income (if married, please combine)?
() \$9,000 or less () \$30,000-\$39,000
() \$10,000-\$19,000 () Over \$40,000
() \$20,000-\$29,000
8. What language(s) other than English do you speak?

9. Which school(s) is/are your child(ren) attending? -

10. What is the highest level of education **you would like** for your child(ren) to obtain:

- () High School Diploma
- () Junior College (high school plus two years)
- () College (high school plus 4 years)
- () Master (college plus 2 years)
- () Doctorate (college plus 3-5 years)

11. What is the highest level of education **you believe** your child(ren) will obtain:

- () High School Diploma
- () Junior College (high school plus two years)
- () College (high school plus 4 years)
- () Master (college plus 2 years)
- () Doctorate (college plus 3-5 years)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate number. Do this for questions 12-33.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Does not Apply	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

12. I will not allow my child(ren) to get anything less than a B for a grade 1 2 3 4 5

13. I do not help my child(ren) with their homework because I do not understand the assignment 1 2 3 4 5

14. I wish I had more time to meet my child's(ren's) educational needs 1 2 3 4 5

15. My child(ren) is/are not allowed to play unless their homework is completed 1 2 3 4 5

16. I have discussed with my child(ren) about the importance of having a good education 1 2 3 4 5

17. I expect my child(ren) to let me know how he/she/they plan to spend(s) his/her/their free time 1 2 3 4 5
18. I know my child(ren) will graduate from high School 1 2 3 4 5
19. My child(ren) has/have a specific time and place at home to do their homework 1 2 3 4 5
20. I read to my child(ren) or encourage him/her/them to read 1 2 3 4 5
21. I know what classes my child(ren) is/are enrolled in 1 2 3 4 5
22. I do not visit my child's(ren's) school because of how I am treated 1 2 3 4 5
23. I have talked to the teacher of my child(ren) in the last month to see how my child(ren) is/are doing in school 1 2 3 4 5
24. I am not familiar with my child's(ren's) report card 1 2 3 4 5
25. I believe I have the right to ask about my child's(ren's) education 1 2 3 4 5
26. My experience with schools has led me to believe they do not care about my opinion(s) 1 2 3 4 5
27. Parents should not have academic discussions with teachers about their child(ren) because teachers know what they are doing 1 2 3 4 5
28. I feel that getting involved with school activities such as, parent-teacher conference and back to school night, would be unproductive in my child's(ren's) education 1 2 3 4 5
29. My language prevents me from communicating with teachers 1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Agree Disagree	Agree	Does not Apply	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>				
30. I am aware of my child's(ren's) strengths and Weakness	1	2	3	4 5
31. I do not attend assembly awards, plays, sport or school events because of transportation issues	1	2	3	4 5
32. I am aware that tutoring services are available and encourage my child(ren) to utilize these services	1	2	3	4 5
33. I talk to my child(ren) about following the dress code policy	1	2	3	4 5

Please select all that apply

34. My child(ren) is/are at risk of dropping out of school or not graduating because he/she:
- Has too many absences
 - Did not pass the High-School-Exit-Exam (CAHSEE)
 - Got held back a grade
 - Was expelled too many times
 - Had severe health problems
 - Had low or failing grades
 - Got pregnant
 - Got married
 - Had alcohol or other drug related problems
 - Had to financially support the family

 - My child(ren) is/are not at risk of dropping out or not graduating

Survey developed by Jose Rosas Hernandez

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE (SPANISH VERSION)

Estimado Padre,

Este cuestionario es un esfuerzo para comprender cómo el desempeño académico puede ser mejorado. Al llenar este cuestionario cuidadosamente, usted nos ayudará a comprender estos problemas y mejorar programas educativos para la juventud estudiantil. **No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas a estas preguntas. Simplemente trate de contestar cada pregunta lo mas honestamente y correctamente posible. La información que usted dé será anónima.**

FAVOR DE SEGUIR ESTAS DIRECCIONES:

A. Lea cada pregunta con cuidado y contéstela a lo mejor de su conocimiento.

B. Esté seguro de contestar cada pregunta. Dónde hay un espacio _____, entre la palabra de figuras solicitados. Dónde hay corchetes (), llene con una X.

-
1. ¿Qué es su edad? _____
 2. Sexo: () Masculino () Femenino
 3. ¿Cual es su raza? _____
 4. ¿Cuantos viven en su hogar? _____
 5. ¿Cual es su nivel de educación?
() No se graduó de la Preparatoria () Graduado Colegial
() Graudado de Preparatoria () Licenciatura
() Algo de Colegio () Doctorado
 7. ¿Qué es su nivel de ingresos (si es casado(a), combine los dos)?
() \$9,000 o menos () \$30,000-\$39,000
() \$10,000-\$19,000 () Over \$40,000
() \$20,000-\$29,000
 8. ¿Qué otro idioma habla usted? _____
 9. ¿Cuál(es) escuela(s) asiste su niño(a)? _____

10. ¿Qué nivel de educación **quiere usted** que su niño(a) obtenga?

- Diploma de Preparatoria
- Colegio Comunitario (Preparatoria más dos años)
- Graudado Colegial (Preparatoria más 4 años)
- Licenciatura (colegio más 2 años)
- Doctorado (colegio más 3-5 años)

11. ¿Qué nivel de educacion **piensa usted** que su niño/a va obtener?

- Diploma de Preparatoria
- Colegio Comunitario (Preparatoria más dos años)
- Graudado Colegial (Preparatoria más 4 años)
- Licenciatura (colegio más 2 años)
- Doctorado (colegio más 3-5 años)

Indique por favor el nivel que usted esta de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con cada declaración haciendo un circulo en el número apropiado. Haga esto para las preguntas del 12-33.

Totalmente De Acuerdo	De acuerdo	Indeciso	Desacuerdo	Totalmente En Desacuerdo
1	2	3	4	5

12. Yo no permitire que mi niño(a) obtanga menos de una B de calificación 1 2 3 4 5

13. Yo no ayudo a mi niño(a) con sus deberes de tarea porque yo no comprendo el ensayo. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Deseo tener más tiempo para ayudar a mi niño(a) con sus necesidades educativas 1 2 3 4 5

15. Mi niño(a) no es permitido jugar a menos que termine su tarea 1 2 3 4 5

16. He hablado con mi niño(a) sobre la importancia de obtener una buena educación 1 2 3 4 5

17. Mi niño(a) me dise como pasa su tiempo libre la mayoría del tiempo 1 2 3 4 5

Totalmente De Acuerdo	De acuerdo	Indeciso	Desacuerdo	Totalmente En Desacuerdo
1	2	3	4	5
18. Sé que mi niño(a) se graduará de la Preparatoria				1 2 3 4 5
19. Mi niño(a) tiene un tiempo y lugar específico en casa donde hace su tarea				1 2 3 4 5
20. Yo le leo a mi niño(a) o le digo que lea				1 2 3 4 5
21. Sé cuales clases mi niño(a) esta tomando				1 2 3 4 5
22. Yo no visito la escuela de mi niño(a) por cómo soy tratado(a)				1 2 3 4 5
23. He hablado con el maestro(a) de mi niño(a) en el mes pasado para ver cómo mi niño(a) esta haciendo en la escuela				1 2 3 4 5
24. Yo no estoy familiarizado(a) con el reporte mi niño(a)				1 2 3 4 5
25. Creo que tengo el derecho de hacer preguntas sobre la educación de mi niño(a)				1 2 3 4 5
26. Mi experiencia con las escuelas me han dirigido a creer que ellos no tienen interés en mis opiniones				1 2 3 4 5
27. Los padres no deben tener discusiones académicas con los maestros acerca de su niño(a) porque los maestros saben lo que hacen				1 2 3 4 5
28. Siento que participando en las actividades escolares tal como, conferencias de padres y maestros, no sería productivo en la educacion de mi niño(a)				1 2 3 4 5
29. Mi idioma me impide comunicarme con los maestros				1 2 3 4 5

30. Estoy consciente de las fuerzas y debilidades de mi niño(a) 1 2 3 4 5
31. Yo no asisto premios de asamblea, juegos deportivos, hobbys, o eventos escolares por falta de transporte 1 2 3 4 5
32. Estoy enterado(a) que ayuda educativa está disponible en la escuela de mi hijo(a) y favorezco que mi niño(a) utilice éstos servicios 1 2 3 4 5
33. Hablo con mi niño(a) acerca de seguir el código de vestir 1 2 3 4 5

Seleccione por favor todo lo que aplique

34. Mi niño(a) está en peligro de retirarse de la escuela o de no graduarse porque él/ella:
- Tiene demasiadas ausencias
 - No pasó el requisito para la graduación de Preparatoria (CAHSEE)
 - Fue detenido un grado
 - Fue expulsado demasiadas veces
 - Tuvo problemas severos de salud
 - Tuvo bajos o grados débiles
 - Se embarazó
 - Se casó
 - Tuvo problemas de alcohol o otras drogas
 - Tuvo que apoyar financieramente a la familia

 - No está en riesgo de retirarse de la escuela o de no graduarse

El cuestionario fue desarrollado por Jose Rosas Hernandez

APPENDIX C
AGENCY APPROVAL LETTER

Jan 24, 2011

California State University, San Bernardino
5500 University Pkwy
San Bernardino, CA 92407

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to endorse the research project of Mr. Jose R Hernandez, a student with Cal State San Bernardino. Mr. Hernandez has described the research project to me and I feel that it would be of special interest to our Community. As the manager, I grant permission for him to conduct this research project with the following conditions:

- Participation of parents is completely voluntary
- Researchers will be responsible for informing the parents regarding the project and the measures. Also, that all information is collected anonymously to assure confidentiality.
- The Researcher will obtain written consent from the parents.
- The researchers will be responsible to informing the subjects that The Rubidoux Swap Meet has no involvement other than providing this opportunity for this Research.
- All researchers must arrive in the one vehicle that will occupy the space provided by The Rubidoux Swap Meet (No extra vehicles parked elsewhere)
- All researchers must stay in the provided space. (No satellite soliciting) Researchers may walk around and shop if desired, but may not direct Swap Meet Patrons to visit the space where research is being conducted.
- No gratuities such as Food, Drinks or candy may be offered, displayed or given to Patrons of The Rubidoux Swap Meet.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me at (951) 204-7249.

Sincerely,

Paul L. Pence
Rubidoux Swap Meet, Manager

APPENDIX D
INFORMED CONSENT

You are invited to share your opinions in a study that focuses on increasing academic achievement among the Hispanic community. The study is being conducted by Jose R Hernandez under the supervision of Professor Thomas D. Davis. The study has been approved by the CSUSB Institutional Review Board.

The survey is anonymous and no record will be made or kept of your name or any identifying information. You are free to skip any questions you do not want to answer. The questionnaire mainly consists of closed-ended questions and should not take longer than 15 minutes to complete.

There are no foreseeable risks to taking part and no personal benefits involved. Your contribution will help to find new constructive ways in which students can be helped to increase school performance.

Please understand that your participation in this research study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time. I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study you can contact Dr. Davis (909/537-3839).

By marking below, you agree that you have been fully informed about his survey and are volunteering to take part.

Place an
X here

Date

APPENDIX E
INFORMED CONSENT (SPANISH VERSION)

Consentimiento Informativo

Es invitado a compartir sus opiniones en un estudio que enfoca incrementar la educacion entre la comunidad hispana.

El estudio es realizado por Jose R Hernandez bajo la supervisión de Profesor Thomas D. Davis. El estudio ha sido aprobado por el el equipo de Revisión Institucional de la escuela CSUSB.

La informacion contenida sera anónima y ningún registro será hecho ni será mantenido de su nombre ni información de identificación.

Tenga la libertad de saltarse alguna pregunta que usted no quiere contestar. El cuestionario consiste principalmente en preguntas de cerrado-terminó y no debe tomar más de 15 minutos para completar.

No hay riesgos previsibles al participar y ningun beneficio personal implicara. Su contribución ayudará encontrar nuevas maneras constructivas en las que estudiantes pueden ser ayudados a aumentar desempeño de escuela.

Comprenda por favor que su participación en este estudio es completamente voluntario y usted está libre de retirarse caudo guste. Reconozco que he sido informado de, y comprendo, la naturaleza y el propósito de este estudio, y libremente doy consentimiento para participar. Reconozco que tengo por lo menos 18 años de la edad.

Si tiene cualquier pregunta o alguna preocupacion acerca de este estudio usted puede comunicarse con el Dr. Davis (909/537-3839). Marcando abajo, concuerda que ha sido informado completamente acerca del cuestionario y se ofrece a participar.

Marque aqui
con una x

Dia

APPENDIX F
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Thank you very much for taking a few minutes to let us know your opinions. The survey you just completed was for the study of parental involvement and academic achievement. It was conducted by Jose R Hernandez under the supervision of Professor Thomas D. Davis to provide information for future interventions to increase the grades of children in the Hispanic community.

If you have any questions or encountered any problems while completing the survey, please feel free to contact Dr. Davis (909/537-3839). To obtain a copy of this study you can locate it after Sept 2011, in the School Library at 5500 University Ave, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2393.

APPENDIX G
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT (SPANISH VERSION)

Declaración Informativa

Gracias por participar su tiempo y dejarnos saber sus opiniones acerca del estudio paternal y logro académico. El estudio fue conducido por Jose R Hernandez bajo la supervisión del Profesor Thomas D. Davis para usar esta información en futuras intervenciones que nos ayudara aumentar el desempeño académico en la juventud estudiantil.

Si tiene alguna pregunta o tuvo un problema al completar este cuestionario, se puede comunicar con el Profesor Thomas D. Davis (909/537-3839). Para obtener una copia de este estudio usted lo puede conseguir después de Septiembre del 2011, en la Biblioteca de la Universidad Estatal de San Bernardino en esta dirección: 5500 University Ave, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2393.

REFERENCES

- Alliance for Excellent Education, (2006). *Saving futures, saving dollars: The impact of education on crime reduction and earnings*. Washington, DC. Retrieved on November 12, 2010, from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/SavingFutures.pdf>
- Applied Materials, (2009). *Applied materials education initiative: Focus on San Jose California*. Santa Clara, CA: Applied Materials, Inc. Retrieved on January 11, 2011, from www.appliedmaterials.com/sites/default/files/am_education_initiative.pdf
- Brueggemann, W. (2006). *The practice of macro social work* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- California Dropout Research Project. (2007, May). *Why students drop out of high school comparisons from three national surveys*. (Issue Brief No. 2). Santa Barbara, CA: Rotermund, S.
- Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA. (2003). *School-based mutual support groups for parents, staff and older students*. Los Angeles, CA. Retrieved on February 7, 2011, <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/Support/support1.pdf>
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1990). *Literacy for empowerment: The role of parents in children's education*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C., & Trueba, H. (1991). *Crossing cultural borders: education for immigrant families in America*. London, New York: Falmer Press.
- Gonzales, A. (1992). Sex roles of the traditional Mexican family: A comparison of Chicano and Anglo students attitude. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13, 330-339.
- Harriett, R., & Falbo, T. (1996). *Latino high school graduation: Defining the odds*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Headden, S. (1997, October 12). The Hispanic dropout mystery. U.S. News & World Report. Retrieved from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/culture/articles/971020/archive_008077_2.htm
- Hepworth, D. H., Rooney, R. H., Rooney, G. D., Gottfried, K. S., & Larsen, J. (2010). *Direct social work practice: Theory and skills* (8th e.d.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Morton, I. (1993). Getting Hispanics parents involved. *Education Digest*, 58(8), 32.
- Sirin, S. R. (2005, Autumn). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417-453. Published by American Educational Research Association.
- Sparks, E., Johnson, J. L., & Akos, P. (2010). Dropouts: finding the needles in the haystack. *Educational Leadership*, 67(5) 46-49. Retrieved on March 1, 2011, from http://www.edstaranalytics.biz/file/homepage/Sparks_etal_2010_Dropouts.pdf
- Timar, T., Biag, M., & Lawson, M. (2007, October). *Does state policy help or hurt the dropout problem in California?* (Report No. 3). Santa Barbara, CA: Retrieved from California Dropout Research Project: http://www.cdrp.ucsb.edu/pubs_reports.htm
- U.S Census Bureau: High dropout rates. Retrieved on Dember 21, 2010, from www.census.gov/population/socdemo/school/TableA-4.xls -
- U.S. Department of Education (2009). *Raise to the top program executive summary*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf>
- Valdes, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Vinzant, J. C., & Crothers, L. (1998). *Street-level leadership: Discretion and legitimacy in front line public service*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Pub.