A notable increase in the number of U.S. families choosing to home-school their children in recent years has underscored the need to develop more systematic knowledge about this approach to education. Drawing on a theoretical model of parental involvement as well as research on families’ social networks, this study examined home- and public-school parents’ motivations for home-based involvement in their 4th through 8th grade children’s education at two time points. The study also examined whether involvement activities predicted student proximal achievement outcomes (academic self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation for learning and self-regulatory strategy use) across the two groups. Results suggested that parental self-efficacy for involvement, specific invitations from the child, and parent social networks were positively related to home-based parental involvement across the groups, although home- and public-school parents recorded significantly different perceptions of personal self-efficacy, role activity beliefs, social networks, and child proximal achievement outcomes. Findings are discussed with reference to implications for future research and practice.
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Although home-schooling is growing in popularity in the U.S. (e.g., up from 850,000 students, or 1.7% of K – 12 students in 1999 [Bielick, Chandler & Broughman, 2002] to 1.1 million students, or 2.2% of K-12 students in 2003 [Princlotta, Bielick, & Chapman, 2004]), little systematic research has focused on this population. In a recent study (Green & Hoover-Dempsey, 2007), I examined why parents decide to home-school, grounded in Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (1995, 1997, 2005) model of the parental involvement process as well as research suggesting other kinds of beliefs relevant to parents’ decisions about home-schooling (e.g., ideological and pedagogical beliefs; Van Galen 1988). In that study, parents of 136 home-schooled elementary students completed questionnaires assessing model-based constructs derived from the parental involvement literature (personal motivations for home-schooling and life context variables pertinent to home-schooling) and personal beliefs identified in the home-schooling literature as important to parents’ decisions to home-school. Results suggested that home-schooling parents appeared to be more strongly motivated by personal motivators identified in the general parental involvement literature, such as an active role construction and a strong sense of efficacy for helping the child learn, than by other explanations for home-schooling, such parents’ beliefs about the values, content, adequacy, and methods of public-school education.
The goal of this study was to extend that good ‘first step’ in systematic examination of parental involvement by home-schooling families in several ways. First, home-school and public-school parents may manifest other similarities, as well as dissimilarities, in motivations for the kinds of schooling they select for their children’s education. For example, parents who choose to home-school may experience different community, family, or child influences different than those experienced by public-school parents: such differences may in turn cause variations in the salience of specific motivations for involvement across the two groups. Green and Hoover-Dempsey (2007), for example, reported that home-school parents held stronger personal motivators (role activity and efficacy beliefs) for involvement than a sample of involved public-school parents. Other variables suggested by the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) model of the parental involvement process, such as specific child invitations for involvement, may also differ between the home- and public-school groups. Thus, it was a goal of this study to further explore differences that may exist between home- and public-school parents motivations for involvement using the first level of the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (2005; Figure 1) model of parental involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ Involvement Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ Motivational Beliefs</th>
<th>Parents’ Perceptions of Invitations for Involvement from Others</th>
<th>Parents’ Perceived Life Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Role Construction</td>
<td>General School Invitations</td>
<td>Skills and Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Specific Teacher Invitations</td>
<td>Time and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Child Invitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1:* Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s revised theoretical model of the parental involvement process, Level 1 (adapted from Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005; Walker et al., 2005).
Second, the parental involvement literature also suggests that social contextual motivators of home-based involvement in children’s schooling are more extensive than those identified by Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 2007 (see also Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler; 1995, 1997, 2005). Sheldon’s (2002) work, for example, suggests that parents’ social networks may also provide social contextual invitations to involvement and substantial motivation for public-school parents’ involvement in their children’s education. Home-school research suggests that home-school parents (when compared to public-school parents) may have different community and family resources from which to draw in thinking about their involvement in their children’s education, including the availability of church support, home-school support groups, and larger family units (Lines, 2000; Ray, 2000; Van Galen 1988). Examining the relative influence of this source of social contextual motivation on home-school and public-school parents’ involvement decisions may provide useful information on both groups of parents’ thinking about choices for their children’s education and their own role(s) in helping children learn. Thus, it was a second goal of this study to explore the use of social networks and social support in predicting home-based parental involvement.

Third, varied motivators of involvement may be differentially predictive of students’ proximal achievement outcomes (e.g., student’s intrinsic motivation to learn, academic self-efficacy, and self-regulatory strategy use) in ways that are systematically related to parents’ choices about the kinds of schooling their children receive. To my knowledge, home-schooling has not been examined in conjunction with students’ proximal achievement outcomes, although some (albeit controversial) research has suggested that home-school students on average do better than public-school students on distal (summary) measures of achievement (e.g., standardized test scores; Boulter, 1999; Ray, 2000). While neither home-school nor public-
school parents are assisting the students while they take summary tests of achievement, home-
school parents – unlike public-school parents – are in the “classroom” while children study and
learn. This difference may result in different skills and beliefs that students in the two schooling
conditions bring to their performance on summary or standardized tests of learning. Thus, a third
goal of this study was to examine similarities and differences in home-school and public-school
student’s proximal achievement outcomes, including self-regulatory skills and beliefs, intrinsic
motivation, and self-efficacy for learning. Of particular interest was exploring whether parental
involvement was predictive of student proximal achievement outcomes when controlling for
prior student proximal achievement.

In sum, this study strove to explore the first level of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s
(1995, 1997, 2005) model of the parental involvement process (including role construction for
involvement, sense of self-efficacy for helping the child learn, and perceptions of specific
invitations to involvement from the child; Figure 1)—and as drawn from research on parents’
social networks and social support as potential contributors to parents’ decisions about
involvement—predict home-based parental involvement in parents as a general group. This study
also examined whether reports of home-based involvement in parents as a general group were
related to students’ proximal achievement outcomes. Finally, due to suggestions from the home-
school literature about differences and similarities between home-school and public-school
parents on these motivations for involvement, this study also explored the differences between
the two groups on role construction for involvement, parental self-efficacy for helping the child
learn, specific invitations to involvement from the child, social networks and social support,
reports of parental home-based involvement and reports of student proximal achievement
outcomes.
I turn now to a discussion of the broad theories upon which the specific constructs and guiding questions in this study were grounded.

Theoretical grounding

Social learning theories, social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and sociocultural theory (Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978) in particular, emphasize the idea that learning occurs as part of on-going and normal social processes. Specifically, they suggest that the social environment that surrounds a child and the individuals (e.g., family members) in it provide information necessary for the child to learn. From the sociocultural perspective, children’s development is embedded in the learning they derive from the rich context of social relationships, sociocultural tools, and sociocultural practices that surround them (Rogoff, 1990). In the perspective of this theory, the individual child cannot be studied in isolation thus making parental interactions with the child and involvement in his or her education critical to the child’s learning. Parents (and others) provide the sociocultural tools that allow children to learn (Rogoff, 1990). Social cognitive theory, on the other hand, emphasizes that personal factors (such as the child’s behavior and cognition) and the environmental contexts with which he or she interacts are key elements of children’s learning (Bandura, 1986); further, parents’ personal beliefs (e.g., about child-rearing goals and practices) influence how parents interact with the child and how the child develops and learns (Miller, 1988). For example, a parent who strongly believes that education is important is likely to interact with the child in a manner that is consistent with those beliefs, and the child is likely to develop in ways that promote educational success (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997, 2005; Sigel, 1990). Hess and Holloway (1984) noted that parental-child communications, parental expectations regarding the child’s achievement, the affective parent-child relationship,
and parenting style and control practices—as well as parental beliefs and attributions about the child—are among important parental variables that influence children’s achievement and school success.

Apart from these variations in the emphasis on elements of the social context most critical to children’s learning and development, both sociocultural and social learning perspectives suggest that parental beliefs influence children’s outcomes through behavioral mechanisms such as parental encouragement, reinforcement, modeling and instruction (Dornbusch & Wood, 1989; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005; Martinez-Pons, 1996). Both theoretical perspectives also note that children are not simply passive recipients of parental influence: reciprocal determinism also plays a role. Bandura (1978), for example, suggested that children should be viewed as active participants in their own learning as they use social guidance (and participate in cultural activities; i.e., Rogoff, 1990). Further, children have unique characteristics (e.g., activity level: Vygotsky, 1978) that may promote or inhibit learning from the environment and those who share the environment. Children are not only influenced by— but also influence—the environment and the people around them, in part by seeking out environments and persons who fit them best. McGillicuddy-DeLisi (1992), for example, noted that parents often believe that the child’s own cognitions, based on personal experience, form the basis for continued social and cognitive development. However, because parents come to their interactions with children with greater prior experience and stronger beliefs than their children generally hold, it is most often generally assumed in the parental involvement literature that parents’ beliefs and behaviors generally function primarily as contributors to children’s learning outcomes. This parent-focused perspective may change as the children move through
adolescence, a time in which children begin their press for independence and parents may take on a less direct role in their children’s education.

Thus, social cognitive and sociocultural theories offer a foundation for understanding why parental involvement in children’s education often influences children’s leaning and school outcomes. While these theoretical perspectives support examining parental involvement’s influence on children’s classroom-based and standardized test achievement outcomes, as well as parents’ motivations for being involved in their child’s proximal achievement and educational outcomes, they are not as helpful in explaining how and why these processes may differ depending upon the context of schooling that a student experiences. Ecological theory, however, offers a framework for understanding how different schooling contexts—such as public-schooling or home-schooling—may influence the path between parental involvement and students’ proximal achievement outcomes.

Similar to sociocultural and social learning theories, ecological theory emphasizes interactions between the person and environment. It suggests not only that development occurs as a result of learning within and from social interactions, but also that all development takes place within varied and layered ecological contexts. Development thus is defined by Bronfenbrenner (1979) as one’s evolving conception of the environment and one’s relation to it, as well as one’s capacity to discover, sustain, and alter the environment’s properties. Thus, ecological theorists suggest that development must be studied in the context of the family environment and the family must be understood within the context of both its community and the larger society. Bronfenbrenner (1986) also suggested that the child, family, community and society should all be viewed as separate systems that interact regularly to influence individual development. He further suggested that the child – at the center of ecological theory – be viewed
as an active, evolving system that both influences and is influenced variably by interactions with increasingly complex external systems.

Traditionally, parental involvement in children’s schooling has been examined within four ecological systems involving the child, family, and school. The systems believed to have the greatest impact on the child’s development and learning are dyadic systems, which include, for example, interactions between the parent and child or between teacher and student (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Both family and school are considered micro-systems that contain the activities, roles, and relations in which the child actively engages (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Patrikakou, Weissberg, Redding & Walberg, 2006). Family-school interactions constitute a meso-system (Bronfenbrenner, 1986), a system that has the ability to influence (and be influenced by) the home-based behavior and the interactions of the child and parent. Because the meso-system is somewhat more distal for the child than are the micro-systems that contain the child directly (family, school), family-school interactions and partnerships are seen as influencing but generally not directly causing children’s development and learning.

At the next level of the child’s developmental ecology, according to Bronfenbrenner (1979), are exo-systems that involve the broader environment and environmental events that generally do not directly influence the child, but may directly influence the parent, whose interactions with the child may then be influenced by the exo-system. Exo-systems that relate to parents’ involvement in their children’s development and education may include family resources, such as the parents’ workplace or social networks, and these systems may provide information and support for the parent. The final, most distal system in the ecology of human development that Bronfenbrenner described is the macro-system, which includes the wider society’s or culture’s influence on many aspects of the parents’ life, including parents’ beliefs.
and behaviors related to child-rearing as well as involvement in their children’s learning and education.

Families who home-school and use public-schools for their children’s education may experience all of these systems differently, and the varied layers of ecosystems may influence these groups of families in different ways. This is because elements of home-school parent’s operationalization of the concept of education can be qualitatively different than public-school parents’ operationalization of education. For example, at the center of the home-schooled child’s ecological system is the dyadic system of the parent and child in the home environment micro-system. For the public-schooled child, on the other hand, the child’s central ecological system related to education may be the dyadic interaction between the teacher and child in the classroom environment micro-system. The meso-system for both groups of children and parents contains the family-community environments with which the child interacts. For many home-school families, this may include specialized home-school community gatherings, such as home-school play groups or classes, as well as family interactions in the community related to children’s learning (e.g., trips to the museum, library, or zoo). For many public-schooled children and families, the meso-system may include family-school interactions, such as their participation in after-school events and other events in which elements of the community may gather. The two groups’ eco-systems may also look somewhat different; for example, home-school parents tend to participate in social networks specifically related to home-schooling (such local home-school resource and support groups), while public-school parents may participate in school-based social networks and sources of information and support, such as the Parent-Teacher Association.

In sum, sociocultural and social learning theories suggest that social interactions, including parents’ involvement in children’s education, are important for children’s development
and learning and development across different ecologies. Ecological systems theory offers a framework for understanding how the different contexts of schooling that parents’ choose and children experience may influence the relationship and varied paths among parents’ motivations for home-based involvement in their children’s education and the influence of their involvement choices and activities on children’s proximal achievement outcomes.

A Model of the Parental Involvement Process

Within these broad theoretical frameworks, specific parental beliefs and social contexts may influence parents’ decisions about involvement in their children’s education as well as the influence of their involvement choices and activities on students’ educational outcomes. Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (1995, 1997, 2005) model provides a strong theoretical framework from which to examine specific predictors of parental involvement. Grounded primarily in psychological literature, the model proposes three major sources of motivation for parents’ involvement in their children’s education: parent’s motivational beliefs (role construction for involvement; sense of self-efficacy for helping the child succeed in school), contextual invitations (general invitations to involvement from school, specific invitations to involvement from the teacher(s), and specific invitations from the child), and life context variables (parent’s skills and knowledge, time and energy; see Figure 1.)

This study focused on three of these model-based sources of parent’s motivations for becoming involved in their children’s education: personal motivational beliefs relevant to involvement (specifically, parental role construction for involvement and parental self-efficacy for helping the child succeed in school) and one type of model-based contextual invitation to involvement (specific invitations to involvement from children). This study also included two
social-contextual constructs not in the model but particularly pertinent to this inquiry: parent’s social networks and social support from which parents may draw in ways that influence their decisions about involvement and their choices of specific involvement activities. The study also assessed parents’ home-based involvement activities in order to examine a) links between motivators and parents’ choice of involvement activities and b) links between parents’ involvement activities and students’ proximal achievement outcomes. Thus and finally, the study also assessed selected model-based student proximal achievement outcomes (self-regulatory strategy use, academic self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation for learning).

The Constructs

Parents’ Motivational Beliefs

Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (1995, 1997, 2005) model suggests that major personal motivators of parental involvement included parents’ role construction for involvement and parents’ sense of efficacy for helping the child learn. As reported in Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler (2005), considerable work with the construct of role construction led to conceptualizing it as made up of role activity beliefs (how active a parent believes he or she should be in relation to supporting his or her child’s education) and role valence (the general positive-to-negative valence characterizing the parent’s experiences with schools and the influence of those experiences on the parents’ emotional orientation toward engaging with schools. The two components may be used separately or in combination. Consistent with this study’s purposes, I assessed parents’ role activity beliefs: parents’ beliefs about how active they should be in supporting their children’s education.
Role Activity Beliefs for Involvement

Studies of diverse groups of elementary and middle school students have suggested that role activity beliefs do influence parents’ decisions about becoming and being involved in their children’s education involvement (e.g., Chrispeels & Rivero, 2001; Drummond & Stipek, 2004; Grolnick, Benjet, Kurowski, & Apostoleris, 1997; Hoover-Dempsey, et al., 2005; Sheldon, 2002). Green and Hoover-Dempsey (2007), for example, reported that most home-school parents had particularly strong role activity beliefs related to involvement in their children’s education.

Parental Self-efficacy for Helping the Child Succeed in School

Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s model (1995, 1997, 2005) also suggested that parents’ self-efficacy for helping the child succeed in school may influence their decisions about becoming involved in their children’s education. Self-efficacy is defined as a person’s belief that he or she can act in ways that are likely to produce desired outcomes; it is a significant factor shaping the goals an individual chooses to pursue and his or her levels of persistence in working toward those goals (Bandura, 1997). Applied to parental involvement, self-efficacy theory suggests that parents make involvement decisions based in part on their thinking about the outcomes likely to follow their involvement activities (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997; Walker et al, 2005). Personal self-efficacy beliefs have been associated with parental involvement for elementary, middle and high school students (e.g., Grolnick et al., 1997; Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, & Brissie, 1992; Shumow & Lomax, 2002). Green and Hoover-Dempsey (2007) found that most home-school parents in their sample recorded a particularly strong sense of self-efficacy for helping their children succeed in school.
Social Contextual Motivators of Involvement

Specific Invitations to Involvement from the Child

Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (1995, 1997, 2005) model also suggested that parents’ perceptions of contextual motivators, including specific invitations to involvement from the child, can be powerful in prompting parental involvement, in part because parents generally want their children to succeed and are motivated to respond to their children’s needs (e.g., Grusec, 2002; Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, & Burow, 1995). Implicit invitations to involvement may emerge as students experience difficulties in school or with aspects of schoolwork (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2001; Xu & Corno, 1998). Explicit requests or invitations from children also often result in increased parental involvement (e.g., Balli et al., 1998; Shumow, 1997). As true of all types of invitations to involvement, invitations from the child may be increased by school actions to enhance family engagement in children’s schooling (e.g., Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2001; Gonzalez, Andrade, Civil, & Moll, 2001). Green and colleagues (2007) reported that among personal, contextual and life context variables, invitations to involvement from the child were the strongest predictor of home and school-based involvement in a large and diverse sample of public-school parents.

Parents’ Social Networks and Social Support

Although not explicitly included in the Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler model of parental involvement, parents’ social networks and related social support systems offer another perspective on the influence of social context on parents’ beliefs and behaviors regarding involvement. Social networks and support systems are particularly relevant to this study because parents’ social contexts may vary as a function of differing family and community influences.
Literature noted below suggested that examining social networks and the support they provide may offer useful perspectives on additional sources of influence on home-school and public-school parents’ motivations for involvement.

Various investigators have examined social networks and social support grounded in other models of parental involvement in children’s public-school education. For example, Grolnick and colleagues (1997) examined social support as an element of family context that influences parental involvement decisions. They found that positive social support was particularly important to involvement decisions made by mothers of boys, noting that mothers who perceived more social support described their children and contexts as less difficult than did mothers who perceived less social support. The importance of social networks was also reflected in Lareau’s (1987) work examining parental involvement. She observed and interviewed parents in two schools serving neighborhoods of different socioeconomic status (SES) about their ideas regarding parental involvement. She reported that families with lower SES generally reported many close family members in their social networks and drew social support primarily from those close family members. Families with higher SES, on the other hand, reported fewer close family ties in their networks and greater reliance on members of the school community for information about schooling. Lareau concluded that higher SES families were often more knowledgeable than their lower SES counterparts about school functioning, expectations, and related information because their social networks often included others who were themselves more knowledgeable (e.g., as compared to members of social networks comprised primarily of extended family members) about school matters.

Thus far I have used social networks and social support fairly interchangeably and, indeed, the constructs of social support (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980) and social networks (Adams,
1967) have traditionally been broadly characterized as interpersonal transactions. However, lack of definitional clarity in the area is a problem noted often in the literature (e.g., O’Reilly, 1988). Currently, most researchers define social networks and social support as separate, albeit related, constructs. For example, Dunkel-Schetter and Bennett (1990) defined social networks as the structure of social relationships and social support as the function of social relationships.

Similarly, others have suggested that social networks are an antecedent of social support (e.g., Langford, Bowsher, Maloney, & Lillis, 1997), and describe the social support provided by social networks as emotional, instrumental, informational, and appraisal or companionship (e.g., Cauce, Reid, Landesman & Gonzales, 1990; Langford et al., 1997). However, the functions of specific social relationships are often dependent upon the structure of the social network. Despite clarification in the area, the constructs continue to be conflated in the literature.

Nonetheless, social networks and social support have been examined with reference to their relationship with number of constructs, including academic achievement, psychological adjustment, and parenting. For example, Kenny and colleagues (2002) noted that in a group of academically successful, ethnically diverse inner-city high-school seniors, many students attributed their academic success to the educational support they received from a social network comprised of family, neighbors, teachers and employers. Other researchers have found links between parents’ social support and measures of child achievement, including undergraduate grade point average (Cutrona et al., 1994). This connection may occur because social support networks often enhance parenting behavior (Jarrett, 2000; McLoyd, 1990; Taylor & Roberts, 1995), particularly among low-income families (Hashima & Amato, 1994); improved parenting may, in turn, improve child achievement (Ceballo & McLoyd, 2002). The latter authors suggested, however, that the relationship between social networks and enhanced parenting
behavior might be weakened for families who reside in high-crime neighborhoods. Sociologists (e.g., Carbonaro, 1998; Coleman, 1988; Portes, 2000) have suggested that social capital, particularly in the form of intergenerational closure (or closeness in the form of positive relationships between generations), is one reason for stronger educational outcomes in families with more supportive social networks.

A few studies have also suggested a connection between parental involvement and social networks. For example, examinations of parental involvement in children’s education from socioeconomic, cultural, and ethnic perspectives have suggested that when parents better understand school expectations (through better ties to teachers and other families in the school), they experience more opportunities for parental involvement (Auerbach, 2004; Delgado-Gaitan, 1992; Lareau & Shumar, 1996; Lareau, 1987). The availability of social networks may also influence parental involvement in school choice (Neild, 2005; Reay, 1996), particularly if official information about available school choices is lacking. Sheldon (2002), for example, reported that different types of social networks were related to varied kinds of involvement (e.g., larger, family-based social networks were associated with higher levels of home-based involvement, while larger, school-based social networks were often associated with increased school-based involvement). In a related vein, Lareau (1987) and Graue (1993) noted that families from different SES backgrounds often report different ways of approaching the school system and different ways of receiving school information: these variations, they suggested, are based on differences in social networks. Sheldon (2002) also noted a modest positive correlation between parents’ role construction and social networks, but did not explore the relationship further.
Overall, these findings suggest that the integration of social networks and the social support they provide into a model of parental involvement might offer additional power for understanding the parental involvement process. Social networks, for example, may moderate the influence of other involvement predictors on the types of involvement parents choose (e.g., an extensive, non-family social network may encourage parents who hold active role beliefs and strong efficacy beliefs to become more involved in school-based activities). There are also indications in the literature that social networks may be particularly important for home-school parents. Although public acceptance of home-schooling has risen steadily in recent years (Rose & Gallup, 2001), it remains a somewhat controversial practice. For example, when home-schooling first became legal (in many states, not until the 1980’s), it received little general support and many parents home-schooled against immediate family wishes (Van Galen, 1988). Today, support groups are available for many home-school parents, particularly those who hold relatively strong religious beliefs. If some home-school parents have lower personal motivation for home-schooling, it may be that social support groups serve as a moderator for their involvement decisions.

*Parental Involvement*

Parental involvement has been described in varied ways (Epstein, 1986; Fan & Chen, 2001) but can be generally defined as a parents’ investment of various resources in their children’s education. These resources may include a wide range of activities, including supplying school materials, communicating with teachers, participating in school events, and stating achievement expectations (Fan & Chen, 2001; Fehrmann, Keith, & Reimers, 1987). Other researchers have defined parental involvement as varied types of engagement in children’s
schooling, such as cognitive involvement (e.g., help with homework), school involvement, and personal involvement (Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994). Although parental involvement in children’s education is a complex process that often transcends the geographic boundaries of home and school, pragmatic issues have often underscored researchers’ decisions to characterize involvement as primarily home-based or school-based (e.g., Christenson & Sheridan, 2001). Such categories are useful because they represent relatively common but distinct sets of activities expected by schools and families in many public-school systems. Because home-school and public-school parents participate in relatively similar home-based involvement activities, this study focused on parents’ home-based involvement.

*Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes*

Student achievement, as measured by grades or standardized achievement tests, has often been correlated with parental involvement measures. Many researchers have reported positive relationships between involvement and such summary measures of achievement (i.e., Christenson, Rounds, & Gorney, 1992; Epstein, 1991; Fan & Chen, 2001; Jeynes, 2003, 2005, 2007; Singh et al., 1995) while others have found no relationship or a negative relationship between parents’ involvement and students’ achievement (i.e., Fan & Chen, 2001; Ford, 1989; Keith et al., 1986, Natriello & McDill, 1989; Reynolds, 1992; Storer, 1995). This pattern of mixed findings has suggested that student performance on summary measures of achievement may increase as a result of parental involvement (i.e., a positive correlation), and that parental involvement may increase as a result of poor child achievement (i.e., a negative correlation, as parents become more involved in order to support lagging achievement). Such apparently
bidirectional effects may cancel out positive correlations between involvement and summary measures of student achievement unless prior achievement is controlled for.

A large body of research, however, suggests that parental involvement may have its most direct and critical influence not on summary measures of achievement, but on student attributes that lead to achievement. As some researchers have suggested (e.g., Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Hoover-Dempsey, Battiato, Walker, Reed, DeJong, & Jones, 2001; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989), students’ development of such attributes that are important for learning and may mediate the relationship between parental involvement and more distal or summary measures of achievement and school success. Because student proximal achievement outcomes are likely more closely linked to parental involvement than are summary or distal measures of achievement, this study examines parental involvement in relation to selected proximal indicators of student achievement outcomes. (Another reason for examining proximal achievement outcomes in this study of parental involvement in home-school and public-school groups is that home-school students, unlike their public-school counterparts, are not required in all states in the U.S. to take state-mandated standardized tests of achievement tests [Boulter, 1999]).

The Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) model of parental involvement identified four student proximal achievement outcomes that: a) are susceptible to parental influence through involvement activities and b) are likely to be causally related to school success. I included three of the identified proximal learning outcomes in this study: academic self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation to learn, and self-regulatory strategy use (I did not include the fourth outcome included in the model, social self-efficacy for relating to teachers, because home- and public-school children likely have much different experiences of the construct).
Academic Self-Efficacy

Including academic self-efficacy among the proximal achievement outcomes linked to parental involvement and student achievement is consistent with Bandura’s (1997) work on the role of efficacy in human behavior. This work suggested that if a person believes that he or she can be successful, the person is more likely to continue performing in ways consistent with that belief. Academic self-efficacy includes beliefs about one’s abilities to complete schoolwork successfully (e.g., Ryan & Patrick, 2001; Schunk, 1991). In general, students with stronger academic self-efficacy (i.e., students who believe they have the ability to act in ways that produce valued academic outcomes) are likely to realize better performance in a variety of academic tasks than are students with poorer academic self-efficacy (e.g., Corno, 2000; Gutman & Midgley, 2000).

Intrinsic Motivation to Learn

In general, the construct refers to children’s interest in learning for its own sake, in contrast with learning for the external consequences or rewards it may yield (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Children’s development of intrinsic motivation for learning is influenced by patterns of parental behavior, and variations in motivation for learning have been associated with different patterns of school achievement (e.g., Baumrind, 1989; Ginsberg & Bronstein, 1993; Gottfried, Fleming, & Gottfried, 1998; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994).

Self-Regulatory Strategy Use

Varied investigators have defined self-regulation as a relatively wide-ranging set of cognitions, meta-cognitions, and behaviors that promote learning and developmental success (e.g., goal-setting, self-monitoring, evaluation of strategy effectiveness, adjustments in strategy use, active attention to and engagement in learning: Martinez-Pons, 1996; Schunk &
Zimmerman, 2003; Stipek & Gralinski, 1996). In the case of children’s school learning, self-regulatory strategy use pertains to their knowledge of and ability to use general tactics that support learning, including self-monitoring, structuring time and location for study, and asking for assistance when needed. Parental involvement behaviors have been linked to students’ knowledge and use of these self-regulatory strategies (e.g., Brody, Flor, & Gibson, 1999; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Walker & Hoover-Dempsey, 2006), and stronger self-regulatory skills have been associated with higher levels of school success (e.g., Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1988, 1990).

Purpose and Research Questions

This study examined the relationship among parents’ motivations for involvement in their children’s learning, parents’ home-based involvement activities and children’s proximal achievement outcomes first on the parents as a whole. This study also explored whether home-school and public-school parents and children had significantly different beliefs on these variables. Children and parents both completed measures at two time points in order to assess the influence of parental involvement on children’s proximal achievement outcomes while controlling for prior standing on those outcomes.

In order to examine these relationships, the home- and public-school parents were first examined as a whole. Three research questions were examined with the entire group of parents: (1) Are parents’ reports of personal (role activity beliefs, efficacy) and selected social-contextual motivators (invitations from the child, parental social network and social support) of involvement positively related to their home-based involvement (as reported by parents and children) and to student proximal achievement outcomes (as reported by parents and children)?
(2) Are parents’ social network connections and support related to other motivators of parental involvement, particularly role activity beliefs, in both home-school and public-school parent groups? (3) Do parents’ reports of home-based involvement predict student proximal achievement outcomes?

Finally, the home- and public-school parents were separated into their respective schooling group in order to examine the final research question: (4) Do home- and public-school parents have significantly different perceptions of these constructs?
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METHODS

Participants and Procedures

Participants included parent-student dyads from home-school and public-school settings. Home-school participants were recruited by email and postcard requests to those who agreed to be contacted again in a prior study (n = 100; response rate for this study 33%). Public-school participants were recruited through flyers left at local libraries, museums, and parent-support groups. Students and parents were assessed late in the spring semester (Time 1; n = 64), and again six months later, in the fall semester of the following school year (Time 2; n = 33). All students were in 4th through 7th grade at Time 1, and in 5th through 8th grade at Time 2.

A total of 64 parent-child dyads completed the survey at Time 1, including 30 public- and 34 home-school parents. Of these participants, a larger percentage of the home-school parents were self-reportedly of Caucasian/white ethnicity than public-school parents (74% v. 57%), home-school parents reported more children under the age of 19 currently living at home (for greater than 4 children; 25% v. 3%), and home- and public-school parents reported fairly equivalent family incomes per year (> 50k; 56% v. 60%). Half of the students were boys, and 39% of the students were in 4th grade, 23% were in 5th grade, 19% were in 6th grade, and 19% were in 7th grade.

Thirty-three of the original 64 participants again completed the survey at Time 2 (54% of the participants). Due to the small number of participants in each schooling group at Time 2, all analyses were conducted with the full group. Thus, home-school and public-school differences
were only explored at the first time point, whereas full group analyses were done at Time 1, Time 2, and with longitudinal analyses from Time 1 to Time 2.

**Measures**

Measures from prior research (Green & Hoover-Dempsey, 2007; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005), adapted from the parent involvement literature (e.g., Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler & Brissie, 1992; Walker, et al., 2005), or modified based on information derived from qualitative studies of home-schooling (e.g., Knowles, 1988; Van Galen, 1988) were used to gather information on all study constructs. All measures employed a 6-point Likert-type response scale, with higher scores indicating more frequent use of or more agreement with standings on the construct. All underwent face and content validity evaluations by a panel of five persons who have expert knowledge of the constructs being evaluated. Home-school and public-school families received the same survey. Alpha reliabilities were assessed for each scale for home-school, public-school, and all participants at Time 1 as well as for all participants at Time 2 (Table 1). Additionally, test-retest reliabilities were assessed (Table 2). All the correlations were significant and ranged from .35 to .79. Two of the smaller correlations (parent reported specific child invitations \( r = .35 \) and student reported parental home involvement \( r = .48 \)) were expected as they both relied on participants responding on someone else’s behavior. The questionnaire can be found in its entirety in Appendix A.
Table 1: Scale information, alphas reported here from Spring 2007 (Time 1) and Fall 2007 (Time 2) data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full group Alpha (N)</td>
<td>Full group Alpha (N)</td>
<td>Home-School Alpha</td>
<td>Public-school Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-reported Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Activity Beliefs</td>
<td>.73 (60)</td>
<td>.68 (33)</td>
<td>.74 (31)</td>
<td>.58 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.85 (62)</td>
<td>.85 (33)</td>
<td>.82 (32)</td>
<td>.82 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Invitations from the Child</td>
<td>.69 (64)</td>
<td>.76 (33)</td>
<td>.67 (34)</td>
<td>.73 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>.98 (47)</td>
<td>.95 (32)</td>
<td>.97 (30)</td>
<td>.93 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.92 (52)</td>
<td>.94 (32)</td>
<td>.93 (29)</td>
<td>.91 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>.55 (64)</td>
<td>.67 (33)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>.89 (53)</td>
<td>.89 (32)</td>
<td>.87 (29)</td>
<td>.90 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-reported Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>.67 (43)</td>
<td>.60 (28)</td>
<td>.68 (24)</td>
<td>.71 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>.91 (43)</td>
<td>.93 (28)</td>
<td>.90 (24)</td>
<td>.93 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Test-retest reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent-reported Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Activity Beliefs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Self-efficacy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Invitations from the Child</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-reported Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = p < 0.01; * = p < 0.05

**Personal Motivators of Involvement**

Measures for the two indicators of parents’ personal motivation for involvement were adapted from the model (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005; Walker et al., 2005) and related parental involvement literature and have been successfully used with both home-school (Green & Hoover-Dempsey, 2007) and public-school parents (Green et al., 2007; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 1992). The *Parental Role Activity Beliefs* (Green et al., 2007; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005) scale assessed parents’ beliefs about how active they should be in their students’ education. It included 10 items (sample: “I believe it is my responsibility to help my child with schoolwork”). *Self-Efficacy for Helping the Child Succeed in School* focused on parental beliefs
about personal ability to help the child learn and succeed in school (Green et al., 2007; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 1992). The scale included 7 items (sample: “I know how to help my child do well in school.”)

Parents’ Perceptions of Social Contextual Motivators

The Parental Perceptions of Specific Child Invitations to Involvement Scale (Walker et al., 2005) was used to assess parents’ perceptions of child invitations to involvement (e.g., explicit requests for parental help or engagement in school-related activities or for requests implicit in having difficulties with some learning tasks (5 items; sample: “My child asked me to help explain something about his or her homework.”). Items were adapted for use with home-school parents (e.g., “homework” was replaced with “daily learning activities”).

The Social Networks and Social Support Report was developed during the course of this study to assess parents’ perceptions of relevant social networks and the kinds of social support they received from network members. The measure was grounded in a definition of social networks as the structure of social relationships and social support as the function of social relationships (Dunkel-Schetter & Bennett, 1990). A total of 16 items asked parents about specific forms of social support they receive from social network members; the items were based on research about the kinds of social support often provided by social networks: emotional, instrumental, informational, and companionship support (Cauce et al., 1990; Langford et al., 1997). In assessing social support, the measure used a 5-point Likert-type response scale (1 = “never true” to 5 = “always true” response scale; sample item: “I can turn to [my support system] if I have concerns about my child’s education.”). This Likert-type response scale was used to evaluate social support. Once each social support scale item was completed, parents were asked to note the initials of people or organizations in their support systems who (or that) would fill
each of the specific types of support noted in each item. These answers were analyzed separately to evaluate one characteristic of social networks: average density.

Parents’ Home-based Involvement Activities

Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler’s (2005) scale was used to measure parent-reported engagement in a sample of home-based involvement activities, and adapted the scale slightly in creating the student-report version of the same scale. The scale included seven items (sample item: “Someone in my family kept an eye on my progress.”). The scale was adapted for use with public- and home-school parents and students (e.g., “school day” was replaced with “daily educational activities”).

Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes

Three proximal student achievement outcomes—academic self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation to learn, and self-regulatory strategy use—were assessed using measures reported by Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005). Individual measures of each component as well as the aggregate measure previously recorded satisfactory alphas for public-school parents and students (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005; Walker et al., under review). The scale was adapted for use with home-school parents and students (e.g., “homework problems” was replaced with “educational problems” in the parent scale, e.g., “My child goes back over educational problems he or she doesn’t understand;” in the student scale: “I go back over things I don’t understand.”)
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RESULTS

Results are presented in accordance with each research question. First I present descriptive statistics for each time point, and then I address each research question.

Descriptive Statistics

Time 1

A total of 64 parent-child dyads completed the survey at Time 1, including 30 public- and 34 home-school participants. Some participants did not complete all survey items, so the number of participants varied across scales. Descriptive statistics (including correlations, means, and standard deviations) are reported for all participants in Table 3. (Descriptive statistics for public-school participants and home-school participants at Time 1 are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively).
### Table 3: Descriptive statistics, all participants: Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49(**)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.27(*)</td>
<td>0.44(**)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.50(**)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>0.49(**)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.44(**)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specific Invitations from the Child</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.47(**)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.53(**)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Network</td>
<td>0.27(*)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Support</td>
<td>0.44(**)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33(*)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.47(**)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.57(**)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>0.50(**)</td>
<td>0.44(**)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.33(*)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.40(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valid N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. (mean)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. (mean)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = p < 0.01;  * = p < 0.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent-reported Scales</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Role Activity Beliefs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45(*)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parental Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specific Invitations from the Child</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.56(*)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Network</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.54(*)</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Support</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.53(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>0.45(*)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.54(*)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.53(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-reported Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.56(*)</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.53(*)</td>
<td>0.53(*)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| valid N | 29 | 30 | 30 | 22 | 18 | 24 | 19 | 19 |
| Min. (mean) | 3.29 | 3.14 | 1.75 | 0.93 | 3.07 | 2.70 | 2.60 | 2.90 |
| Max. (mean) | 5.57 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 4.40 | 6.00 | 5.90 | 6.00 | 5.65 |
| Mean       | 4.62 | 4.87 | 4.13 | 1.92 | 5.14 | 4.24 | 4.96 | 4.42 |
| SD         | 0.63 | 0.76 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 0.77 | 0.96 | 0.93 | 0.85 |
| Variance   | 0.39 | 0.58 | 1.03 | 1.189 | 0.59 | 0.91 | 0.86 | 0.73 |

** = p < 0.01;  * = p <0.05
Table 5: Descriptive statistics, home-school parents: Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent-reported Scales</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Activity Beliefs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.46(**)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.39(*)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.46(**)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.38(*)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.59(**)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Invitations from the Child</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.50(*)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.38(*)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>0.39(*)</td>
<td>0.59(**)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-reported Scales</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.50(*)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.57(**)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>valid N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. (mean)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. (mean)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = p < 0.01; * = p < 0.05
In general, parents across the combined group recorded strong personal motivations for parental involvement (role activity, M = 5.02/6.00 [sd = 0.69], parental efficacy for helping the child learn, M = 5.18/6.00 [0.72]), relatively strong student invitations to involvement (M = 4.26/6.00 [1.07]), strong social support beliefs (M = 5.31/6.00 [0.80]) and medium-level density of social networks (M = 3.26 [3.34]). Parents also described themselves as being very involved in their child’s education at home (M = 5.43/6.00 [0.61]) and reported that their children were relatively strong in proximal achievement attributes (M = 5.40/6.00 [0.83]). Students across the two groups, as true of their parents, reported that their parents were very involved in home-based educational activities related to their education (M = 5.02/6.00 [0.93]) and also reported relatively strong standing on proximal achievement attributes (M = 4.41/6.00 [0.76]).

**Time 2**

A total of 33 parent-child dyads (17 home-school, 16 public-school) from the first round of data collection completed the survey at Time 2. (The lower number of participants than anticipated at Time 2 precluded obtaining accurate scale alpha reliabilities for the two sub-groups at Time 2). Instead, the second round of data collection was used to evaluate research questions that could be examined using the entire dataset. In addition, some participants did not complete all items in the survey, so number of participants varied across scales. Descriptive statistics for the full group are reported in Table 6. Patterns of descriptive findings were generally quite similar across the two time points, as indicated by strong test-retest reliabilities (Table 2).
Table 6: Descriptive statistics, all participants: Time 2

Parent-reported Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Activity Beliefs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.52(**)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.61(**)</td>
<td>0.47(**)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.56(**)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.52(**)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.44(*)</td>
<td>0.66(**)</td>
<td>0.50(**)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Invitations</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.41(*)</td>
<td>0.67(**)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.60(**)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>0.61(**)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.38(*)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.40(*)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.47(**)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.41(*)</td>
<td>0.38(*)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Home-based</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.44(*)</td>
<td>0.66(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.75(**)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal</td>
<td>0.56(**)</td>
<td>0.66(**)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.40(*)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.67(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student-reported Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Home-based</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50(**)</td>
<td>0.60(**)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.75(**)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.67(**)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N                  | 33  | 33  | 33  | 32  | 32  | 33  | 32  | 28  | 28  |
Min. (mean)              | 3.57| 3.29| 1.50| 0.93| 2.33| 2.80| 2.90| 3.40| 2.90|
Max. (mean)              | 6.00| 6.00| 6.00| 8.67| 6.00| 6.00| 5.90| 6.00| 5.95|
Mean                     | 4.94| 5.27| 4.27| 2.90| 5.13| 5.30| 4.52| 5.14| 4.49|
SD                       | 0.59| 0.67| 1.15| 2.18| 0.86| 0.78| 0.74| 0.70| 0.85|
Variance                 | 0.35| 0.45| 1.33| 4.75| 0.73| 0.61| 0.55| 0.49| 0.72|

** = p < 0.01; * = p < 0.05
Results by Research Question

Research question 1: Are parental perceptions of personal and social-contextual motivators of involvement positively related to parent and student reports of parents’ home-based involvement and to parent and student reports of student proximal achievement outcomes?

Time 1

There were significant positive correlations between parent-reported invitations from the child and both parent-reported (r = .47, p < .01) and student-reported home-based parental involvement (r = .53, p < .01). There were also significant positive correlations between parent-reported efficacy (r = .44, p < .01), parent-reported role activity (r = .44, p < .01), parent-reported social support (r = .33, p < .05) and parent-reported student proximal achievement outcomes.

Hierarchical regression analyses using parents’ reports of personal and social contextual motivators as predictors of student-reported parental involvement suggested that parent-reported invitations from the child (β = .53; p < .01) emerged as the only significant variable in the prediction: F (1, 39) = 15.38, p < .01; Adj. R^2 = .28. Hierarchical regression analysis was then used with parents’ reports of personal and social contextual motivators as predictors of parent-reported parental involvement; results suggested that parent-reported invitations from the child (β = .43; p < .01) and parent-reported social support (β = .36; p < .05) were significant variables in the prediction: F (5, 39) = 5.49, p < .01; Adj. R^2 = .67.

Because there were no significant correlations between parental reports of personal and social-contextual motivators of involvement and student-reported proximal achievement outcomes, hierarchical regression was used to examine the contributions of parents’ reports of these personal and social-contextual motivators of involvement to parent-reported student
proximal achievement outcomes. Parent-reported role activity beliefs (β = .52; p < .01) was the only significant predictor of parent-reported student proximal achievement outcomes: F (1, 47) = 17.05, p < .01; Adj. R² = .25, although parent-reported efficacy approached significance (β = .28, p = .06).

Time 2

In general, findings at Time 1 were supported by Time 2 data. For example, there were significant positive correlations between student-reported parental involvement and parent-reported invitations from the child (r = .60, p < .01), as well as parent-reported efficacy (r = .50, p < .01). Parent-reported parental involvement was again predicted by parent-reported invitations from the child (r = .66, p < .01), as well as parent-reported efficacy (r = .44, p < .05). There were also significant positive correlations between parent-reported student proximal achievement outcomes and parent reports of parental efficacy (r = .66, p < .01), role activity beliefs (r = .56, p < .01), and social networks (r = .40, p < .05).

Hierarchical regression modeling using parents’ reports of personal and contextual motivators of involvement to predict student-reported parental involvement revealed that a significant portion of variance (F [3, 27] = 11.86, p < .01; Adj. R² = .55) was accounted for by parent-reported efficacy (β = .46, p < .01), parent-reported child invitations (β = .63, p < .01) and parent-reported social network (β = -.34, p < .05).

Hierarchical regression modeling using parents’ reports of personal and contextual motivators of involvement to predict parent-reported parental involvement revealed that a significant portion of variance was predicted (F [5, 26] = 7.49, p < .01; Adj. R² = .51), specifically by parent-reported child invitations (β = .68, p < .01). Parent-reported social network approached significance (β = -.32, p = .06).
Because there were no significant correlations between student-reported student proximal achievement and motivators of parental involvement, parent-reported student proximal achievement were used instead. A significant portion of variance in student-reported proximal achievement outcomes was predicted by the variables, \( F(1, 31) = 23.68, p < .01; \) Adj. \( R^2 = .42 \), however only one predictor, parent-reported efficacy (\( \beta = .66, p < .01 \)) was significant in the equation.

**Summary**

Results across Time 1 and 2 suggested that parent-reported invitations to involvement from the child were the strongest predictor of both student- and parent-reported home-based parental involvement. Parent-reported social support and parental self-efficacy for involvement also contributed to home-based parental involvement, varying from Time 1 to Time 2. Somewhat surprisingly, at Time 2, parent-reported social networks were a negative predictor of home-based parental involvement. When parent-reported student proximal achievement outcomes were examined, parental role activity and parental self-efficacy for involvement were associated with the outcome, varying from Time 1 to Time 2.

**Research question 2: Are parents’ social network and social support beliefs related to other motivators of involvement?**

**Time 1**

Consistent with expectations, there were strong positive correlations between parent-reported role activity beliefs and parent-reported social support (\( r = .44, p < .01 \)), as well as parent-reported social network density (\( r = .27, p < .05 \)) with the full group. However, there were
no significant correlations between social support and social networks or other motivators of involvement.

*Time 2*

Notably, there were strong positive correlations between parent-reported role activity beliefs and parent-reported social support (r = .47, p < .01), as well as parent-reported social networks and role activity (r = .61, p < .01). There was also a positive correlation between social support and parent-reported specific child invitations (social support: r = .41, p < .05).

*Summary*

In exploring whether parents’ social support and social networks (assessed by measures developed for this study) were related to other motivators of parental involvement, a positive relationship was found between both variables and parents’ role activity beliefs. This finding suggests a strong link between parents’ perceptions of their social support and networks, and their socially constructed role activity beliefs related to their involvement in their child’s education. At Time 2 there was also a significant relationship between parents’ social support and child invitations to involvement.

*Research question 3: Can reports of parental involvement be used to predict student proximal achievement outcomes?*

*Time 1*

Preliminary Time 1 analysis of data pertinent to this question suggested that student-reported proximal achievement outcomes were positively related (r = .44, p < .05) to student reports of parents’ involvement. Although parent- and student-reported parental involvement were positively related (r = .57, p < .01)—as were parent- and student-reported student proximal
achievement outcomes (r = .40, p < .01)—there was no significant correlation between parent-reported parental involvement and student-reported or parent-reported student proximal achievement outcomes. Hierarchical regression examining the ability of the full set of variables to predict student-reported proximal attributes indicated that a significant portion of the variance was accounted for (F [2, 42] = 12.67, p < .01; Adj. R² = .36) by student-reported parent involvement (β = .48, p < .01) and parent-reported child achievement outcomes (β = .44, p < .01).

Time 2

Again, the relationship between parental involvement and student-reported proximal achievement outcomes were explored. Student and parent reports of students’ proximal achievement outcomes were positively related (r = .67, p < .01), and parent and student reports of parental involvement were also positively related (r = .75, p < .01). However, no other correlations reached significance (this includes the correlation between student-reported parental involvement and parent-reported student proximal achievement outcomes). Hierarchical regression was then used to see whether student-reported proximal achievement outcomes could be predicted by parent-reported and student-reported parental involvement, and parent reported student proximal achievement outcomes. A significant portion of the variance was accounted for, but as expected based on the correlations, only parent-reported student proximal achievement outcomes was a significant predictor of student-reported proximal achievement outcomes (F [1, 27] = 21.03, p < .01; Adj. R² = .43; B = .67).

Longitudinal (Time 1 to Time 2)
The goal of including the longitudinal analyses was to determine whether parental involvement at Time 1 could predict student proximal achievement at Time 2, when controlling for Time 1 student proximal achievement (Figure 2).

\[ Y'_2 = B_{X1}X_1 + B_{Y1}Y_1 + B_0 \]

*Figure 2*: Cross-lagged estimation in the combined groups to predict achievement with reported parental involvement when controlling for prior achievement.

A total of 28 parent-child dyad participants completed measures over the two time periods. The hierarchical regression equation was significant (Adj. \( R^2 = .24 \), \( F[1, 24] = 8.75, p < .01 \)) but home-based parental involvement (as reported by the parent; \( B = -0.29, p = .11 \), partial correlation -0.33) did not significantly predict student-reported proximal achievement outcomes when student proximal achievement from Time 1 was entered into the equation (\( \beta = .53, p < .01 \)).

*Summary*

In sum, findings for this research question did not show a link between parent-reported home-based parental involvement and student-reported student proximal achievement outcomes. There were, however, significant relationships between parent- and student-reported parent involvement, and between parent- and student-reported student proximal achievement outcomes,
and at Time 1 student-reported home-based parent involvement was significantly positively related to student-reported student proximal achievement outcomes.

*Research question 4: Do home- and public-school parents have significantly different perceptions of these constructs?*

*Time 1*

Home- and public-school parents were compared using t-tests and Cohen’s d effect size estimates (see Table 7). Results suggested that home-school parents, when compared to their public-school counterparts, reported significantly stronger sense of efficacy for helping the child learn (M = 5.46 v. 4.87, d = .90), stronger role activity beliefs (5.39 v. 4.62, d = 1.33), and higher density of social network (4.24 v. 1.92, d = 0.73). Home-school parents, when compared to public-school parents, also viewed their children as having stronger student proximal achievement outcomes (4.71 v. 4.24, d = .58). Interestingly, however, differences between groups did not extend to student-reported data.

*Summary*

In sum, home- and public-school parents recorded significantly different perceptions of some parental involvement motivators as well as children’s proximal achievement outcomes. However, no significant differences emerged in parent perceptions of specific child invitations for involvement, nor were there differences in student perceptions of how involved parents were at home or in student reports of their proximal achievement outcomes.
Table 7: T-test and effect size comparisons by group (home- and public-school): Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means (SD)</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Cohen’s D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent-reported Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Activity Beliefs</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.39 (0.53)</td>
<td>5.13(**)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.62 (0.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.46 (0.54)</td>
<td>3.55(**)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.87 (0.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Invitations from the</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.38 (1.11)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.13 (1.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.24 (4.04)</td>
<td>2.62(*)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.92 (1.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.34 (0.80)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.04 (0.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.71 (0.66)</td>
<td>2.14(*)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.24 (0.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-reported Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Home-based Involvement</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.07 (0.94)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.96 (0.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Proximal</td>
<td>Home-school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.39 (0.70)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Outcomes</td>
<td>Public-school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.42 (0.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = p < 0.01;  * = p < 0.05
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study provides a positive contribution to both parental involvement and home-school research literature in several ways. First, the findings revealed that specific child invitations to involvement were a salient and positive predictor of home-based parental involvement for both public-school and home-school parents. This finding further extends applications of the first level of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (2005) model of parental involvement to home-school parents. Second, valid and reliable measures for social support and social networks were developed for this study, and further extended the parental involvement literature by enabling examination of each variable’s relative contributions to parental involvement and student proximal achievement outcomes. Third, the study explored relationships between parallel parent and student reports of parental involvement and student proximal achievement outcomes in a group of actively involved parents. Interesting differences between the constituent groups (home-school and public-school parents) in reports of motivations for involvement and perceptions of children’s proximal achievement outcomes; however, no significant between-group differences emerged in students’ reports of parent’s home-based involvement, nor were differences found in student perceptions of their proximal achievement outcomes.

In the paragraphs below I summarize and discuss results in more detail. First, however, it must be noted that there were some limitations to this study. For example, the results should be viewed in the light of the fact that they pertain to a relatively small dataset and there may have
been mono-method bias due to the use of survey measures. The latter in particular limited both the range of constructs measured and participants’ options for responding. In addition, both samples of parents were comprised of apparently highly active and highly involved parents; the findings therefore may not be generalizable to home-school or public-school parents as a whole. Nonetheless, the study yielded some interesting findings, which are explored further below.

One research question focused on model-based motivators of parental involvement and parents’ home-based involvement in their children’s schooling. In general, the pattern of findings for predictors of home-based involvement was consistent with previous research on public-school parents (e.g., Green et al., 2007) and home-school parents (Green & Hoover-Dempsey, 2007). Specifically, parents’ reports of efficacy for helping the child succeed in school and parents’ reports of specific invitations to involvement from the child predicted students’ reports of their parents’ involvement. In other words, students perceived their parents to be actively involved in their education when their parents recorded relatively high efficacy for helping their children learn and perceived that their children requested or needed their help.

At the second time point, parent-reported social network was negatively associated with student-reports of parents’ home-based involvement; one might surmise that students whose parents have larger and more dense social networks may access more support-system help for the child and thus be perceived by their children as being somewhat less actively involved themselves.

It was also a goal of this study to explore the relationship between social networks and social support as they relate to role activity beliefs and other motivators of involvement. Results pointed to a strong link between role activity beliefs and both social support and social networks, for both home- and public-school parents. While this question was exploratory in this study, the
link suggests that future research should further explore the depth and functions of social networks and social support in shaping parents’ active role construction for involvement in their children’s education. Because home- and public-school parents exhibited different strengths in reports of their role construction for involvement, it might be useful to further explore these relationships with in-depth interviews in both groups of parents.

One of the most interesting findings of this study pertains to identified differences between home- and public-school parents. Results from the first round of data collection suggested that home-school parents, when compared to their public-school counterparts, reported significantly stronger efficacy, role activity beliefs, and social network beliefs; in addition, they reported more positive perceptions of their children’s proximal achievement attributes. The differences between the two groups, however, did not extend to student-reported data, suggesting that differences between the two groups lie primarily with the parents and not the children. While caution should be used in interpreting a null result, this does suggest a possibly fruitful avenue of further research. Specifically, public discussion often seems to assume home-school children are different than public-school children; this has led, for example, to research on differences between the two groups in achievement (e.g., Rudner, 1999), and social skills (e.g., Medlin, 2000). However, the most important difference might not lie within the children, but rather in the parents who make the school choice decision. Other possible reasons for this result, of course, might include the possibility that home-school participants in this study had higher achieving students than might be seen in the full home-school population. Although demographic data on home-school parents participating in this study are fairly consistent with national statistics describing home-schooling families (e.g., Princlotta, Bielick, & Chapman, 2004), this remains a possibility. In addition, home-school parents may be more inclined to respond favorably to
questions regarding their child’s proximal achievement outcomes than was true of public-school parents; this may be so because there is often less support in the general community for the choice to home-school and, perhaps, and a strong desire on the part of these parents to show home-schooling in a favorable light.

Results also revealed significant positive relationships between motivators of parental involvement and student proximal achievement outcomes. Specifically, parent-reported child proximal attributes were related to parents’ role activity beliefs and parents sense of efficacy for helping the child learn. No links were found between student-reported proximal achievement outcomes and parent-reported predictors of involvement; this was not a surprising finding, however, as Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (2005) model of the parental involvement process that there are other important sets of variables between parents’ motivations for becoming involved and children’s performance on varied indicators of child achievement.

Finally, this study sought to predict student proximal achievement outcomes with parental involvement after controlling for prior student achievement using a cross-lagged panel design. Results suggested significant relationships between student-reported parental involvement and student proximal achievement outcomes, and significant relationships as well as between parent-reported parental involvement and student proximal achievement outcomes. The two findings suggest strong links between what parents and children see each other doing. The failure to find a significant relationship between parental involvement and student achievement outcomes when controlling for prior achievement was disappointing, but likely in part due to small sample size during the second round of data collection. If the effect of predicting child achievement with home-based involvement is a small (but positive), as previous research suggests (e.g., Christenson, Rounds, & Gorney, 1992; Epstein, 1991; Fan & Chen, 2001; Singh...
et al., 1995), a much larger sample size is likely needed to have enough power to pick up on the effect. These observations do point to replication with a larger sample size.

Results of the study overall hold several implications for research and practice. First, the findings suggest that the model constructs of parental self-efficacy and specific invitations from the child are useful in predicting home-based parental involvement among active public-school and home-school parents. This finding supports research suggesting that the model can be applied to understanding a wide variety of parents and settings for children’s education. Results also suggest the usefulness of including social support and social networks as a motivator of parental involvement. Because the social support and social network scales were designed specifically for this study, it would also be useful in future research to further examine the psychometric properties of the scales.

Second, results from this study also have implications for increasing the incidence and effectiveness of parental involvement among both public-school and home-school families. Because the participants in this study appeared to be highly active parents, the results also suggest that public schools can increase the incidence and effectiveness of parental involvement by implementing interventions that target parental self-efficacy and specific child invitations. Likewise, home-school support groups could strive to support self-efficacy beliefs and specific child invitations in efforts to strengthen home-based parent-child learning activities. Both groups could strive to ensure that parents have a diverse and large social networks, offering varied types of social support (for example, parent information, support and training opportunities in order to enhance parental involvement in the home).

In sum, the study’s results suggest that active home- and public-school parents are strongly motivated to be involved in home-based activities by the belief that their involvement
will help their children and by specific invitations to involvement from their children. Parent’s beliefs about playing active roles in supporting their children’s education—and their perceptions of their social support and social networks—played a somewhat smaller role in supporting parents’ home-based parental involvement. Although parent-reported home-based involvement was not found predictive of student-reported proximal achievement outcomes when controlling for prior proximal achievement, future research should further explore this issue with a larger sample size.
APPENDIX

A. Parental Involvement Questionnaire

Parental Involvement Survey Round 2

1. Consent Form

1. Dear Parent:

Hi! My name is Christa Green, and I am student at Vanderbilt University. I am asking you to participate in a research study on home-based parental involvement practices in children’s education. This research is being completed for my dissertation.

You are being asked to complete a 30 minute survey on parental involvement and child learning beliefs, and to allow your 4th – 8th grade child to complete a short (10 minute) version of the same survey immediately after you complete your portion of the survey.

In addition, we are asking to be allowed to contact you via email in approximately 6 months so that you and your child may fill out the same survey again. You and your child’s responses will be completely confidential. No one will be able to connect you to the responses on the questionnaire, your name will not be on the questionnaire. Your email will only be retained for this study in order to ask you to fill out the survey again, and these emails will be destroyed after the study has been completed.

We hope the approximately 40 minutes it takes you and your child to complete the questionnaire is only a minor inconvenience. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions. The “right” answer is what is true for you. The only disadvantage to you if you choose to participate is that you might decide your time might better be spent doing something else. If you start to fill out the Questionnaire and decide you don’t want to continue, you may stop at any time. We hope that the information we gain about parental involvement and children learning beliefs will outweigh any cost to you in this study.

If you decide while filling out the survey that you would not like to participate in the study, you may simply stop filling out the survey. Incomplete questionnaires will not be included. If you decide to withdraw from the study after completing the survey at any point, please contact Christa Green (email: christa.l.green@vanderbilt.edu, ph# 615-322-8387). In the event new information becomes available that may affect the risks or benefits associated with this research study or your willingness to participate in it, you will be notified so that you can make an informed decision whether or not to continue your participation in this study.

Contact Information. If you should have any questions about this research study, please feel free to contact Christa Green at 615-322-8387 or my Faculty Advisor, Kathleen V. Hoover-Dempsey at 615-322-8141.
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For additional information about giving consent or your rights as a participant in this study, please feel free to contact the Vanderbilt University Institutional Review Board Office at (615) 322-2918 or toll free at (866) 224-8273.

STATEMENT BY PERSON AGREING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY
I have read this informed consent document and the material contained in it has been explained to me. All my questions have been answered, and I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. By clicking on the agree button below, you are indicating your willingness to participate in this research. Additionally, you are giving your child permission to complete the online survey. Please print off a copy of this page before continuing.

This research is being conducted at Vanderbilt University by Christa L. Green. Study Title: Linking Parental Involvement Beliefs and Achievement in Different Educational Settings. Revision Date: 1/8/07

☐ Agree

2. Motivations for Involvement

When responding, please think about your 4th - 7th grade child and the current school year.

* 2. Do you...
☐ Home-school
☐ Public School

3. My child asked me to explain something about his or her homework/schoolwork.
☐ never ☐ 1 or 2 times this year ☐ 4 or 5 times this year ☐ once a month ☐ 1 or 2 times a week ☐ daily

4. My child asked me to help with his or her homework/schoolwork.
☐ never ☐ 1 or 2 times this year ☐ 4 or 5 times this year ☐ once a month ☐ 1 or 2 times a week ☐ daily

5. My child asked me to attend a special event related to school or schoolwork.
☐ never ☐ 1 or 2 times this year ☐ 4 or 5 times this year ☐ once a month ☐ 1 or 2 times a week ☐ daily
### Parental Involvement Survey Round 2

6. My child asked me to help out at the school or with school-related work.
   - □ never
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 1 or 2 times a week
   - □ 1 or 2 times this month
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 4 or 5 times this month
   - □ 4 or 5 times this year
   - □ once a month
   - □ once a week
   - □ daily

7. Someone in this family talks with my child about the school day/ school-related work.
   - □ never
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 1 or 2 times a week
   - □ 1 or 2 times this month
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 4 or 5 times this month
   - □ 4 or 5 times this year
   - □ once a month
   - □ once a week
   - □ daily

8. Someone in this family supervises my child’s homework.
   - □ never
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 1 or 2 times a week
   - □ 1 or 2 times this month
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 4 or 5 times this month
   - □ 4 or 5 times this year
   - □ once a month
   - □ once a week
   - □ daily

9. Someone in this family reads with this child.
   - □ never
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 1 or 2 times a week
   - □ 1 or 2 times this month
   - □ 1 or 2 times this year
   - □ 4 or 5 times this month
   - □ 4 or 5 times this year
   - □ once a month
   - □ once a week
   - □ daily

10. Someone in this family practices spelling, math, or other skills with my child.
    - □ never
    - □ 1 or 2 times this year
    - □ 1 or 2 times a week
    - □ 1 or 2 times this month
    - □ 1 or 2 times this year
    - □ 4 or 5 times this month
    - □ 4 or 5 times this year
    - □ once a month
    - □ once a week
    - □ daily

11. Someone in this family helps my child study for tests.
    - □ never
    - □ 1 or 2 times this year
    - □ 1 or 2 times a week
    - □ 1 or 2 times this month
    - □ 1 or 2 times this year
    - □ 4 or 5 times this month
    - □ 4 or 5 times this year
    - □ once a month
    - □ once a week
    - □ daily

### 3. Motivations for Involvement 2

Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each of the following statements. Please think about the current school year as you consider each statement.

12. I know how to help my child do well in school.
    - □ Disagree very strongly
    - □ Disagree
    - □ Disagree just a little
    - □ Agree just a little
    - □ Agree
    - □ Agree very strongly

13. I don’t know if I’m getting through to my child.
    - □ Disagree very strongly
    - □ Disagree
    - □ Disagree just a little
    - □ Agree just a little
    - □ Agree
    - □ Agree very strongly

14. I don’t know how to help my child make good grades.
    - □ Disagree very strongly
    - □ Disagree
    - □ Disagree just a little
    - □ Agree just a little
    - □ Agree
    - □ Agree very strongly

15. I feel successful about my efforts to help my child learn.
    - □ Disagree very strongly
    - □ Disagree
    - □ Disagree just a little
    - □ Agree just a little
    - □ Agree
    - □ Agree very strongly

16. Other children have more influence on my child’s grades than I do.
    - □ Disagree very strongly
    - □ Disagree
    - □ Disagree just a little
    - □ Agree just a little
    - □ Agree
    - □ Agree very strongly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Involvement Survey Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. I don’t know how to help my child learn.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. I make a significant difference in my child’s school performance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. I know about educational activities outside of the home.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. I know how to plan special learning events for my child.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. I know effective ways to contact teachers or parents about learning related issues.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22. I know how to communicate effectively with my child about his/her learning.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23. I know how to explain things to my child about his or her schoolwork.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24. I know enough about the subjects of my child’s schoolwork to help him or her.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25. I have enough time and energy to communicate with my child about his/her learning.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26. I have enough time and energy to involve my child with educational activities outside the home.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27. I have enough time and energy to communicate with other parents or teachers about school related topics.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Disagree very strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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28. I have enough time and energy to help my child with schoolwork.
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

29. I have enough time and energy to supervise my child’s schoolwork.
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

4. Motivations for Involvement

30. It’s my job to explain tough assignments to my child
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

31. I make sure my child’s schoolwork gets done
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

32. I make curriculum-related decisions when I can.
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

33. It’s my job to make sure my child understands his or her assignments
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

34. I find it helpful to talk to teachers or parents about education-related issues.
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

35. It’s important to talk to other parents or teachers about things that concern my child.
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

36. I believe it’s my responsibility to participate in educational support groups or organizations.
   - Disagree very strongly
   - Disagree
   - Disagree just a little
   - Agree just a little
   - Agree
   - Agree very strongly

5. Social support

Your support systems include the people and organizations that help you during your involvement with your child’s education. I am going to ask you about support you receive during your regular home-based involvement in your child’s education.

1. Please write down the initials of everyone you can think of that provides the support that is asked about in EACH individual question. (If you write down two people with the same initials, please change the initials slightly so that I know you mean two different people, not the same person.) The same person can be written down for multiple items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. I know [ ] would help out if I start to feel overwhelmed with my involvement in my child’s education</td>
<td>Never true, Rarely true, Occasionally true, Sometimes true, Generally true, Always true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. [ ] is positive about the ways I am involved in my child’s education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I feel like [ ] is as involved in their child’s education as I am in mine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I feel like [ ] support my involvement decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. [ ] approval of my involvement in my child’s education is very important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. [ ] helps out if I need them to do practical things (e.g., watch after the children or help with housework) that support my involvement in my child’s education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. [ ] helps me with involvement in my child’s education (e.g., helps me if I have questions about schoolwork, is involved when I’m not.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I can ask [ ] if I need more information about my child’s education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
53. I can check in with [ ] to see if they have information that might affect my involvement in my child’s education. |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
54. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
55. I know [ ] would contact me if they have information about my child’s education. |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
56. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
57. I can get good ideas about involvement strategies or activities from [ ]. |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
58. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
59. Thanks to [ ], I feel like I have enough information about my child’s education. |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
60. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
61. I can turn to [ ] if I have concerns about my child’s education. |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
62. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
63. I can tell [ ] when I have a good idea about involvement strategies or activities. |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
64. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
65. [ ] can ask me when they have questions about their involvement in their child’s education. |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
66. | Never true | Rarely true | Occasionally true | Sometimes true | Generally true | Always true |
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Please think about whether you have seen your child doing the following activities during the current school year as you consider each statement.

67. My child gives up when homework is hard.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

68. My child seems confident when learning new topics.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

69. My child tries to finish hard problems before asking for help.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

70. My child tries to understand how to solve his or her homework problems.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

71. My child looks for more information about school subjects.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

72. My child wants to learn new things about school subjects.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

73. My child double-checks his or her homework for mistakes.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

74. My child goes back over homework problems he or she doesn’t understand.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

75. My child finds a place that makes it easier for him or her to do homework/schoolwork.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

76. My child asks someone at home for help if he or she has problems with homework.
- [ ] Disagree very strongly
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Disagree just a little
- [ ] Agree just a little
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Agree very strongly

### 7. Demographics

Almost done! When you’re done answering these questions, please hit next, and ask your child to fill out his or her portion of the questionnaire. Many thanks!
77. Please enter your email address, so that we may send you the same survey in about 6 months. I promise no one besides myself will see your email address, and I will delete it after you fill out the second survey. Thanks!

78. Gender:
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

79. Your Race/Ethnicity:
   ○ Asian/Asian-American
   ○ Black/African-American
   ○ Hispanic/Hispanic-American
   ○ White/Caucasian
   ○ Other

80. How many children (under the age of 19) live at home?

81. On average, how many hours per week do you work outside of the house?

82. Your level of education (please select highest level completed):
   ○ less than high school
   ○ high school or GED
   ○ some college, 2-year college or vocational
   ○ bachelor's degree
   ○ some graduate work
   ○ master's degree
   ○ doctoral degree

83. Your spouse or partner's level of education (please select highest level completed):
   ○ no spouse/partner
   ○ less than high school
   ○ high school or GED
   ○ some college, 2-year college or vocational
   ○ bachelor's degree
   ○ some graduate work
   ○ master's degree
   ○ doctoral degree

84. On average, how many hours does your spouse or partner work per week outside of the house?
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85. Family income per year:
- less than $5,000
- $5,001-$10,000
- $10,001-$20,000
- $20,001-$30,000
- $30,001-$40,000
- $40,001-$50,000
- over $50,001

86. Thanks! This ends the parent portion of the survey. Please let me know in the lines below if you have any questions or comments about the survey.

8. Student Survey

This portion of the survey is for 4th - 8th grade students. Thanks!

* 87. Dear Student:

Hi! My name is Christa Green. I am a student at Vanderbilt University, and I study ways in which parents are involved in their kid’s education. To help us learn about this, I am asking you and your parents to answer a survey. I have already asked your parents to fill out a survey.

Your parent has already agreed to let you fill out the survey. If it’s okay with you, we would like for you to answer some questions about your parents’ involvement in your education. Even though your parents said you could participate in our study if you want to, you don’t have to; you can decide that you do not want to answer our questionnaire and not fill it out. Nobody will be mad at you if you don’t want to participate.

If you decide you do want to fill out the survey, your answers will be completely confidential (we will not know how you answered the questions). No one will ever connect you to your responses on the survey. No one other than the researchers will see what you wrote or how you answered. Even the researchers won’t know what you answered; they will just know that one of the students who completed the Questionnaire answered the questions this way.

Do you have any questions about what I am going to ask you to do today? If you do, please ask your parents to contact me with the information below. If you do not have any questions, click the agree button below. Please remember that there is no right or wrong answer to any question on the survey; the best answer is always the
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one that is true for you.

Thank you!

---

This research is being conducted at Vanderbilt University by Christa L. Green. Study Title: Linking Parental Involvement Beliefs and Achievement in Different Educational Settings. Revision Date: 1/8/07

---

### 9. Student Survey

Families do many different things when they help children with school. There are no right or wrong answers when answering the following questions. Thanks!

**88. I am in the:**

- [] 4th grade
- [] 5th grade
- [] 6th grade
- [] 7th grade
- [] 8th grade

**89. I am a:**

- [] boy
- [] girl
### Parental Involvement Survey Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90. Someone in my family talks with me about the school day.</td>
<td>never 1 or 2 times this year 4 or 5 times this year once a month 1 or 2 times a week daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Someone in my family supervises my homework/schoolwork.</td>
<td>never 1 or 2 times this year 4 or 5 times this year once a month 1 or 2 times a week daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Someone in my family practices spelling, math, or other skills with me.</td>
<td>never 1 or 2 times this year 4 or 5 times this year once a month 1 or 2 times a week daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Someone in my family reads with me.</td>
<td>never 1 or 2 times this year 4 or 5 times this year once a month 1 or 2 times a week daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Someone in my family helps me study for tests.</td>
<td>never 1 or 2 times this year 4 or 5 times this year once a month 1 or 2 times a week daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. I give up when homework is hard.</td>
<td>disagree very strongly disagree disagree just a agree just a little agree agree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. I am confident about learning new topics in school.</td>
<td>disagree very strongly disagree disagree disagree just a agree just a little agree agree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. I try to finish hard problems before asking for help.</td>
<td>disagree very strongly disagree disagree disagree just a agree just a little agree agree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. I try to understand how to solve my homework problems.</td>
<td>disagree very strongly disagree disagree disagree just a agree just a little agree agree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. I look for more information about school subjects.</td>
<td>disagree very strongly disagree disagree disagree just a agree just a little agree agree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. I want to learn new things about school subjects.</td>
<td>disagree very strongly disagree disagree disagree just a agree just a little agree agree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. I double-check my homework for mistakes.</td>
<td>disagree very strongly disagree disagree disagree just a agree just a little agree agree very strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>102. I go back over homework problems I don’t understand.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103. I find a place that makes it easier for me to do homework.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>104. I ask someone at home for help if I have problems with homework.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>105. I try new ways to do schoolwork when I am having a hard time.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>106. I am interested in schoolwork.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>107. I stick with a problem until I solve it.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>108. I follow the teacher’s (or my parent’s) directions.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>109. I can explain what I think about school.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>110. I work hard on homework.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>111. I organize my homework.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>112. I check my homework as I go along.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>113. I have a good attitude about my homework.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Disagree very strongly</td>
<td>( ) Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. I keep trying when I get stuck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Disagree very strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Disagree just a little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Agree just a little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Agree very strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. THANK YOU!

That's it! Thanks so much for filling out the survey.
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