Reconceptualizing Parental Involvement: Looking through the Eyes of the Beholder

Nathanie Lee

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Masters of Education

University of Washington

2014

Committee:

Susan B. Nolen, Chair

Ann Ishimaru

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Education

University of Washington

Abstract

Reconceptualizing Parental Involvement: Looking through the Eyes of the Beholder

Nathanie Lee

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Dr. Susan B. Nolen
College of Education

When a number of studies evaluated the benefits of parental involvement on student achievement and motivation, several legislative acts pushed for schools to be more accountable in their efforts to improve partnerships with parents. Parental involvement has been traditionally measured by how or how often parents are present in the schools, their communication with teachers, or their involvement in school or community-based decisions. These definitions, however, do not consider the voices of the parents who may not have the time or financial resources to be present in the schools, nor do they consider the different ways in which some parents conceptualize their involvement in their children's education. This literature review is two-fold: The purpose is to review and evaluate the research on parental involvement and student motivation as an outcome. In doing so, the ways that parental involvement are defined and measured are assessed. The

second purpose is to look at additional studies of how those definitions afford or do not afford

the involvement of diverse families and to move toward a direction of further study that

considers the implications of parental involvement practices that are not always seen in our

classroom.

Introduction

When Aristotle quoted that "the whole should be greater than the sum of its parts." (as cited in Garbarino, 1992, p.45) this was viewed as a way to describe natural systems and how their properties should be viewed as a collection of parts; the systems functioned as wholes and could not be fully understood solely by their individual components (Oshby, 2008). In the context of education, there are many functioning parts or persons that play a role in educating a child. People have their individual roles that contribute to the development of the child; the parent nurtures the child in the home by providing the essentials for safety and good health, likewise teachers play a role in teaching the child, and peers may provide socialization and play. Each child grows with individuals who aid in the construction of their identity and development. While each player has an integral role, their impact as a collective is what drives the child forward in their development.

Parental involvement has been defined in several ways. Several studies defined parent involvement following Epstein's (1995) model of parental involvement. Epstein's (1995) model consisted of six dimensions of how teachers encourage parents to be involved: (1) parenting, (2) obligation of the schools, (3) parental and community involvement, (4) provision of learning activities in the home, (5) participation in school decision-making, and (6) collaboration with the community. Several other models of parent involvement have also been identified. Davies' (1985) conceptualized parental involvement into four categories: 1) co-production or partnerships between the school and families, (2) decision making, 3) citizen advocacy, and 4) parent choice. Chrispeels (1991) model of parent involvement has a hierarchical structure with co-communication being the basis for other types of involvement components: (1) involving parents as partners in school governance, (2) establishing effective two-way communication, (3)

respecting the differing needs of families, (4) establishing strategies for programmatic structures

to enable parents to participate, (5) providing support and coordination for staff and parents to

implement and sustain appropriate parent involvement from K-12, and (6) using schools to

connect students and families with community resources that provide educational enrichment

and support. Because there has been a lack of a clear operational definition of parent

involvement, many researchers have argued for a multi-dimensional approach to understanding

parent involvement, as the aforementioned models have shown (Epstein, 1995; Grolnick &

Slowiaczek, 1994). Some aspects of parental involvement have had differential effects on

different constructs of student motivation. Izzo et al. (1999) found that when parents were

frequently engaged in school activities, students reported to be more engaged in school activities,

but engagement was reported to be less when parents initiated contact with the school. Grolnick

& Slowiaczek (1994) also found that not all dimensions of parental involvement necessarily

resulted in increased motivation, demonstrating a need for further exploration of how the

different dimensions of parental involvement influence student motivation. Some of these

dimensions as well as others in the following review are studied in terms of their effectiveness as

contributors to student motivation.

Purpose of the Review

The purpose of this review is two-fold: the first purpose is to review the research on how

different dimensions of parental involvement are defined and related to constructs of student

motivation, and the second purpose is to look at how those dimensions afford or do not afford the

involvement of diverse cultural groups.

Organization of the Review

The reviewed articles indicate several constructs related to the effects of parent involvement on student motivation: intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, locus of control/competence/self-concept, engagement, and goal-orientation. In the first section of this review, a historical context of how the importance of parental involvement came to fruition is provided. Next, a theoretical model is discussed to provide a basis for this review. Each of the constructs of motivation will then be addressed with a look at the research that supports the relationship between some of the different dimensions of parent involvement and student motivation. The second section of this review will address those dimensions as defined by the reviewed literature and will also address additional literature that reconceptualizes parental involvement and how those conceptualizations afford or do not afford student achievement and motivation in diverse cultural groups. The final section discusses why different variables or dimensions of parental involvement may be further studied in continued research.

Historical Context

It was as early as the beginning of the 19th century that the ideal of schools and families working together became prevalent. The school community and parents had control over decisions of the school, such as deciding the school calendar as well as having a say in developing the school curriculum (Epstein, 1986). As teaching became more recognized as a profession in the early 20th century, separate tasks and responsibilities were delegated to parents and teachers, with the premise that teachers had the specific skills and knowledge to educate children, and parents were not qualified to contribute when issues pertained to curriculum and instruction. With this, parents began to put more responsibilities on the school; they had

acknowledged that the school was to educate their children to be responsible and democratic citizens while the parents' job was to support the school in this task. In accordance with this view, teachers also saw their job as one of education while parents should be supportive of the teachers and the school. A clear line of delineation between the family and school became more transparent at this time. In the 1960's, research on parent involvement came to the forefront and attention of the education community. Diana Baumrind (1967, 1971) studied the effects of parenting styles on preschool children's behaviors noting that when parents took on a more authoritative parenting style, one of warmth and structure, their children were more motivated and achievement-oriented in their school settings. In addition to Baumrind's (1967, 1971) study was Mildred Smith's (1968) study where she introduced changes to the prevailing relationships between families and schools. Smith's (1968) study was to see if low-income minority student's grades could improve due to (1) restoring the family with the responsibility of teaching the child, (2) giving the family ownership and pride as the child's teacher, and (3) bringing the child's significant others-the parent and teacher-together as partners in the child's learning process. Teachers elicited help from the families, and parents were asked to do a number of things: provide a quiet period in the home for reading and study, listen to the child read and read in front of them, ask them questions, be sure they were prepared for school, and to participate in the homework process. Teachers were asked to provide books and dictionaries for the children, and limit the assignments so that parents could participate. Teachers were also provided with support in the classroom so that time could be given to the children. This study, though limited in results pertaining to data on some of the activities, roles that each person played, and relations between the parents and teachers, helped define factors that influence the capacity of the parent and teacher to help the child when they work in concert. Central to this research and the proceeding

research is the understanding that the parent is the child's first and best teacher. Federal and state governments took notice of the positive outcomes of parent involvement as a way to improve the educational outcomes for students, especially those who were poor and underachieving. Being spurred on by the widening achievement gap and the alarming differences in the educational achievement of ethnically diverse students, federal legislation mandated parent involvement in schools. The passing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA, 1965) was one of the first linking parent involvement to education. Parent involvement, in this legislative act, was defined as:

"the participation of parents in regular, two-way meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school-related activities including ensuring that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning; that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child; and that their other activities are carried out, such as those described in section 118 of the ESEA (Parent Involvement)" [Sec 910 (32.EA].

In attempts to push for parent involvement, Goals 2000: Education America Act of 1994 tried its hand at promoting parent-school partnerships. In goal 8 of the legislation, it states that "by year 2000, every school will promote partnerships that increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children." (Sec. 102, 8, A). The objectives of this goal were threefold: (1) that every state develop policies to assist local schools and local educational agencies to establish programs for increasing partnerships that respond to the varying needs of parents and the home, including parents of children who are disadvantaged, or bilingual, or parents of children with disabilities, (2) every school would

actively engage parents and families in a partnership which supports the academic work of children at home and shared educational decision-making at school, and (3) that parents and families would help to ensure that schools are adequately supported and would hold schools and teachers to high standards of accountability (P.L. 103-227).

When the No Child Left Behind Act was passed in 2002 (NCLB, 2002), the ESEA was reauthorized to set benchmarks and goals for closing the achievement gap recognized in its initial passage in 1965. Along with this, Title I of the act provided allocation of federal funding to designated low-income schools with the goal of increasing test scores and prompting academic development to escape poverty. Section 1118, the parent involvement section of Title I made family involvement a priority by supporting partnerships between families and schools. There were three provisions to strengthen parent involvement: (1) schools having a parent involvement policy developed by school districts and parents, and by schools and parents, (2) having schools and parent compacts that identified shared responsibilities for high student performance, and lastly, (3) training to build school and parent capacity for involvement, including literacy and parenting education.

No Child Left Behind and the reauthorization of the ESEA of 1965 was based on four principles that provided a framework through which families, educators, and communities could work together to improve teaching and learning: (1) accountability for the results, (2) local control and flexibility, (3) expanded parent choice, and (4) effective and successful programs that would reflect scientifically based research (NCLB, 2002).

Parent improvement provisions within Title I have stressed the importance of accountability between schools and parents for high achievement. In doing so, they have

expanded public school choices and supplemental educational services for eligible children in low-performing schools and have pushed for the local development of parent-involvement plans with flexibility to address local needs. There has also been the need to build parents' capacity using effective practices to improve their own children's academic development.

Parent organizations, such as the nationally-known Parent Teacher Association have noted that effective parent improvement programs include activities that address the following six standards: (1) communication is two-way and meaningful, (2) parenting and parenting skills are promoted and supported, (3) parents play an integral role in student learning, (4) parents are welcome in the school for support and assistance through volunteering, (5) parents participate in school-decision making and advocacy, and (6) parents collaborate with the community (National PTA, 1997).

The focus and premise of this legislation has been that practices be empirically based. Practices for involving parents must be "based on the most current research that meets the highest professional and technical standards, on effective parental involvement, and on effective parental involvement that fosters achievement to high standards for all children (ESEA, NCLB, Section 111.d)."

Past and current legislation has inevitably shaped the dynamics and relationships between families and schools, emphasizing the necessity for a marriage of school and family practices that benefit the child. The standards and measures they have encouraged and pushed for in the schools pave the way for accountability on behalf of the teachers and parents, but there is still much to be questioned when it comes to the effective practice of parental involvement and building authentic relationships with families.

Theoretical Framework

The framework for this review is based on the work of Urie Bronfenbrenner and his Ecological Systems Model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). This model holds an ecological approach to human development, placing the individual in a position that is influenced by social experiences and their environment. This influence and interaction between the individual and their environment forms the basis by which they develop, perceive, and act on the world (Garbarino, 1982). The Ecological Model places the individual's development as being reflective of five environmental systems: the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Each of the systems are embedded in each other and each has a bidirectional influence upon the others. This model acknowledges that an individual affects or is affected by the environments in which they spend time. It also places our attention on the individual's development in relation to their immediate and distal cultural environment.

In the context of this paper, the individual on whom we place the focus is the child. The child's most important setting is within their home with their family or extended family. It is within this setting that we ideally assume the child is safe and nurtured by their family, where they are taken care of physically, mentally, and emotionally. It is also within this setting that we assume the child's basic, inherent needs are met by those in his or her immediate living environment. This intimate make-up of the child's environment is the child's microsystem. This microsystem is where the child inhabits and includes the people who live with them; it also includes the activities they do together. One of the most important forces of development within this microsystem includes the relationships that take place in it. Bronfenbrenner (1979) describes two-person interactions as dyadic relationships. In the microsystem, you may see multiple dyadic relationships between either parent and the child, or a grandparent and the child.

Also included within the child's microsystem could be the school or the child's neighborhood. In those settings, one might observe the interaction between a teacher and the child, or a youth worker and the child. The richness in the child's microsystem, as well as all the other systems is measured by enduring, reciprocal, and multi-faceted relationships that emphasize playing, working, and loving (Garbarino, 1982). Microsystems can also be made up of larger numbers of relatives, neighbors and friends. Children who have the benefit of growing up among a diverse set of relationships spanning different age groups and backgrounds are afforded more opportunities for interactions. Development is also enhanced with the complexities and differences between and within their dyadic experiences.

The mesosystem encompasses the relationships and interactions between microsystems in the child's life. In this system, richness is also measured by the quality of the connections. Success and development may be observed when there is active participation of the child's different microsystems between two settings. A clear example might be the interaction between the microsystem of the child and parent and the microsystem of the teacher and the child. When there are successful interactions between a parent and the teacher, the mesosystem will have a stronger developmental impact on the child. If the parent and teacher can work together in agreement on best practices for the student, the child benefits from this relationship. Conversely, if there is a breakdown between the parent and teacher and their interactions do not work to benefit the child, the developmental impact can have adverse effects on the child. In such circumstances, the child may benefit from and depend on other positive interactions within their mesosystem.

The exosystem entails situations or settings where the child does not play a direct role, but is indirectly influenced (Garbarino, 1982). The exosystem consists of those decisions that

may affect the child's day-to-day experiences. An example of this might be when the school

board makes a decision to change the school boundaries, which affects how the child may get to

school. The government, community, school or parent organizations, or youth agencies may be a

part of the child's exosystem.

The child's macrosystem reflects people's shared assumptions about how things should

get done; it is shaped by the culture, attitudes, and behavior patterns that surround the child. The

macrosystem can also be affected by historical changes and evolution (Garbarino, 1982). Later

on, Bronfenbrenner revised his model by calling it the bioecological model, positing that the

child's chronosystem consists of environmental events and transitions in life. This system

accounts for the variable of time that impacts the other four systems; time impacts our ideas

about truth and reality, thus also impacting our development (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994).

The ideas and realities that we embrace today will seem outdated a decade from now, and what is

currently embraced may impact development differently later on. This system takes into account

changes in family structures such as socioeconomic status, residence, or abilities to function in

day-to-day life (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

The Ecological Model and Student Motivation

Interactions with significant others in our lives is the premise of the Ecological Systems

Model as it places the child or the individual's development as the outcome of interacting

systems and settings. Bronfenbrenner (1979) posits that three structures are optimal for

development: dyads (observational, joint, and primary), reciprocity, and balance of power.

These three types of dyads can influence how children and others in their lives can perceive their

roles. An observational dyad is defined as two people who pay attention to one another's

activities. A joint activity dyad is when two persons pay attention to the activities of others, such as when a child is paying attention when his or her parent is reading to them. This type of dyad affords favorable learning conditions for cognitive growth, competence, and motivation to engage in similar activities when the participants in that dyad are no longer together (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). This joint dyad and their interactions also reflect their affective relationship with one another. When there is a balance of power and reciprocity in their interactions, this enhances the child's developmental process; this can be reflected in teacher-parent or parent-child relationships. Lastly, the primary dyad is one that continues to exist when the participants are absent from one another. The influences of this dyad are what help direct the course of the other's development and goals. Bronfenbrenner (1979) underscores that for this to occur, the primary dyads should be established or be a part of the same setting. For example, this can occur when the parent is present in the school, or the teacher takes the opportunity to visit the child's home. The prolonged effects of those interactions among the primary dyads can be stronger when these cross-setting interactions can occur.

The developmental impact of the learning that takes place is also enhanced by mutual feelings with whom the children have the dyadic relationships. Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) posits that for one to feel intrinsically motivated, they need three things: competence, relatedness, and autonomy. Relatedness to others and affective relationships also influence how parents perceive their roles in their children's education. It is those positive primary dyadic relationships that foster autonomous behavior and intrinsic motivation to learn absent of those relationships. Bronfenbrenner (1979) posits that role expectations are connected to the position of the person (or child), the content and context of the activities, and the relationship between the two individuals. These microsystem interactions play a role in

determining whether children experience their world and themselves in positive or negative

terms. Bronfenbrenner (1979) also emphasizes the importance of reciprocity in interactions,

which fosters the acquisition of interactive skills while also instilling a level of interdependence

as one moves toward cognitive development. The ease at which two-way communication is

established between the two settings increases the child's developmental potential, and if this

holds true, the interconnectedness between the home and the school would be characterized by

more frequent and quality interactions and communication with the caveat that these

interconnections do not undermine the motivation and capacity of those who deal directly with

the child. Children construct an image of themselves based on the feedback they receive from

significant others in their lives. This construction of themselves and how they perceive the

influence from others also shapes their goal orientations, feelings of competence, engagement,

and thus motivational orientations (Bronstein, Ginsburg, & Herrera, 2005).

Risks and Opportunities

Bronfenbrenner (1979) viewed the child's developmental experience as also being

influenced by biological and sociological risks and opportunities. In the child's microsystem,

parents and significant others respond to their immediate and distant environment, which is full

of complexities, activities, beliefs, and values. Those opportunities and risks for development are

mediated by the physical, mental, and emotional make-up of their environment. Each system is

also envisioned as a set of nested structures, so when looking at the risks and opportunities, it is

important to look at the compounding and comprehensive influences of each system to help the

child adjust (Garbarino, 1982). Risks and opportunities that hinder or afford healthy school and

family interactions and thus the child's development depend on the alignment and strength of the

linkages between microsystems. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) example of a child going to the first

day of school alone demonstrates a weak link between the home and the school. This example

shows that a child can be at risk if there is little to no alignment of the home and school's values,

experiences, and behavioral styles. If the family members are not educated, or academic skills

are not encouraged in the home, there is an increased risk for the child's academic competence to

suffer (Garbarino, 1981b). Likewise, if the child's teacher or school does not honor the culture

of the child's home or history, the risks are the same. The structure of the systems function in

similar ways, but also produces differential outcomes between social groups, classes, ethnic, and

religious groups (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Conditions that are outside of any immediate context

that the child experiences can also have a profound impact on how the child's behavior and

development is shaped. The influences of those conditions, positive or negative, can also define

how they are perceived. Unless those conditions and perceptions of risks and opportunities are

taken into account, conclusions can lead to a narrow and distorted understanding of the child's

development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Parent efficacy and parents' perceptions of their roles are also influenced by demands and

stresses emanating from other settings and systems. Mesosystem interactions can also be affected

by changes in the child's exosystem. Childcare schedules may get disrupted or a parent may lose

their job due to the economy. These stresses can affect parents' evaluations of their abilities to

provide safe interactions and opportunities in their child's microsystem. How parents handle

these demands and perceive themselves as parents affects the roles they may also play in their

children's education. Only a restricted understanding of the interactions within the child's

mesosystem can hinder healthy cognitive growth and development. Through this, we see the

importance of the alignment of the home and the school and how this alignment of interactions

can foster greater outcomes for the child. When the microsystems work in concert with one

another, the child benefits. When they work in opposition or isolation, the child is at risk

(Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) Ecological Systems Model will be used as a framework to

explain the bidirectional influences and impacts that each system has on the child's microsystem

(i.e. teachers, parents, extended family, and neighborhood). Also addressed will be how the

alignment or misalignment of microsystem interactions and ideas affect student outcomes.

Parental Involvement and Constructs of Student Motivation

With schools striving to increase tests scores and to meet annual goals, past and ongoing

research on factors contributing to academic achievement has been underscored. Researchers

have concluded that academic success and achievement are a positive outcome of parental

involvement. Parents have a strong impact on children's motivational beliefs and academic

competence. Several studies have cited that constructs of motivation such as student self-efficacy

(Fan &Williams, 2010), student perceptions of control (Fulton & Turner, 2008), engagement

(Fan & Williams, 2010), goal-orientations (M. Kim, J. Kim & Schallert, 2010), and grades

(Cheung & Pomerantz, 2012) are an outcome of parental involvement. Variables such as time on

homework, attendance, persistence on schoolwork, and aspirations are indicators of how much

students may value education and are motivated to succeed (Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, &

Holbein, 2005) and some of those are a result of parental influence. Many of the reviewed

articles look at different constructs of motivation as an outcome or a mediating variable between

parent involvement and academic achievement. Those constructs include intrinsic and extrinsic

motivation, engagement, locus of control and competence, and goal orientations. A range of

parental involvement activities is also identified to see how various parent involvement practices and behaviors differentially relate to student motivation.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

Parental involvement and practices can have a positive impact on student intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Fan and Williams (2010) looked at the effect of parental involvement on several constructs: students' academic self-efficacy, engagement, and intrinsic motivation. This study examined the parental activities and behaviors that could contribute to promoting adolescents' sense of self-efficacy, engagement, and intrinsic motivation. The data for this study was taken from an Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS, 2002) from a nationally representative sample cohort of tenth grade students. In this study, Fan and Williams (2010) defined parental engagement using a multidimensional conceptualization of parental involvement. Those dimensions included parent aspirations for students' post-secondary education, family rules reflecting parental home supervision, parental advising, parental participation in extracurricular activities, parent-school communication concerning students' schooling problems, school-initiated contact with parents, and parent-initiated contact with schools on benign issues.

Measures of parental involvement effects included student-reports of their academic efficacy in five motivational outcomes: math and English, intrinsic motivation toward math and English, and their engagement. Students also reported on their intrinsic motivation to engage in educational activities and their engagement through effort and persistence. Parents reported on parent advising, which was assessed by communication between parents and students regarding information or advice they provided to their child about (1) selecting courses, (2) plans and

preparation for college entrance exams, (3) applying to college, (4) specific jobs after high

school, (5) community/world events, and (6) things troubling the child. They also reported on

their participation in extracurricular activities with children, which was measured by the

frequency at which they (1) attended concerts, plays, or movies outside the school, (2) attended

sporting events outside of school, (3) attended family social functions such as parties or

weddings, (4) took day trips or vacations, (5) worked on a hobby, (6) went to restaurants with the

child, and (7) did some other activity together. Parents also reported on their initiation of

communication with the school concerning students' school problems and looked at the

frequency of parent-school communication concerning students' school problems such as poor

performance and behavior problems. Parent-initiated contacts were measured by school contacts

made by parents regarding school programs, plans after high school, course selection, and help

with homework. Parents also reported on their educational aspirations for their own child. The

family rules measure assessed parents' enforcement of rules regarding grades, maintaining a

certain GPA, doing chores, and watching television. Lastly, socioeconomic status and gender

was measured by parents' education and income. Results pertaining to involvement at home and

school were mixed. They did, however, confirm the importance of how parents communicate

with the schools. Evidence showed that the different reasons for communication lead to different

outcomes in students' academic self-efficacy, engagement, and intrinsic motivation. Parent-

school communication concerning poor performance or behavior problems had negative

associations with self-efficacy in the two subject areas, intrinsic motivation in both subject areas,

and in engagement. However parent-initiated contact regarding school programs and future

planning had positive associations with the five outcomes. Parents' educational aspirations were

also a strong predictor for academic self-efficacy, engagement, and intrinsic motivation. If

students perceived that their parents valued their education and had high expectations, they were more engaged in their academic endeavors, leading to higher perceived self-competence. Results also showed that if parents participated in their child's extracurricular activities, it was positively linked to a sense of self-efficacy and engagement in math, but was a negative predictor of intrinsic motivation in English. Parent participation in school had differential effects. There was a positive association with self-efficacy in math, but too much participation was perceived as controlling, which could be seen as an extrinsic motivator for achieving. There was also a positive association between academic engagement and intrinsic motivation if families made time for constructive activities that were enjoyable. This was a positive predictor of the development of mastery goal orientations. If parents placed an emphasis on grades, this was a predictor of students possibly developing performance goal orientations. Parent advice was also shown to have positive associations with all five motivational outcomes.

The differential findings from this study suggest that in the context of working with adolescents, there is a delicate balance of the parent's role and involvement in their child's school and home environment, being sure to provide support for goals and aspirations while also affording the student opportunities to be autonomous and to feel competent. The ways in which parents communicate with schools and over what matters also seem to predict the ways that students respond. When communication involves academic and behavior problems, students may perceive this in a negative and controlling way, which may lead them to develop performance-oriented goals. Results also show that when parents are involved in extracurricular and school activities, there is a positive effect on self-efficacy, affording the students to feel supported in their academic endeavors. However, the negative associations with intrinsic motivation may also indicate the need for students to feel autonomous and to have their individuality valued during

this transitional time in their lives (Fulton & Turner, 2008; Fan & Williams, 2010; Gonzalez & Wolters, 2006).

Other researchers have also questioned student motivational outcomes as related to parental involvement and parent-oriented motivation. Hong and Ho (2005) posit that children's autonomous motivation and feelings of agency underlie the effect of parents' involvement on their achievement. The more involved parents are, the more motivated children are to do well for parent-oriented reasons. According to the self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000, 2008), all human beings have the fundamental need to feel relatedness, competence, and autonomy in order to develop and function optimally. This theory also highlights the role of one's social context, which can facilitate or undermine intrinsic motivation and internalization of values, behaviors, and attitudes (Joussemet, Landry, & Koestner, 2008). Because parents or guardians are often the students most immediate source of support, the ways that parents interact with them can have a profound impact on the internalizations of those shared values and beliefs. Having this identified motivation is associated with children feeling that they have a sense of purpose when realizing the goals of the major figures in their lives.

A study conducted by Cheung & Pomerantz (2012) was unique from other studies looking at academic motivation as it focused on a more controlled view of motivation and its effects on student motivation. The following study, as will studies in the second section of this review, highlights the role of culture and its influence on parent involvement. Taken from Deci and Ryan's (1985, 2000, 2008) self-determination theory of motivation, controlled forms of motivation are viewed as introjected and extrinsic. Introjected motivation comes from engaging in a task for fear of being ashamed or feeling guilt if it is not complete. Extrinsic motivation comes from engaging in a task for a reward or other external reason. On the other hand,

autonomous forms of motivation are viewed as identified and intrinsic. Identified motivation is

when one is engaged in a task because it is important. Intrinsic motivation is being engaged in a

task because it is fun or enjoyable. In this study, parent-oriented motivation is defined as being

driven by a concern with one meeting parents' expectations to gain approval (Cheung &

Pomerantz, 2012). Parent-oriented motivation is focused on circumventing guilt and anxiety.

When parents are more involved in children's learning, the children are more motivated to show

parents they are responsible and they may desire to gain approval, which heightens engagement

and achievement (Pomerantz, Kim, & Cheung, 2012). The premise of looking at parent-oriented

motivation stems from the idea that parent involvement supports a sense of relatedness between

children and their parents. Cheung and Pomerantz's (2012) study looked at whether the effects of

parents' involvement on children's parent-oriented motivation and their engagement and

achievement were similar in China and the United States. The nature of involvement, motivation,

and learning are not universal. In China, a parent's way of loving may be in ensuring that their

children are meeting societal standards (Chao, 1994). This may explain the controlling way of

parenting that is often observed in China. The question becomes if this way of controlled

parenting leads to the child's controlled motivation when engaging in a task. Their longitudinal

study of 7th graders was based on their previous findings that the more motivated children were

in school for parent-oriented reasons as they begin middle school and the more sustained that

motivation, the more engaged they were in school at the end of 8th grade. The goals of this study

were to (1) examine the role of children's parent-oriented motivation in mediating the effects of

parents' involvement on children's achievement, (2) to evaluate the mechanisms through which

parents' involvement in children's learning contributes to student achievement, and (3) to

examine whether parental involvement fosters children's parent-oriented motivation. They used

Grolnick & Slowiaczek's (1994) definition of parental involvement, where parental involvement was conceptualized by integrating developmental and educational constructs that have general and specific dimensions. They also defined parental involvement as the dedication of resources by the parent to the child within a given domain with a guiding model that predicted that parental involvement would facilitate engagement and achievement through parent-oriented motivation. With this, several resources, or ways of involvement, were considered and they posited that these resources must be experienced by the child in order for them to have any kind of influence. Parental involvement was categorized in three ways: (1) behavioral involvement, in which parents go to the school and participate in school activities, (2) personal involvement, in which the child experiences the parent's involvement as an affective experience, and (3) cognitive/intellectual involvement, where the child is exposed to cognitively stimulating activities. Five measures were translated and modified for relevance in both countries. The first measured parents' involvement in children's learning as perceived by the students; this looked at ways in which the student perceived their parent's involvement. The second student self-reported measure looked at parent-oriented motivation in school; this scale assessed the underlying academic motivation that the students held when considering their parent's roles. The third measure looked at controlled and autonomous motivation in school, which considered the reasons underlying engagement in academic activities along the motivation scale in the forms of extrinsic, introjected, identified, and intrinsic motivation. The fourth measure looked at students' self-regulated learning and cognitive strategies, which considered metacognitive strategies such as monitoring, planning, and regulating while learning. Rehearsal and elaboration strategies were ways in which cognitive strategies were assessed. Structural equation modeling was used to account for differences between the two countries. Results showed that there was a correlation

between parent-oriented motivation and the other constructs in both countries, but it was more positively associated with extrinsic and introjected forms of motivation. These types of motivation may only get children engaged superficially as the drive to engage in tasks may only be associated with their parent's desires for them to complete them. It was also found that these forms of controlled motivation did not predict self-regulated learning strategies. However, parental involvement was predictive of higher achievement over time. These findings suggest that students experience parent-oriented motivation as controlled motivation, though it was much less positively associated with autonomous motivation. Over time, the more involved parents were in their children's learning, the more motivated they were to do well for parent-oriented reasons. These effects can change over time as students may eventually value and desire their autonomy. The researchers propose that obligation to the family may foster engagement as they get older, but there may be a decrease in achievement. Though the effects were not as strong, parental involvement predicted some autonomous motivation in school through relatedness with parents, which can then foster an intrinsic motivation for learning.

Different parenting styles and practices also influence student motivation. Baumrind's (1967, 1971) early studies on the effects of parenting styles on children's behavior precipitated the future studies on parental influence on student behavioral and achievement outcomes. Ginsburg & Bronstein (1993) and Grolnick & Ryan (1989) found that adolescents exhibited higher intrinsic motivation and grades if parents were more autonomy supporting and involved children in decision-making processes. On the other hand, if parents exerted more control and exhibited more dictating behavior, their children had poor academic performance and were more extrinsically motivated. Bronstein, Ginsburg, & Herrera (2005) sought to find out if a particular parenting style would foster higher achievement, which would then increase intrinsic motivation.

The aspects of parenting that they considered in their study included general styles of parental behavior in the form of external control, lack of guidance, and autonomy support in daily interactions as well as parental behavior in the academic domain. They claimed that parent engagement may enhance independent thinking, problem-solving skills, and self-efficacy, thereby increasing intrinsic motivation and achievement. Results from this study of 93 5th graders, in their transition from elementary to middle school, were taken from measures of mother-reported surveillance of homework, student self-reported perceived parental reactions to grades, and student and parent reports of parenting and family styles. The outcome measures assessed grades and achievement scores, perceived scholastic competence, and motivational orientation in the classroom. Results showed that when children were in the 5th grade and their parents used external control, they did less well academically and had less intrinsic motivational orientation toward their work in the 7th grade. When parents were also low in offering guidance in the 5th grade, their children also did less well academically and had less intrinsic motivation in the 7th grade. However, if their parents supported their autonomy in the 5th grade, the results were the reverse. Bronstein et al. (2005) posit that the relationship between parenting style and motivation is mediated by academic achievement. This study tells us that parent behaviors, namely through external control, lack of guidance, and autonomy support are long-term predictors of achievement and motivational orientation. When parents exhibit more control while insisting that their children to homework, there is an undermining effect on ones interest to do school work, which leads to a more extrinsic motivational orientation. Likewise, when parents do not exert more guidance or show interest in their children's academic endeavors, this may lead to the child's decreased feelings of competence and self-efficacy, which can limit the development of intrinsic motivational orientations (Harter & Connell, 2004). An autonomy-supportive

parenting style may afford a more intrinsic motivational orientation due to more support of the

child's autonomy in making academic choices. Results also suggest that academic achievement

and intrinsic motivation may have a mutually reinforcing or bidirectional effect as shown by this

and other research (Gottfried, A.E., Fleming, & Gottfried A.W., 1994; Grolnick, 2009; Harter &

Connell, 1984; Pomerantz & Cheung, 2012;). Children who tend to do well in school gain

confidence and perceived competence, which increases intrinsic motivation. This intrinsic

motivation also paves the way for students to be more invested in their schoolwork, which then

leads to greater achievement.

Student Engagement

Parental practices and involvement also have shown to have a positive influence on

student academic engagement. Engagement is a construct of interest as it can be seen as a

predictor of potential dropout (Lehr, Sinclair, & Christenson, 2004). Though several definitions

of engagement have been used, academic engagement has been typically conceptualized as

having three components: cognitive, behavioral, and affective (emotional) engagement (Janosz,

Archambault, Morizot, & Papani, 2008). Cognitive engagement pertains to student beliefs about

themselves and others; this can be assessed by looking at self-efficacy, motivation, and

educational aspirations. Behavioral engagement describes student's participation in academic

tasks, demonstration of positive classroom behavior, and participation in extracurricular

activities. Affective engagement describes the student's feelings toward their school, teachers,

and classrooms (Jimerson, et al., 2003). These three components of engagement can be

influenced by individual interests as well as social and familial factors. Estell and Perdue (2013)

examined the association between social support from parents, teachers, and peers with affective

and behavioral engagement. A child's feelings of support or relatedness to these sources of

support as well as significant others in their lives and their influence on the child's engagement

may be important (Sinclair, Christenson, Lehr, & Reschly-Anderson, 2003; Furrer & Skinner,

2003). Furrer and Skinner (2003) identified relatedness as a catalyst for engagement, with

engagement being a key construct in motivational models. It is considered a pathway through

which motivation facilitates learning and taps into the student's feelings of support, inclusiveness,

task-orientation, and feeling accepted. Estell and Perdue's (2013) longitudinal study on 328 5th

graders looked at the social support received during 5th grade and school engagement in the 6th

grade. Only two measures of school engagement were used: an indicator of behavioral

engagement in the form of work habits and the other as an indicator of affective engagement in

the form of school attachment. The measures included looking at academic achievement through

grades and maternal-reported disability to assess if the child had any learning disabilities or

attention/behavioral/emotional problems. Parental involvement was reported by teachers based

on their perceptions of the parent's support of the child's school experience. The parental

involvement questionnaire assessed the parent's comfort and satisfaction with the teacher and

school, parent involvement through volunteering, and frequency of parent-teacher contact (PTIQ;

Miller, Johnson, Maumery-Gremaud, & Conduct Disorders Research Group, 1995). Teacher

support was measured by classroom observations and a scale that reflected classroom qualities.

A student-reported measure of perceived peer support was assessed through student interviews

on perceptions of peer social support. A teacher report on student work habits and behavior in

the classroom assessed behavioral engagement. Measures of affective engagement assessed

students' self-reported perceptions of their school. Results showed that parental support

predicted higher behavioral engagement than affective engagement while peer support resulted

in higher affective school engagement. Teacher support did not relate to affective engagement as

the measure used only measured feelings that students had about the school as a whole rather than in the classroom. This may be due to the fact that affective engagement was measured at the school level and that relates to the social nature of the school via clubs and teams. Teacher reported behavioral engagement was measured at the classroom level where one needs to focus some attention on learning activities rather than on peer interactions. Because behavioral engagement consists of more concentrated tasks such as participation in learning activities, positive behavior, and participation in extracurricular activities, parent influence and relatedness may play a role in affecting students' sense of self-efficacy and competence in academic tasks and endeavors.

The intersecting relationships between the child's microsystems, as in the relationship between the child and the teacher as well as the parent and the teacher, may also suggest that the dynamics of these relationships influence student engagement. Hughes and Kwok (2007) looked at the influence of student-teacher and parent-teacher relationships on low-achieving readers' engagement and achievement. This study tested the theoretical model that teachers' relationships with students and their parents mediate associations between children's background characteristics and teacher-rated classroom engagement. Secondly, it tested if classroom engagement mediates associations between student-teacher and parent-teacher relatedness and achievement. Child characteristics were those such as gender and race. Engagement was conceptualized as behavioral engagement, which was measured by cooperative participation, conformity to classroom rules and routines, self-directedness, persistence, and effort (Fredricks, Blumenfield, & Paris, 2004). Pianta (2006) and Rimm-Kaufman, La Paro, Downer, and Pianta (2005) suggest that parents' attitudes towards education predict child participation and engagement and that engagement accounts for the longitudinal effect of the quality of teacher-

student relationships. Hughes and Kwok's (2007) study was to examine student background

variables, quality of relationships, and changes across academic years of 443 1st grade ethnically-

diverse children at- risk for school difficulties. Engagement was examined as the mediator

between student-teacher and parent-teacher relatedness and achievement. It has been found that

when students experience a good relationship with their teachers, they are more engaged in their

work, more accepting of direction, and in persevering through difficulties (Little & Kobak,

2003; Wentzel, 1999). Likewise, supportive student-teacher relationships can be more predictive

of reading skills for at-risk students coming from unstable home environments (Hamre & Pianta,

2001). Parent-teacher relationships have also been found to affect student's school adjustment.

When parents are involved in their children's education, students demonstrate more motivation

and behavioral adjustment. In this study, parental involvement was defined as volunteering in

the school, communicating with the teacher, attending school functions, and assisting with

homework. Parent-teacher relationship quality was referred to as the quality of the home-school

connection. This was measured by trust, mutuality, affiliation, support, shared values, and

shared expectations and beliefs about each other and the child (Vickers & Minke, 1995). The

measures used in this study included the student's academic achievement, teacher-reported child

engagement seen as effort, attention, persistence, cooperative participation, teacher perception of

student-teacher support, teacher perception of the parent-teacher relationship, and peer

nomination of teacher-student support. Results showed that social relatedness is critical to

student engagement particularly in the early elementary years. The students in this study showed

more gain in achievement when they and their parents experienced more supportive relationships

with the teachers. These supportive relationships and their effects on achievement were mediated

by engagement. Socioeconomic status had a significant effect on the parent-teacher relationship

but not on the teacher-student relationship. The implications of this study validate the

importance of teachers' and schools' efforts to improve home-school relationships and

underscore the importance of evaluating the measure, quality, and dimensions of parental

involvement behaviors, especially in low-income, and culturally diverse families. This may be

due to several explanations ranging from diverse interactional styles and educational beliefs

between teachers and families of at-risk students. This will be further discussed in the second

section of the review.

These aforementioned studies provide evidence to support the idea that parental

involvement and positive parent-teacher relationships facilitate students' academic achievement.

Students' relatedness with parents and their teachers fulfill their needs for inclusiveness, support,

and school adjustment. This, in turn, can affect task and goal orientation and motivation (Furrer

& Skinner, 2003). Closer ties to parents and teachers do not necessarily have a causal effect on

student engagement, but these studies highlight that relatedness to them may play an influential

role in predicting student motivation.

Student Self-Concept, Locus of Control, and Competence

One's intrinsic or extrinsic motivational orientation also has an influence on their locus of

control. Locus of control is defined as how students may attribute the causes of events

(Gonzalez De-Hass, Willems, & Holbein, 2005). One may say that an event occurred due to

luck or fate, which describes one having an external locus of control; the cause is due to factors

outside of themselves. A person with an internal locus of control attributes causes of events to

be due to factors within themselves such as effort and skill. Studies on elementary and

adolescent students have shown that students who have an internal locus of control also have

higher achievement and may set higher goals for themselves (Trusty & Lampe, 1997). Grolnick,

Ryan, and Deci (1991) also found that parental involvement predicted students' control

understanding (the degree to which students understand who is responsible for their academic

outcomes), perceived competence (students' feelings of competency), and perceived autonomy

(the degree to which they initiate and regulate actions on their own). Rogers, Theule, Ryan,

Adams, & Keating (2009) sought to examine the association between children's perceptions of

parent involvement and their personal characteristics, such as academic competence and self-

concept, and thus achievement. Parental involvement was defined as participation with

homework, encouragement, and managing the learning environment. In this study of 110 5th

graders and 121 6th graders in a middle-upper class community, Rogers et al. (2009) claimed that

children's academic and self-competence would mediate the relationship between parental

involvement and academic achievement. Measures included two student-reported assessments

of parents' behaviors at home that focused on academic success; one assessed interactions with

their mothers and the other was related to interactions with their fathers. A student self-report

measure assessed self-concept and attribution attitudes in math, reading, and global self-concept.

A teacher-reported measure assessed the students' academic competence, including their

motivation and interest in schoolwork, academic skills, and study skills. Lastly, report card

grades in math, science, and language arts were obtained. Results revealed that mothers'

participation in homework and active management of the learning environment was positively

and indirectly related to academic achievement through academic competence. Academic

competence was the only personal characteristic strongly associated with achievement. Results

also showed that paternal involvement was indirectly related to achievement, mediated by

academic competence. Fathers' active management of the learning environment was also a

positive predictor of academic competence. However, academic pressure and participation with

homework was negatively associated with academic competence, hence with lower achievement.

Academic pressure was found to be associated with lower academic competence and lower self-

concept in reading and math as the pressure can be viewed as controlling and can decrease

children's intrinsic motivation, thus undermining the learning process (Grolnick, 2003). Mothers'

involvement with homework was positively associated with academic competence when the

father's help with homework was not. The differential results in the effects of parental

involvement on self-concept and competence could be due to several reasons for why parents

may get involved. For instance, if the parents initiate involvement in homework when the student

is not asking for help, it could be perceived as controlling by the student. On the other hand, if

the student asks for help, there is a possibility that the student may already have higher

achievement or motivation to do well. There may also be differences between mothers' and

fathers' involvement on academic self-concept, competence, and achievement due to a number

of factors ranging from the nature of the parenting style to family dynamics, and the family

environment. This difference could be further explored through more careful observation of

parenting styles and interactions. Both parents' ways of involvement may be manifested in

different ways. They also saw that with both parents, academic pressure is associated with a

perception of control, which undermines learning, and can lead to decreased intrinsic motivation.

Since this study consisted of a fairly homogenous sample of white middle-upper class families, it

is essential to further understand the correlation between parent involvement on lower income

and diverse populations when family dynamics may look different than what is traditionally seen.

This study, however, supports the findings that parental involvement, encouragement, and

support are associated with student self-concept, which influences one's locus of control when completing tasks and further leads to intrinsic motivation.

According to Eccles' (1994) Expectancy-Value theory, students progress into wider social contexts from their homes, which influence their cognitive, behavioral, and socio-emotional development. Academic success can depend on students' perceptions of their competence in learning. Eccles, Roeser, Wigfield, and Freedman-Doan (1999) posit that this level of competence can be based on family and individual factors. Quilliams and Beran (2009) examined factors related to achievement and determined which ones may explain why some students are at risk for poor academic achievement. In their study, 21 teachers and 154 5th grade students reported on individual factors such as self-concept, academic motivation, and parental involvement. Self-concept was referred to as an individual's perceived competence within the domains of academics, appearance, social skills, and family (Quilliams & Beran, 2009). Previous studies have found that when children invest in activities in which they feel competent, they become more intrinsically involved, which can lead to achievement (Anderman, et al., 2001). The measure of intrinsic motivation assessed the student's curiosity, enjoyment of learning, and persistence towards challenging and novel tasks. The measure of self-concept looked at the student's perceived competence within academic, personal, physical, social, moral, and family domains. The measure of perceived parental involvement considered the parent actively discussing homework, teachers, friends, and goals; it also measured their participation in school-related activities and how they also promote a work ethic and grades. Teachers also reported on student achievement and grades. Teachers' reports on grades and academic achievement variables were highly correlated with teachers' reports of academic motivation, self-concept, and parental involvement in education. However, results also showed low

correlations between academic achievement and students' reports of the three variables. Achievement was also positively correlated with motivation and teacher-reported self-concept. Achievement was also positively and directly related to parental involvement, but to self-concept at a lesser extent. Motivation and parental involvement were positively correlated, telling us that if students were curious, persistent, and enjoyed learning, they also perceived their parents as being involved in their education. Parental involvement and teacher-reported self-concept were positively correlated, thus demonstrating that academic motivation and self-concept were also positively related. There were conflicting results between students' and teachers' ratings of self-concept. Because teachers' ratings were moderately related to achievement, children who had low teacher ratings of competence were seen as being at-risk for low achievement. These results show that children who perceive their parents to have low involvement may also struggle in their self-concept and confidence, thus having decreased motivation toward schoolwork and lower achievement. Likewise, the results tell us that students at risk for poor achievement may have little parental support, little motivation, and lower self-concept.

Students' Goal Orientations

Parents also play a role in how students orient their goals. Achievement goal theory (Ames & Archer, 1988) and self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) both explain how parents' goals or involvement also influence ways in which their children are motivated. Eccles, Jacobs, and Harold (1990) also suggest two types of parent attitudes that can influence individuals' self-perceptions: expectations focused on academic performance or academic competence. Ways that parents engage with their children, or ways in which they emphasize the importance of academic tasks can also influence the goal orientation of their children. According to the achievement goal theory, individuals may engage in achievement tasks for mastery or

performance/ego reasons (Ames & Archer, 1988). Students focused on a mastery goal participate in a task for the purpose of mastery or learning at a deeper level. Those with mastery goal orientations may be seen as more intrinsically motivated; they find value in the task at hand or engage in it for the purpose of enjoyment. Students who focus on a performance task may do so for the purpose of comparing themselves with others (Ames & Archer, 1988). These students may have more extrinsic reasons for engaging in a task, which is to measure their performance against a norm, or because of some form of reward or praise they may receive from it; they may want to obtain a high grade for the purpose of outperforming others.

Peixoto (2011) analyzed the relationships between parental attitudes and process versus performance-centered achievement. This study specifically looked at process –centered attitudes as having a focus on the learning process and centering on helping students learn through their errors. Performance-centered attitudes were mainly concerned with academic achievement; parents with this attitude pushed students to obtain the highest grades and showed disappointment if grades were not high enough. Peixoto (2011) assessed 498 7th and 9th grade students on measures of self-concept and self-esteem in academic and social domains, motivational orientations, looking at four dimensions of goal orientations: self-enhancing, self-defeating, avoidance, task-orientation, and lastly, parental attitudes towards academic performance looking at process and performance-centered attitudes. Results showed the students' perceptions of parents' process-centered attitudes were positively correlated with task-orientation, academic self-concept, and self-esteem. Process-centered attitudes were also negatively correlated with avoidance orientation. Conversely, students' perceptions of parents' performance-centered attitudes were positively correlated with self-enhancing ego orientation. The initial aim was to test of model of the mediation of individual variables as motivational

orientations and self-concept in the relationship between perceptions of parental attitudes towards academic performance and achievement. Because their model revealed a poor fit to data, a revised model revealed indirect positive effects of the perception of process-centered attitudes on academic achievement through task-orientation and negative indirect effects of perception of performance-centered attitudes through avoidance orientation. This study supports that students' internalization of perceptions of parents' goals as process or performance centered has a relationship with their own self-concept, self-esteem, performance, and goal orientation. However, given a more diverse sample of students from different cultural groups, we may see that some of these results may not necessarily be generalized across cultures as some cultural groups may perceive their parents' attitudes and internalize them in different ways.

Though the reviewed studies show a positive relationship between parental involvement and different motivational constructs, most of their measures of parental involvement include perceived student and teacher reports. For example, the Parent-Teacher Involvement Questionnaire (PTIQ; Miller, Johnson, Maumery-Gremaud, & Conduct Disorders Research Group, 1995) used in Estell and Perdue's (2013) study used a teacher version of the questionnaire, which assessed the amount and type of contact that occurs between parents and teachers, the parents' interest and comfort in talking with teachers, the parent's satisfaction with their children's school, and the parents' degree of academic stimulation with their children through volunteerism and contact with the teacher. Questionnaires, such as this, may influence results with teacher bias and use of teachers' perceptions of parent involvement that are not accurate. The sources of measurements and analyses of these measurements also need to be considered. Present in several studies (Estell & Perdue, 2013; Hughes & Kwok, 2007; Quilliams & Beran, 2009) was the use of the same sources to report on several measures. In doing so, this

may attribute to a "halo effect," which results in overgeneralizing results. For example, if the teacher reports parent involvement to be high, they may also report behavioral engagement to be high (Estell & Perdue, 2013), or in Quilliams and Beran's (2009) study, students and teachers both reported on all the measured variables. It was found that all teacher reports were highly correlated with each other. In Hughes and Kwok's (2007) study, most measures were based solely on teacher reports. Teachers are more likely to report high teacher support with high behavioral engagement. With the issue of shared variance in these studies, or for teachers to measure parent involvement based on their own perceptions, the results are more than likely to be inflated. This results in alternative explanations that may not necessarily be accurate or considered.

The reviewed studies aim for holding parents accountable for their children's education and motivation, but overlooks the historical, structural, and cultural influences that families encounter. These influences and changes are not reflected in the traditional conceptualizations of parental involvement models used in these studies. The dynamicism by which society influences a child's distal and immediate systems should also influence the dynamicism by which we conceptualize parental involvement.

Reconceptualizing Parental Involvement

Purcell-Gates (2007) highlighted that "people always act, think, create, and believe within describable sociocultural contexts"(p. viii) while J. Kim, et al. (2010) add that "these contexts are differentiated by particular groups representing differences in race, gender, socioeconomic status, wider or narrow geographical areas, and dynamics of power that represent how humans interact with one another." (p. 419)

Many traditional definitions of parental involvement consist of parents volunteering in classrooms, showing up at parent-teacher conferences, open houses, and parent-teacher organization meetings. Schools have often used parent attendance at these events as a measure of parent involvement. Several of the studies used in this review defined parental involvement and practices using Epstein's (1995) conceptualization of parental involvement. There are six practices that teachers have commonly used to involve parents: (1) parenting activities, (2) school obligations, (3) parental and community involvement at school, (4) provision of learning opportunities at home, (5) participation in school decision-making, and (6) collaboration with the community. Other studies defined parent involvement more generally as parents' participation in their children's education with the purpose of promoting academic and social successes (Fischel & Ramirez, 2005). Other researchers conceptualized involvement separately as school and home-based, with school-based involvement defined as attendance at school events, parent-teacher communication, and volunteering at school. Home-based involvement would include provision of structure for homework and leisure time in the form of having a set time and place for homework, visiting museums, and monitoring schoolwork and progress (Epstein & Sanders, 2002). Fan and Williams (2010) study conceptualized parents' involvement in extracurricular activities as attending concerts, going on vacations, sporting, events, and eating at restaurants. Other home-based practices include setting and maintaining expectations (Suizzo & Soon, 2006). As most of the studies on parental involvement have been done on European American and middle class populations, the educational views of these two populations have shaped the standards for improved practices in connecting schools and families.

In the questionnaires, or measures that assess traditional dimensions of parental involvement, the voices of diverse cultural groups are also not heard. Parents who may not

speak English, or the primary language of the school population, may not feel competent to volunteer in the school or classroom, thus opting to not volunteer. More importantly, families may not value activities such as attending concerts or are not able to afford vacations as some studies measure (Fan & Williams, 2010). Some families whose parents have not had much of an educational background may also struggle with helping their child select school courses or may have difficulty discussing plans for their child taking exams. Measures that assess the frequency of these activities in homes dismiss the utility of parents as effective partners in their children's education. Parents in other cultural groups may also conceptualize parental involvement and engage in their children's education in their own ways, ways that are not acknowledged by the schools or their children's teachers.

Parental behaviors are largely shaped by a number of factors including socioeconomic factors, education level, and cultural models of socialization goals and strategies (Gallimore & Goldenberg, 2001). Homes contain language and value codes. Getzels (1974) posits that language codes exist in the ways that families communicate their experiences with one another. The code is learned through the context of the family. Some of these codes align with those valued by the school while others do not. Those families whose codes and values align with the schools enter with a foundation of skills and motives that may prepare them for the academic agenda. For those students and families whose codes are not aligned with the school, the academic culture is foreign to them and this only widens a gap between them and the school that can span for generations. These codes, models, and scripts are often shared by members of a community and carry a great deal of generational and historical influences that are instantiated through routines and practices (Rogoff, 2003). When parental involvement practices are not consistent with those defined by the schools or teachers, many educators feel they need to "teach"

parents how to be involved in their children's education. This is evident in parenting workshops where educators and/or administrators train parents on how to become academically involved with their children; this may encompass teaching parents the academic language used in the schools, teaching them how to set up their home-environment in which they can study quietly without interruptions and distractions, or simply teaching effective communication techniques to their children in ways that may be consistent with their teacher and the school's way of communicating. With this model and deficit view of parents, it can undermine the parent's role as an educator themselves or as a partner in their child's learning. Because parental involvement has been signified as a practice that parents will partake in when they have more time and resources, such as chaperoning field trips and volunteering in the classroom, teachers have a tendency to place a higher value on school- based involvement, and this only perpetuates the deficit view of thinking that minority, working class parents do not care about their children's schooling. Mehan, Villanueva, Hubbard, and Lintz (1996) suggest that just as these parents' non-traditional involvement strategies are often invisible to schools, so are their roles outside of the traditional school-family partnership model.

Sentiments between teachers and parents reflect the relationship and partnership between them as well as their construction of reality. This reality, in each of their own perspectives, is highly subjective and is formed due to a number of factors. The quality of their interactions is determined by mutual alignment of their ideas pertaining to the education of the student. When family and home cultures are at odds with those of the dominant culture, this may lead to tensions and misunderstandings (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994b). Cankar, Deutsch, and Sentocnik (2012) conducted a study on 3rd and 9th grade teachers and parents, and their goals were to estimate the degree to which expected and actual cooperation between parents and teachers were

in agreement, secondly, to find out the interconnectedness of parents' involvement or

cooperation with parents' gender, education, location of their home, participation in formal

school events, and lastly, to determine if a Reading and Conversation program improved

cooperation between the school and family. Questionnaires were given to 368 3rd and 9th grade

parents and 132 teachers from 55 randomly selected primary schools. The questionnaires

compared answers of groups of teachers, groups of parents, as well as those of parents and

teachers. The questionnaires, one written for teachers, and one for parents assessed three

variables: (1) school to home communication-how well parents were informed of the school and

how it operated, (2) parent and teacher influence on the school, and (3) involvement measuring

parent-teacher involvement in the learning process. A focus interview was also conducted with

9th grade teachers asking them to describe their constraints in collaborating with parents. The

Reading and Conversation program, which lasted for a year, entailed students, parents, and their

teacher reading books and discussing content related to diversity, tolerance, celebrations,

intergenerational contacts, and life messages. The plan for collaboration was put together by all

involved and they met for monthly meetings. Results showed that both parents and teachers

agreed that a partnership between parents and teachers was beneficial for their children and

students. They also agreed that school to home communication was essential for good

cooperation, but there were some discrepancies in regard to the form of communication. Third

grade teachers, especially, were more positive than parents about their provision of information

regarding their students' progression meeting expectations. Parents were also more negative

about a lack of information on their parent rights and information for involvement in school

activities. Teachers also reported that parents influenced the workings and decisions of the

school. However, parents didn't feel they could express opinions about school decisions nor

were they informed about decisions affecting students. When looking at variables determining

the quality of school to home cooperation, only the parents' attendance of formal school events

had a statistically significant effect ($p < .01$) on parents reporting the importance of school to

home communication ($p < .05$) and involvement in schoolwork ($p < .01$). Parent education also

had a statistically significant influence on the parents reporting the importance of parent

influence on schoolwork and involvement ($p < .01$). Mothers, parents with more education, and

parents who attended formal school events rated parental involvement higher, and those

variables had a statistically significant influence on parents reporting involvement ($p < .05$).

Location of their home had no influence on the quality of cooperation. Participation in the

Reading and Conversation program yielded results with parents reporting positive experiences

with communication, advice, teacher activity, successful organization, and collaboration with the

school counselor. Parents also had some negative perceptions of the school's lukewarm attitude

toward parent initiative. However, by the end of the project, parents' attitudes toward their

children's teachers changed and all reported that they understood the importance of their

engagement in their children's education. The 9th grade teacher interviews showed that teachers'

statements also supported the empirical data. They felt that cooperation with parents was critical,

but the type of cooperation was the most important question. Some teachers felt that parents

didn't seem too interested in their child's success and their expectations seemed unrealistic.

They also enjoyed collaboration with parents, but did not appreciate when they would interfere

in the classroom. Some felt that parents could express their opinions in parent meetings, but

should let the teacher do their work in the classroom while they do their work at home. Results

from the parent and teacher questionnaires showed discrepancies in each group's views about

their parent-teacher cooperation. Teachers, as a group, are fairly homogeneous in their views of

parental involvement and expectations, and though they value the importance of parental involvement, they also saw their role as more of an obligation than a partnership. Parents, on the other hand, come from more diverse backgrounds, social groups, and have different educational experiences and expectations. These differences and gaps point out the necessity for schools and teachers to be mindful of the gaps that exist between their perceptions of their parent outreach with what parents perceive as welcome and realistic for them to participate in.

Role Conceptualization

Many of the obstacles to involvement, as well as parents' experiences, influence the ways in which they conceptualize their role in their child's education. Some of those obstacles may include minimal opportunities for involvement, lack of parent efficacy or parent education, time and job pressures, as well as language barriers (Anfara & Mertens, 2008) Traditional models of involvement carry the assumption that parents are to participate in the school to support the teacher. Several studies support the idea that parents and teachers are in alignment with the knowledge that parents have a responsibility for their children's education (Cankar, Deutsch, & Sentocnik, 2012; Bartel, 2010), but for many parents who have obstacles that keep them being involved in the school, it is the type and degree of involvement that are not always recognized and understood. Biddle (1986) posit that roles that people take on are socially constructed and are a set of duties, obligations, and expected behaviors that correspond with the varied positions that people take on in multiple social contexts.

Role theory provides a possible explanation for and provides a glimpse into the reasons for the many discrepancies that we see between the school and teacher's views on how parent involvement should be conceptualized. There are three concepts that frame role theory: (1) roles

or identities are assumed by participants in a social setting (in the school, it is the teachers, parents, and students), (2) the characteristic social behaviors are expected of and demonstrated by members of that social group (students learn, teachers teach, parents support teachers), and (3) there are scripts or expectations for the behaviors of varied members (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983). Those expectations are learned through interactions within those social groups and they could be explicit or implicit, individual or shared (Biddle & Thomas, 1966). When looking at how parents construct their roles in their children's education, the perceptions about what they are supposed to do are predictive of their involvement in the home and in the school.

Role theory helps explain that parents' roles are constructed by the relationships with others within their contexts. Whitaker and Hoover-Dempsey (2013) hypothesized that parents' understanding of their role in their child's learning is influenced by their prior experiences with schools, their perceptions of invitations for involvement from (1) the school, (2) the teacher, (3) the student, and (4) the school's implicit expectations for parent involvement. Their study compared role beliefs in two Title I middle schools; one school primarily consisted of African American parents and the second consisted of Caucasian parents. Each school was at different stages of implementing their parent involvement programs. The study first aimed to identify ways in which schools and staff influence parents' role construction for involvement in their children's education predicted by parents' valence toward school, parents' perceptions of student and teacher's invitations to involvement, perceptions of school expectations of involvement, and perceptions of the school climate. Secondly, the study aimed to identify if parents' current experiences in schools were more influential in their current involvement rather than their own prior experiences in schools. School #1, with a majority African American population, was a Title I school for five years. They had a parent-partnership center where parent workshops, focus

groups, and events were held. Communication was made through parent meetings and newsletters. School #2 was majority Caucasian and was a Title I school for only one year. They were in the process of creating their parent involvement program, and parent activities included conferences, open house, and field days. Teachers made contact with parents through phone calls or letters home. Both schools sent home district-created mailings three times a year regarding parent activities and methods of communication available to them. Results showed that at School #1, parents' perceptions of school expectations of involvement, school climate, and student invitations were predictive of their role beliefs while school climate was the only predictor at School #2. At School #2, even though the school had a family coordinator, whose role was to develop the expectations and invitations throughout the year, there was still a mismatch between beliefs about parents' roles in student learning and the staff expectations of involvement. At School #2, where there was no family coordinator, the responsibility for communicating with families fell on the staff and teachers. These teachers made more frequent contacts, which may have influenced parents' perceptions of the school climate. Results also showed that parents' valence toward school was not directly related to parents' role beliefs and that their current experiences with schools were more predictive of their role beliefs than their prior school experiences. In Title I schools where a high percentage of the students are from low-income families, social networking is rooted more in kinship groups whereas middle-upper class parents may have interwoven social ties with their children's teachers and school personnel to help them navigate the school system (Whitaker & Hoover-Dempsey, 2013). Because Title I schools decide how to involve parents and this differ across schools and districts, these results cannot be generalized. However, they give us a glimpse into the ways that schools influence the ways that parents perceive their roles in their children's education.

Previous work also finds that parents' educational aspirations and their level of investment are relatively similar across social class and racial groups, but the expression of those aspirations and demonstrations of investment may differ (Lareau, 1989; Lopez, Scribner, & Mahitivanichcha, 2001; Drummond & Stipek, 2004). Hoover-Dempsey, Walker, and Sandler (2005b) posit that there are passive and active manifestations of how parents perceive their role to be in their children's education. Parents taking an active role believe they are solely responsible for the children's achievement while one who takes on a passive role believes the school is primarily responsible and they are to intervene when the school seeks out their support. However, for parents to put into action what they perceive their roles to be, feeling self-efficacious in their roles is often the catalyst to involvement (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005b; Diamond & Gomez, 2004).

In her qualitative study, Sudduth (2011) used narrative interviews with eight African American parents of elementary school students to identify what motivated them to be involved in their children's education, what role construction guided them to be involved, and how they perceived teacher, student, and school invitations for involvement. This study challenges Epstein's (1995) model that assumes that parents respond to school's invitations for involvement. This model does not suggest the consideration of race and culture that involves activities that parents of ethnically diverse parents may participate in. It also does not address parents' perceptions of their roles in their children's education and efficacy for involvement. Some of those activities may include ensuring that their children are adequately prepared for school, monitoring their homework, and assisting in learning-related activities (Diamond & Gomez, 2004). The results that emerged from Sudduth's (2011) study supports previous empirical evidence that African American parents play an integral role in their children's education, but

may do so in different ways. Sudduth (2011) emphasized the role of the community in the lives

of this group of families. Parents defined their community as church, beauty and barbershops,

and non-school youth serving agencies; they believed that the responsibility of raising a child

should not be placed on one person but there should be interdependence on the community. For

example, one parent emphasized this by inviting patrons of her business to help her daughter

prepare for an achievement test and also by seeking advice from an elder in the community.

They believed it was their personal obligation as parents to help guide their children to a better

future, and their role construction of their involvement was framed by the support from their

community, parents, and grandparents. Parents in this group were also more responsive to

invitations if they knew their support would directly benefit their child. Sudduth's (2011) small

sample of already-involved parents did not consider social class and working-class African

American parents in her study as Diamond and Gomez (2004) did.

Because working and middle-class parents often need to negotiate different home and

school environments, they may interact with schools and teachers differently. Middle-class

parents may have more self-efficacy in negotiating their school environments and the resources

available to them while working-class parents may not be given the same opportunities in the

areas in which they reside. While the middle-class parents of their Diamond and Gomez's

(2004) study enrolled their children in magnet schools, the children of working-class parents

attended their neighborhood schools where most of the students received free and reduced lunch.

Though this literature review does not cover studies related to the influencing factors of social

class on parent involvement, this particular study underscores the point that working and middle-

class African American parents all value the interconnectedness between the home and school

(Lareau, 1989). In their study, fewer middle-class parents reported being involved in

volunteering in their schools, while the working-class parents reported playing roles as hall

monitors, field trip chaperones, and class aides. Likewise, more working-class parents reported

involvement in decision -making roles in a school council than middle-class parents. Most

importantly, working-class parents emphasized wanting to ensure that their children received a

good education even if their school environments were not ideal. Many teachers in previous

studies have reported African American parents having a more confrontational stance with

teachers (Lareau & Horvat, 1999), but parents of this study reported that ensuring a quality

education meant challenging the school administration and teachers if they perceived the school

to be lacking in meeting their child's educational needs. These parents reported wanting to be

seen with more reform-based orientations rather than being perceived as confrontational. They

also reported wanting to feel a need to establish legitimacy with their teachers and to also hold

the school responsible for educating their children. This further shows that even if parents do not

feel efficacious with the academic skills to help their children or to be in the schools, they still

desire the best education for their children and will do what they can to advocate for them.

Many of the roles that parents and guardians take on may be influenced by the school

climate, by the social interactions with staff, and the sense of belonging they may or may not feel

in the school environment. A consideration is that for some families whose cultures are rooted in

relational ties, the type of communication initiated by the teacher or school may also make a

difference in their role perceptions, thus influencing the way that parents conceptualize their

involvement.

Educators can be unaware of the invisible strategies that parents use to support their

children's education, such as making sacrifices for their children (Mehan, et al., 1996). Lopez,

(2001) proposes that the transfer of sociocultural values should also be recognized as a legitimate

form of parental involvement that schools can build upon. Several researchers claim that

Epstein's (1995) model does not address a sense of inclusion of all parents (Lareau & Horvat,

1999) or does not consider status such as race and class (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Parents of

high socioeconomic status have been found to play a more proactive role in their children's

education while parents of lower socioeconomic status are more involved behind the scenes

(Baker & Stevenson, 1986; Lareau, 1989, 2003). African American and Latino parents may also

have a more adversarial or ambivalent stance toward participation in the schools because of

programs that have historically failed their communities (Lareau & Horvat, 1999).

Extending on the framework of role theory, Auerbach (2007) conducted a three- year

ethnographic case study that looked at what shapes non-college educated parents' beliefs, goals,

and experiences when they want their high school aged children to attend college. Parent

involvement literature focused on parental engagement in the Latino culture emerged in response

to the growing achievement gap and due to Latinos being categorized as the largest growing

racial/ethnic minority and among the least educated (Mena, 2011). Though the dropout rate has

improved significantly, from 30% in 1990 to 13% in 2013, and the high school graduation rate

has also improved, from 58% in 1990 to 76% in 2013 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014),

Latinos are still reported to be the least educated minority group. The study took place in a large,

urban high school, and a small sample of majority Latino working-class immigrant and African

American parents was selected to explore their role construction in their children's education

when they themselves had educational backgrounds ranging from no education to some

community college experience. Auerbach's (2007) study was grounded in the framework that

parents' roles in education are (1) socially structured by class and race, (2) culturally mediated

by cultural scripts, and (3) enacted according to individual psychological resources and

relationships within families. The data collected from parent interviews was triangulated with

data from three years of observations, meetings, and interactions and revealed a variation of how

parents typified their roles, practices, and beliefs in their children's education. Auerbach (2007)

placed parents in three categories along a parental involvement continuum: Moral Supporters,

who were parents who were more behind the scenes, Ambivalent Companions, who were the

parents who provided more strong, emotional support and occasional direct help, and Struggling

Advocates, who were the parents who provided direct, instrumental support at home and at

school. With particular attention to the demographics of the study, Latino immigrants and

parents with the lowest education levels were typified as Moral Supporters. They reported a

limited knowledge base that kept them from being involved, but also provided support through

approval, motivating, and encouraging their children; they trusted the school system to prepare

their children and were more likely to respond to their children's invitations for involvement.

African Americans, Latino immigrants, and those with mixed levels of education but had the

most college knowledge were typified as Struggling Advocates. Many of these parents worried

about their children not having access to opportunities, and their mode of support included

monitoring and advocating for their child; their focus was more on cultural and social capital and

finding the means to benefit their children's education. African Americans, Latina immigrants,

and single mothers with some college were typified as Ambivalent Companions. These parents'

goals were to bolster their child's self-esteem and to keep them safe. They wanted to accomplish

this by encouraging, communicating with, and protecting their child, but they were also hesitant

to let go of them. They saw college as a threat to their family ties. This group of parents reported

the most inconsistent support of their children at home and at school and trusted their teachers

and the school to give their children the information they needed. Overall, the study suggests

that parents may conceptualize their capital as a resource that can be exchanged to help them

accomplish a goal. This conceptualization can reflect how they believe they are contributing to

their children's education. Many of the parents in this study, perhaps due to their own lack of

education, took cues for involvement from their children. This study is a challenge to the

schools and institutions that conceptualize parental involvement in very traditional ways rather

than in ways that may be hidden or invisible to the schools. It also brings to light the variety of

ways that parents perceive their roles and conceptualize involvement. It also challenges

educators to deepen relationships with the parents in their classrooms if they are to fully

understand the constraints to their involvement. Because this study consisted of a small sample,

mostly of Latino American parents, further qualitative studies of a larger sample of ethnically

diverse parents in their home contexts will enable for more understanding of the barriers that

may keep parents from being involved. They may also highlight family structural factors and

experiences of minority ethnic groups that will provide insight into the differential modes of

involvement that educators experience.

School Versus the Home: Where Does it Matter?

The common misconception that Latino parents are not involved in their children's

education is addressed in several studies that focus primarily on the emphasis that Latino parents

place on home-based parental involvement activities (Fan, 2001). Latino students often report

high home-based involvement practices where their parents emphasize the importance of

academic success and achievement. It has been found that some of these home-based practices

predict achievement more strongly than aspects of school-based practices (Fantuzzo, McWayne,

Perry, & Childs, 2004; Ho & Willms, 1996; Fan, 2001; Suizzo & Stapleton, 2007). There have

been several identified practices: verbal interactions such as story telling and family discussions,

museum and library visits (Bradley, Corwyn, Burchinal, et al., 2001), and family routines (Fiese et al., 2002). There is less emphasis placed on school-based activities due to a common separation between the home and school environments in their countries of origin (Valencia & Black, 2002). Mena's (2011) study on 137 Latino 9th graders investigated the influence of Latino families' home-based parental involvement practices on students' beliefs about school and academic persistence. Measurements included student self-report surveys that assessed two parental constructs: parental involvement and student school beliefs. Parental involvement variables included monitoring, social support from family, and parent educational encouragement. Student school belief variables included perceptions of school responsiveness, school engagement-trouble, academic attitudes, and academic self-efficacy. The students' intentions to complete high school were measured as the dependent variable. Structural equation modeling revealed (1) that the proposed model of a relationship between parental involvement, student school beliefs, and intention to complete the present school year fit the data well, and (2) that student's school beliefs mediated a relationship between home-based parental involvement practices and the students' intentions to complete the school year. Results from this and Auerbach's (2007) study continue to underscore the need for schools and teachers to find greater congruence between home and school cultures. Understanding Latino families' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez et al., 1995; Moll et al., 1992) they bring into the classroom, not only as a cultural group, but even as individuals may help educators become more aware of and knowledgeable of the roles that parents perceive to have in their children's education. Accessing families or students' funds of knowledge entails understanding their culturally and historically developed skills and ways of functioning for their households or individual well-being (Greenberg, 1989). In alignment with Bronfenbrenner's (1979) Ecological Model, understanding

the student's funds of knowledge acknowledges the students' mesosystem networks in and out of

their homes. The guardian in the home, the child's first teacher, knows the child holistically and

not merely as a student, but as one influenced by the spheres of activities and interactions in

which the child is embedded (Lopez et al., 2001). In many households, children do not have the

same roles they have in the classroom. In the home, their role and participation is often active

while in the classroom, it can be passive. The active role they take on encompasses activities

that are mediated by their social relationships and interactions; it is a resource that schools and

teachers rarely tap into (Lopez et al., 2001). When teachers continue to hold the deficit view that

Latino families do not care or are not active participants in their children's education, this view

does not honor parents' active presence in the child's home lives nor does it value the ways the

child and the family functions together for their educational development. Traditional practices

of parental involvement that are encouraged in many schools may explicitly or implicitly seek to

transform the culture within families in very subtle ways (Sigel & Laosa, 1983). So, when

parents are not conforming to those practices, there is the assumption that these marginalized

parents are not providing an adequate environment at home that is conducive to the child's

educational success. Honoring every student's family and culture is of utmost importance, and it

is important to remember that different families conceptualize and regard parental involvement

practices in the home to be just as important as others may regard school-based involvement

practices.

Cultural Implications on Constructs of Student Motivation

Previous studies on parental involvement primarily considered the viewpoints of the

dominant culture in the schools. Traditional forms of parental involvement in those studies,

however, can have differential effects across ethnic groups as those forms of involvement may

be perceived or defined in different ways. For example, the effects of parental advising in their children's education may be perceived positively to some while to others, it may be viewed negatively. Hickey (2003) defines culture as how individuals construct understandings, ways of fulfilling needs, and goals from interactions they experience in context. Culture also influences student perceptions of how their parents value their education and how their parental involvement practices are received. Those roles that parents play are constructed by their interactions in their social communities and contexts (Biddle & Thomas, 1966), and their cultures also play a defining role in those contexts and communities. Along with the importance of the actions that parents take in their children's education, whether active or passive, are the goals and educational expectations they convey to their children.

Past research has found that perceptions of parents' goal orientations were significant predictors of students' own goal orientations (Friedel, et al., 2007; Gutman, 2006). J. Kim, and M. Kim, Schallert (2010) examined the influences of parent involvement by looking at how Korean students perceive their parents and the degree to which they shape motivational orientations in the classroom. Their study had three purposes: (1) to examine the degree of predictability of contextual factors on students' goal orientations when data is collected from a culture that is not typically studied in parental involvement literature, (2) to explore the different ways that Korean students' perceptions of their parents' motivating styles would be associated with their own self-regulated motivation, and (3) to integrate self-determination and achievement goal theories' perspectives and to assess its universality in explaining motivation. Their goal was to identify how the Korean middle and high school students' perceptions of their parents shape the kind and degree of motivational orientations they adopt in their math classroom. Fuligni and Tseng (1999) posit that Asian American immigrant students may feel a strong sense of familial

obligation. Stevenson et al. (1990) also found that in some Asian families, a child achieves for

his or her family and education is viewed as a collective attainment. Performance in school can

be a reflection on the family. This perspective can be in conflict with the teacher's view of what

is considered appropriate parenting or parental involvement. With this, Urdan (2004) then

hypothesized that students with different definitions of self may pursue performance goals for

different reasons. He claimed that students with stronger family orientations, such as first

generation students from collectivist cultures adopt particular goal orientations out of respect for

fulfilling obligations to their family members.

Most studies on the influences of parental involvement on student motivation discuss the

positive outcomes of autonomy on student motivation, but in some cultures, control can be

associated with positive outcomes. A controlling motivational style may be exhibited by valuing

obedience and conformity. Parents who take on this style may want to solve their children's

problems and/or take the lead in their children's lives (Grolnick, 2003). It has also been found

that non-Western individuals may not necessarily perceive autonomy to be helpful (Markus &

Kitayama, 2003). J. Kim et al., (2010) then extend these ideas by contending that in some

cultures, such as the Korean culture, parents may motivate children by controlling them, setting

goals and limits, and evaluating them from their own perspectives. They measured orientation

by looking at students' goal orientations and perceptions of their parents motivating style as

controlling or being autonomy supportive. When these children conform to the social norms or

expectations, they may not feel controlled, but their conformity will be experienced as self-

determined (Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). Korean students may, therefore, view parent

involvement as some form of interference performed out of affection. Their study was conducted

on two samples of students. One sample of boys and girls was taken from a middle school in a

large city while the second sample was taken from an all-girls high school in a small city. The

measures in this study included a student self-report assessment of their personal achievement

goal orientation, their perceptions of the classroom goal structure, perceptions of their parents'

goal orientations for them, perceptions of their parents' motivating style, and a self-regulation

questionnaire assessing their reasons for studying math. A parent measure was used to assess

parent goal orientations for their children. Results showed that Korean students' goal

orientations were predicted by their perceptions of their parents' goals and motivating styles.

Students' self-regulation motivations also mediated their perceptions of classroom goal

structures. Interestingly, the students' perceptions of class goal structure predicted goal

orientation more than their perceptions of parents' motivating styles and goal orientations.

Correlations between students' perceptions of parents' goals and classroom goal structure was

higher than correlations between parent and student reports of parents' goal orientation alone.

Mastery orientation was associated with identified regulation, and this was predicted by the

students' perceptions of their parents' motivating styles- either autonomy supportive or

controlling. Though they perceived their parents to be controlling, the students adopted

autonomous regulations. Parental autonomy support then predicted both intrinsic and extrinsic

forms of motivation in the forms of identified and introjected regulation. Due to this, perceptions

of a mastery classroom emphasis still mediated a performance approach in the classrooms as a

way to avoid showing signs of incompetence and shame. In connecting the two theories, it was

found that students' goal orientations were predicted by their perceptions of their parental and

classroom variables, and this was mediated by their self-regulated motivation. Their mastery

orientation was also predicted by identified regulation and being motivated by the value of the

task; students were found to be more motivated by finding the tasks valuable rather than

enjoying them. When students saw more value in the task, their performance goal orientations increased. They also had a level of performance-approach and avoidance goal orientation, and this was predicted by their perceptions of their parents' performance goals, which was mediated by introjected regulation. The students' motivation was due to inner pressure or avoidance of shame. In some non-Western cultures, autonomy can be viewed as immobilizing (Markus & Kitayama, 2003). Previous studies also showed that Asian American children were more intrinsically motivated when tasks were assigned to them rather than given a choice of a task (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999). The cultural findings from this study shows that when we look at motivational theories and constructs, we may need to take into consideration the cultural factors that influence the goal orientations of diverse populations on parental involvement. What one student might perceive as controlling and interfering with one's intrinsic motivation may also be perceived as a form of affection and encouragement to another, thus affecting their achievement or motivational outcomes in the classroom.

Extending Fan and Williams' (2010) study on the effects of parental involvement on students' academic self-efficacy, engagement, and intrinsic motivation, Fan, Williams, and Wolters (2012) looked at the effects of parental involvement on constructs of school motivation across different ethnic groups. They looked at how different dimensions of parental involvement were linked to the motivational constructs self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation in math and reading, and behavioral engagement. Deci and Ryan (1985) posit that social factors impact the development of intrinsic motivation, which predicts greater engagement, persistence, and achievement. These 10th graders were seen to be at a transitional point in their education where they were being asked to make decisions regarding their future, thus the study was done at a pivotal point in their lives. The data was collected for three years, was taken from the

Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS: 2002), and included data from Caucasians, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic students. The measures for parent involvement included five measures. Parental advising was measured by whether parents gave their children advice on course selection, on advice about jobs and college, as well other troubles that 10th graders might experience. Parental participation in school functions was measured by whether parents attended parent-teacher organization meetings or volunteered in the schools. Parent and school communication in regard to school problems was assessed by the frequency at which parents or schools initiated contact about poor performance or behavior problems. Parent and school communication regarding benign problems was assessed by contact by either the parent or the school in regards to course selections, questions about school problems, and questions about homework. Lastly, parental aspiration for students' postsecondary education was measured by a scale that assessed the degree or highest level of education they would like to see their children obtain. Results showed that particular aspects of parental involvement in school were related to but had differential effects on their children's motivation. Parental advising and parent-school communication on benign issues was positively related to Hispanic and Asian American students' intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy in English and negatively related to Asian American students' intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy in math. Parental advising had a positive affect on African American students' intrinsic motivation. Parental aspirations for their children's education was positively related to the student's motivation across all ethnic groups and was a strong predictor for self-efficacy in English and in all groups in math except for Asian Americans. It also predicted Caucasian student's intrinsic motivation toward math. Parents' participation in school functions had significant effects for Caucasians and African Americans. It was positively related to self-efficacy in English and in engagement for Caucasians, but had

mixed results for African Americans. Parent's school participation positively predicted African American's engagement, but negatively predicted their intrinsic motivation toward English. Parent-school communication in regards to school problems was a negative predictor of intrinsic motivation and had negative effects across all motivational constructs. There were significant negative effects on intrinsic motivation towards English for Caucasians and a significant negative effect on intrinsic motivation toward math in all groups except for African Americans. There were also strong negative effects on Asian Americans on self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation in math and in engagement. School contact regarding benign issues had no significant effect for Caucasians and African Americans, but was negatively associated with academic self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation toward math for Asian Americans. It also had a positive effect on Hispanic student's intrinsic motivation toward English when there was increased parent to school communication concerning benign issues. When looking at parent reports, Caucasian and African American parents reported more advice to their children than Asian American and Hispanic parents. Caucasian parents also reported that they participated in more school functions, but parents of African American and Hispanic students reported attendance at more parent-teacher organization meetings. African American parents reported the most contact with school concerning student problems or benign issues while Asian American parents reported the least amount of school contact. Hispanic parents reported the highest frequency of school and parent-initiated contacts concerning poor performance. This study shows us the differential effects of parental involvement on student motivational constructs across different ethnic groups and how one groups' conceptualizations of parental involvement cannot be generalized. The results show that Asian American parents' conceptualization of involvement, in particular, may have adverse affects on their children's motivation. Many Asian parents traditionally value math and science

(J. Kim et al., 2010), and the information that they receive from their children in regard to their academic progress also informs them of how to guide their children's decisions about courses to take as well as the out-of-school activities that they are to participate in. This can be perceived as controlling or as a form of affection (J. Kim et al., 2010), but this study shows its negative impact on Asian student's intrinsic motivation, engagement, and self-efficacy in math in particular. Parental aspirations and communication with schools regarding benign issues had a more positive affect on students' self-efficacy and behavioral engagement, which is not surprising at the adolescent age when they are valuing more autonomy in making their own decisions and also wanting to feel the support from their parents. A language barrier may also influence the reports that Asian and Hispanic parents do not participate in school functions or do not initiate communication with their children's teachers, but it may also be due to cultural beliefs that influence a more home-based involvement that is not observed in the schools. The findings in this and J. Kim et al.'s (2010) studies underscore the importance of understanding how parents, in seen or unseen ways, play an integral role in influencing their children's goal and motivational orientations and how the differential effects of involvement can be mediated by culture. In these studies, motivation was viewed and analyzed with a cultural lens, but the ways in which it was measured was still framed by a dominant lens, thus narrowing the scope of how we view the range of influences on motivation that impact these diverse groups.

Most studies on student motivation are conducted on elementary and early adolescent students as many studies have shown that parent involvement drops off into the high school years (Epstein, 1986; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002), but sometimes the longitudinal effects of parental involvement and practices still influence how older students make educational decisions

and steer their goals. Several of the aforementioned studies as well as the following studies look at the differential outcomes of parental involvement as mediated by culture.

Suizzo and Soon (2006) studied the longitudinal effects of specific parental academic socialization practices on 249 diverse college students' development of internal locus of control across four ethnic groups. Research has shown that children's perceived competence and internal locus of control mediate the relationship between parental involvement and school performance (Trusty & Lampe, 1997). Their aim was to identify the dimensions of parental academic socialization that college students' parents had used on them with them when they were younger. Parental academic socialization was described as how parents convey their educational beliefs and expectations to their children. In this study, parental involvement was defined as ways in which parents support and facilitate their children's education, educational practices, directly and indirectly (Fehrmann, Keith, & Reimers, 1987). School-based practices of parental involvement entailed meeting with teachers while home-based involvement involved monitoring and structuring time, engaging in learning activities, discussing school and education, and building educational expectations (Epstein & Sanders, 2002; Fantuzzo et al., 2004). Suizzo and Soon (2006) looked at parental academic socialization in two forms: demandingness and responsiveness. Demandingness is exhibited by parents' attempts to control children by family and social norms, while responsiveness is shown when parents encourage desirable behaviors and acknowledge their children's autonomy (Baumrind, 1991). Responsiveness is associated with intrinsic motivation and internal locus of control (Wentzel, 1999). Past studies have also identified three socialization approaches: structuring, managerial, and facilitative. One aim of this study was to see how Chinese American, European American, Latino, and African American students preferred particular approaches to socialization. In previous studies, it was found that

Chinese American parents would take on a more structural approach where there was more monitoring of activities. European American parents preferred a facilitative and managerial approach where there was more help with homework and more school-based involvement (Ho & Willms, 2006). Warmth and relationship building were key characteristics of Latino parenting and they referred to structuring and monitoring as a way to socialize with their children (Ho & Willms, 2006) with mothers engaging in more of the didactic experiences with the child (Vargas & Busch-Rossnagel, 2003). This has been supported in past research that shows that maternal warmth has been found to predict academic performance in elementary school (Hill, 2001) while parental encouragement is associated with achievement in high school (Catsambis, 2001). Past studies have shown that African American families report more home-based than school-based involvement (Ho & Willms, 1996) and African Americans may prefer structure and monitor their children with a combination of strict and warm practices. Suizzo and Soon (2006) sought to investigate the ethnic group differences in the frequencies of parental academic socialization dimensions and also see which dimensions were related to students' internal locus of control. In this study, locus of control was defined as a generalized expectation of the relation between ones actions and the outcomes of those actions (Rotter, 1966). The measures used in this study were (1) the participants' age, sex, ethnicity, mothers' education level, and other family characteristics, and (2) participants' perception of their parents' childrearing practices in relation to discipline, nurturing, and academic support. This measure also assessed parental support and encouragement of the students' autonomy and efforts. Lastly, locus of control was measured by assessing students' perceptions of the connection between their actions and the consequences of these actions. Results revealed three dimensions of parental academic socialization: emotional support, demanding hard work, and active involvement. As predicted, results showed that

European Americans reported higher frequency of autonomy and emotional support from their actively involved parents. Accordingly, Asian Americans also reported high frequency of demandingness where parents push for competition and for their children to be the best. Due to the fact that all participants had already achieved a high level of success by being in college, there was no evidence of ethnic group differences in locus of control. The researchers point out that this may be a universal parental goal. Parent practices and values may emphasize personal control in the fulfillment of certain internal goals. Emotional support was most strongly associated with European Americans' locus of control and predicted internal locus of control for Asian Americans. This could be due to more demandingness reported by Asian Americans, so rare demonstrations of emotional support may have a stronger effect.

This and previous studies looking at Asian American parents' involvement practices support that Asian American students may perceive their parents' practices differentially (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2012; M. Kim et al., 2010). Latinos, African Americans, and European Americans equally reported high frequencies of parental emotional autonomy practices to support their learning. This study further substantiates the importance of considering ethnically diverse parents' forms of socialization and involvement at home that may also lead to differential student outcomes. Culture shapes parenting and parent-child relationships; these relationships may mediate educational ideals and outcomes.

The ways in which parents choose to be involved may also predict the ways that students engage in their academic work. As we look at adolescent motivation and engagement, the different ways in which involvement is conceptualized may need to be more critically considered. Wang and Sheikh-Khalil (2014), in a two-year longitudinal study, also examined the effects of the different types of parental involvement in the 10th grade on student achievement and

depression in the 11th grade. This study, with a sample of majority European American and African American students, also tested whether parental involvement influenced adolescent outcomes by increasing their academic engagement in school. Lastly, they wanted to see whether these associations varied by ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Parental involvement was conceptualized as school and home-based. School-based involvement entailed parent-teacher communication, attendance at school events, and volunteering at school. Home-based involvement entailed providing time for homework and leisure time, and monitoring schoolwork. Academic socialization was also included as communication of expectations about schoolwork and the importance of education and career goals (Hill, 2001). Other recent studies found that students have been more academically engaged when their parents were more involved in their education, and this is more true when parents are encouraging and express the importance of education (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2011). Eccles et al. (1993) posit that the quality of activities and interaction with parents provide adolescents with more information about their competency to succeed as autonomous learners, relate to others in different contexts, and take opportunities to fulfill their personal goals. Parental practices that afford these needs increase student engagement and promote positive outcomes. The measures included an assessment of home and school-based practices using the aforementioned conceptualizations of parent involvement, behavioral engagement, achievement measured by students' GPA, depression, and covariates such as gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, prior achievement, depression, and problems. Results showed that parents showed more home-based involvement and academic socialization than school-based involvement in the 10th grade. African American parents reported more home-based involvement than school-based involvement. There were no ethnic differences in parents showing more academic socialization, however higher socioeconomic status parents reported

more involvement in all three areas than lower socioeconomic status parents. Results also

showed that home-based involvement and academic socialization were more positively

associated with achievement and engagement and school-based involvement was not. School-

based involvement and academic socialization were also negatively associated with depression

whereas home-based involvement was not. Home-based involvement and achievement were

partially mediated by behavioral engagement, and the association between academic

socialization and achievement was partially mediated by behavioral and emotional engagement.

These results show that parental involvement in the 10th grade improved academic and emotional

functioning among adolescents in the 11th grade. These effects also varied based on the type of

involvement that parents engaged in. Academic socialization can also be perceived as

controlling in some cultures, such as the Asian American culture (Wang, Pomerantz, & Chen,

2007) and could lead to depression. Among Mexican American families, the cultural value of

consejos emphasizes communication, warmth, familial expectations, and the encouragement of

independent thinking among children (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994). This "other" form of involvement

in their children's education, which has a positive effect on Mexican American adolescents well-

being may not be fully appreciated or valued by most schools or teachers because it is not visible

to them. This study reminds us that the traditional conceptualization of parent involvement does

not necessarily result in positive outcomes. Sometimes parents are present in the schools for

non-academic issues, such as when their children have behavioral problems, or sometimes the

duties that are given to them may not be those they are comfortable with. They may also feel less

capable or less effective at changing their child's behavior and achievement due to a lack of time,

resources, and information. Some families may also have more unstable environments, thus

academic socialization may be rare if these children have less exposure to information about educational expectations and aspirations.

<u>Conclusion</u>

In this current educational climate, there is a strong emphasis on accountability and results as a way to show progress. We can see through the empirical research and tireless efforts of educators and administrators that this area of involving parents in their children's education still remains a high priority. Because of the dynamic nature of our society, we can expect there to be a similar nature to how parents continue to be involved in their children's education. How they do so is a result of their interacting systems and circumstances that affect the child and their microsystems (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The interaction and alignment of the child and parent microsystem and the child and teacher microsystem, known as the mesosystem, as we can see, can be identified and viewed in many ways. The risks and opportunities afforded by these interactions impact the child's development, but those risks and opportunities as we can see from the research, can be open to discussion and reconceptualization. What one may consider a risk may be an opportunity to another. In this review, influencing factors such as parent efficacy, family structures, role perceptions, culture, and parent education have all been seen as factors to parental involvement. It has also been seen how these factors affect student outcomes in mostly positive, but some negative ways as well. The end result that all parents/guardians and educators want is for the child to have a positive and healthy development that fosters cognitive growth and motivation. Whether that motivation is mediated by home or school-based parental involvement or different socialization methods differs from family to family and across cultures. Schools cannot prescribe traditional forms of parental involvement as the basis by which parents are held accountable, nor can federal legislation measure parental involvement by the same standards

(NCLB, 2002). Doing so takes away the parent's voice and continues to place the power in the hands of administrators and teachers when there should be a partnership.

Implications for Teachers

It is clear that teachers appreciate parent help in their classrooms, and many schools place the onus on parent organization groups as their means to fund-raising and rallying other parents. Many of these parents can contribute in the classroom and in the schools, but these conceptualizations of involvement are not inclusive nor are they always in alignment with what other groups are able to contribute and give. Some parents respond more to personal teacher and student invitations and they are more likely to participate if their actions directly affect their own child (Sudduth, 2011; Whitaker & Hoover-Dempsey, 2013). Due to limited time and resources, what time some parents can offer may require adjustments in work schedules and time they may not always have. The warmth and appreciation, or positive climate that is provided for these parents can make a difference as to whether parents continue to volunteer or not. When that positive relationship is established, parents can then feel more comfortable. As seen in Sudduth's (2011) study, some families and cultures embrace their communities as a part of their family and fellow teachers to their children. When the teacher can be a part of the extended family and community, the partnership for educating that child can be nurtured.

Implications for Schools

Despite research findings, many schools still use traditional methods of encouraging parents to get involved in their children's education. They do so through sending fliers and emails home, sometimes translated in other languages, inviting them to parent organization meetings, or asking them to help with fundraising events. Going as far as translating the

newsletters and fliers does not accomplish the work of including all families. Parents who do not

speak the dominant language of the school, or do not feel connected to other parents may not

participate due to a lack of efficacy or knowledge of the school culture. Many of these parents

take the cues from their children when there is an event or an opportunity that directly affects

their child; they respond when they can be involved in a way in which they can feel comfortable

and needed by their child. Parent-teacher organization meetings can be viewed as potentially

intimidating as those in charge are, more often than not, those who have the resources or power

to push for action and have the social capital to attain what is needed for the school. Parents who

may feel isolated from those with more of a voice may feel they do not have the skills to make a

difference. School administrators, or those in leadership positions, need to consider the skills

that are outside of the traditional conceptualizations of parental involvement. Some parents who

may not have the financial or time resources may have strengths in other areas such as

connecting with others, or they can give in ways in which they feel comfortable, not in ways they

are expected to give. Honoring what other families can offer that are aligned to their strengths is

a way to be inclusive who may feel like they do not have as much power or voice. In doing so

and in building relationships, that power and voice can be developed and nurtured.

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) model calls for reciprocal interactions between the child's

microsystems, but in some cases, the teacher or school staff may need to be the first to extend the

hand in building a positive relationship with the parents. Communication regarding behavioral

or academic issues is also shown to have deleterious effects on parent as well as student

outcomes (Fan & Williams, 2010; Fan et al., 2012), so the first lines of communication should be

positive and inviting. A positive school climate can be more influential on parents' desires to be

involved than through school newsletters and parent meetings (Whitaker & Hoover-Dempsey,

2013). How schools and teachers involve families may also influence how parents view their roles in the children's education, so the role that the school and teachers have in building the relationship and setting the climate of the school can either deter or invite parents to become more involved in their own ways. Valuing the students' and families' funds of knowledge also honors the ways that all parents can be involved.

Limitations

Parent-child relationships can be rather complex. The parenting practices that parents and families utilize starting from the child's early age can set the tone for their relationship as the child gets older. As the child ages and changes, so do the interactions in their mesosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

A majority of studies on parental involvement use parent, student, and teacher questionnaires to measure perceptions of the level of parental involvement that each respective participant experiences. These perceptions can limit the validity of the results due to bias. They also cannot be generalized across cultures. The results from the studies touching on Asian Americans (Fan & Williams, 2010; Fan et al., 2012; Suizzo & Soon, 2006; Kim, J. et al., 2010; Cheung & Pomerantz, 2012), African Americans (Fan & Williams, 2010, Fan et al., 2012; Sudduth, 2011), Latinos (Mena, 2011), and European Americans (Fan & Williams, 2010, Fan, et al., 2012) also cannot be generalized within cultures. When differentiating across ethnic groups, the labels that researchers use can be very diverse with regards to the country from which members of the sample are taken. The results from these studies only tell us a broad story as to how some minority groups perceive and conceptualize involvement. There is also diversity in terms of the circumstances, acculturation level, and time of residency in the country where the

results are collected (Delgado-Gaitan, 2003). Some minority groups may also report higher expectations and involvement than European Americans due to a belief that their education is a means of overcoming discrimination barriers (Suizzo & Stapleton, 2007). Particular measures used in these studies don't necessarily measure involvement in ALL households and schools without some sort of bias. As with studies in the first section of this review, the use of multiple sources to report multiple variables can result in a halo effect, thus possibly excluding alternative explanation or overgeneralizing results.

Future Directions

Many of these studies have already uncovered multiple ways that parents and families can be involved in their child's education, however there is a scarcity in the number of studies focusing more on the level of involvement in the home. With the limited resources that many households have now, it is sure that this will be the continued state of many families in years to come. Focusing on parental involvement practices within the home, including verbal praise, socialization techniques, and also involvement of the community is an area to spend more time on. Ethnographic data, case studies, and other types of qualitative research methods in this area are also rare as time and financial resources can limit these types of studies. The consideration of design based research opportunities to build parent capacity can also provide case studies that look at student motivation.

Generational differences within and across cultures can also produce differential results. Looking at how acculturation levels and time in the country may also affect the way parental involvement is conceptualized in the home and school.

There continues to be many ways in which parental involvement can be conceptualized. Continuing to focus on how these conceptualizations influence student motivation is warranted as we all strive for more positive outcomes through involvement of the school community and families.

References

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(3),* 260-267.

Anfara, V.A., & Mertens, S.B. (2008). What research says: varieties of parent involvement in schooling. *Middle School Journal, 39(3),* 58-64.

Anderman, E.M., Eccles, J.S., Yoon, K.S., Roeser, R., Wifield, A., & Blumenfield, P. (2001). Learning to value mathematics and reading: Relations to mastery and performance-oriented instructional practices. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26(1),* 76-95.

Auerbach, S. (2007). From moral supporters to struggling advocates: Reconceptualizing parent roles in education through the experience of working-class families of color. *Urban Education, 42(3),* 250-283.

Baker, D.P., & Stevenson, D.L. (1986). Mothers' strategies for children's school achievement: Managing the transition to high school. *Sociology of Education, 59,* 157-166.

Bartel, V.B. (2010). Home and school factors impacting parental involvement in a Title I elementary school. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 24,* 209-228.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75,* 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Harmonious parents and their preschool children. *Developmental Psychology, 4(1),* 99-102.

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11(1*), 56-95

Baumrind, D., & Black, A.E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development, 38(2*), 291-327.

Biddle, B.J. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology, 12,* 67-92.

Biddle, B.J., & Thomas, E.J. (Eds.). (1966). *Role theory: concept and research*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Bradley, R.H., Corwyn, R.F., Burchinal, P.M., McAdoo, H.P., & Coll, C.G., (2001). The home environments of children in the United States: Part II. *Relations with behavioral Development through age thirteen. Child Development, 72,* 1868-1886.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S.J. (1994). Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A biological model. *Psychological Review, 4,* 568-586.

Cankar, F., Deutsch, T., & Sentocnik, S. (2012). Approaches to building teacher-parent Cooperation. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal, 2(1),* 35-55.

Catsambis, S. (2001). Expanding knowledge of parental involvement in children's secondary education: Connection with high school seniors' academic success. *Social Psychology of Education, 5*, 149-177.

Cheung, C.S., & Pomerantz, E.M. (2012). Why does parents' involvement enhance children's achievement? The role of parent-oriented motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(3),* 820-832.

Chrispeels, J.H. (1991). District leadership in parent involvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 367-371.

Davies, D. (1987). Parent involvement in the public schools. *Education and Urban Society*, *19*, 147-163.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The "what" and the "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11,* 227-268.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology, 49,* 182-285.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994). Consejos: The power of cultural narratives. *Anthropology of Education Quarterly, 25,* 298-316.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994b). Socializing young children in Mexican-American families: An intergenerational perspective. In P.M. Greenfield & R.R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp.55-87). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2003). Making a decision about college: Should I stay or should I go? Invited commentary. Harvard Family Research Project. Retrieved from www. hfrp.org.

Diamond , J.B., & Gomez, K. (2004). African American parents' educational orientations: The importance of social class and parents' perceptions of schools. *Education and Urban Society, 36(4)*, 383-427.

Drummond, K.V., & Stipek, D. (2004). Low income parents' beliefs about their role in children's academic learning. *The Elementary School Journal, 104(3),* 197-213.

Eccles, J.S. (1994). Understanding women's educational and occupational choices: Applying Eccles et al. model of achievement-related choices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 585-609.

Eccles, J.S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C.M., Reuman, D., & Flanagan, C. (1993). development during adolescence: The impact of state-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist, 48*, 90-101.

Eccles, J.S., Jacobs, J.E., & Harold, R.D. (1990). Gender role stereotypes, expectancy effects, and parents socialization of gender differences. *Journal of Social Psychology, 46,* 183-201.

Eccles, J.S., Roeser, R., Wigfield, A., & Freedman-Doan, C. (1999). Academic and motivational pathways through middle school. In L. Balter & C.S. Tamler-LeMonda (Eds.), Child psychology: A handbook of contemporary issues (pp. 287-317). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (1965). P.L. No. 89-10, 79 Stat 77, 20.

Epstein, J.L. (1986). Parents' reactions to teacher practices of parent involvement. The *Elementary School Journal, 86(3)*, 277-294.

Epstein, J.L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*, 701-712

Epstein, J.L., & Sanders, M.G. (2002). Family, school, and community partnerships. In D.L. Levinson, P.W., Cookson, Jr., & A.R. Sadovnik (Eds.), *Education and sociology: An Encyclopedia* (pp. 525-532). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Epstein, J.L., & Sheldon, S.B. (2002). Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. *Journal of Educational Research, 95,* 308-318.

Estell, D.B. & Perdue, N.H. (2013). Social support and behavioral and affective school engagement: The effects of peers, parents, and teachers. *Psychology in the Schools, 50(4),* 325-339.

Fan, X.T. (2001). Parent involvement and students' academic achievement: A growth modeling analysis. *Journal of Experimental Education, 70(1)*, 27-61.

Fan, W. & Williams, C.M. (2010). The effects of parental involvement on students' academic self-efficacy, engagement, and intrinsic motivation. *Educational Psychology, 30(1)*, 54-74.

Fan, W., Williams, C.M., & Wolters, C.A. (2012). Parental involvement in predicting school motivation: Similar and differential effects across ethnic groups. *Journal of Educational Research, 105(1),* 21-35.

Fantuzzo, J., McWayne, C., Perry, M.A., & Childs, S. (2004). Multiple dimensions of family involvement and their relations to behavioral and learning competencies for urban, low-income children. *School Psychology Review, 33(4),* 467-480.

Fiese, B.H., Tomcho, T., Douglas, M., Josephs, K., Poltrock, S., & Baker, T.A. (2002). Review of fifty years of research on naturally occurring family routines and rituals: Cause for celebration? *Journal of Family Psychology, 16,* 381-390.

Fischel, M., & Ramirez, L. (2005). Evidence-based parent involvement interventions with school-aged children. *School Psychology Quarterly, 20,* 371-402.

Fisher, C.D., & Gitelson, R. (1983). A meta-analysis of the correlates of role conflict and ambiguity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68(2)*, 320-333.

Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfield, P.C., & Paris, A.H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept , state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74,* 59-109.

Friedel, J.M., Cortina, K.S., Turner, J.C., & Midgley, C, (2007). Achievement goals, efficacy beliefs, and coping strategies in mathematics: The roles of perceived parent and teacher goal emphases. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 32(3)*, 434-458.

Fuligni, A.J., & Tseng, V. (1999). Family obligation and the academic motivation of adolescents from immigrant and American-born families. In T.Urdan (Ed.), *Advances in motivation and achievement: The role of context* (Vol. 11, pp. 159-183). Stamford, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Fulton, E., & Turner, L.A. (2008). Students' academic motivation: Relations with parental warmth, autonomy granting, and supervision. *Educational Psychology, 28(5),* 521-534.

Furrer, C., & Skinner, C. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic Engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 148-162.

Gallimore, R., Goldenberg, C. (2001). Analyzing cultural models and settings to connect minority achievement and school improvement research. *Educational Psychology, 36(1)*, 45-56.

Garbarino, J. (1981b). *The child as an organism: Implications for family structure*. Paper Presented to the International Symposium on "The Child and the City." International Pediatric Society and the Japanese National Institute for Research Advancement, Tokyo, Japan, March 26.

Garbarino, J. (1982). *Children and Families in the Social Environment.* New York, NY: Aldine Publishing Company.

Getzels, J.W. (1974). Socialization and education: A note on discontinuities. *Teachers College Record, 76(2),* 218-225.

Ginsburg, G.S., & Bronstein, P. (1993). Family factors related to children's intrinsic/extrinsic motivational orientation and academic performance. *Child Development, 64(5),* 1461-1474.

Goals, 2000: Educate America Act. (1994, March 31). P.L. 103-227. 108 Stat.125.

Gonzalez, A. & Wolters, C. (2006). The relation between perceived parenting practices and achievement motivation in mathetmatics. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 21*, 203-217.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., Floyd Tenery, M., Rivera, A., Rendon, P., Gonzales, R., & Amanti, C. (1995). Funds of knowledge for teaching in Latino households. *Urban Education, 29(4)*, 444-471.

Gonzalez-DeHass, A.R. & Willems, P.P., & Doan-Holbein, M.F. (2005). Educational *Psychology Review, 17(2)*, 99-123.

Gottfried, A.E., Fleming, J.S., & Gottfried, A.W. (1994). Role of parental motivational practices in children's academic intrinsic motivation and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86,* 104-113.

Greenberg, P. (1989). Ideas that work with young children. Parents as partners in young Children's development and education. A new American fad: Why does it matter? *Young Children, 44(4),* 61-75.

Grolnick, W.S. (2003). *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting backfires*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grolnick, W.S. (2009). The role of parents in facilitating autonomous self-regulation for education. *Theory and Research in Education, 7(2),* 164-173.

Grolnick W.S. & Ryan, R.M. (1989). Parent styles associated with children's self regulation and competence in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*, 143-154.

Grolnick, W.S., Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (1991). Inner resources for school achievement: Motivational mediators of children's perceptions of their parents. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83(4),* 508-517.

Grolnick, W.S. & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parent's involvement in children's schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. *Child Development*, *65*, 237-252.

Gutman, L.M. (2006). How student and parent goal orientations and classroom goal structures influence the math achievement of African Americans during the high school transition. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 31(1),* 44-63.

Hamre, B.K., & Pianta, R.C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development, 72*, 625-638.

Harter, S., & Connell, J.P. (1984). A model of children's achievement and related self-perceptions of competence, control, and motivational orientations. In J. Nicholls (Ed.), *The development of achievement-related cognitions and behavior.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Henderson, A.T., & Mapp, K.L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement.* Austin, TX: Southwestern Educational Laboratory.

Hickey, D.T. (2003). Engaged participation versus marginal nonparticipation: A stridently sociocultural approach to achievement motivation. *The Elementary School Journal, 103(4),* 401-429.

Hill, N.E. (2001). Parenting and academic socialization as they related to school readiness: The role of ethnicity and family income. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 686-697.

Ho, S.E., & Willms, J.D. (1996). Effects of parental involvement on eighth grade achievement. *Sociology of Education, 69(2),* 126-141.

Hong, S., Ho, H. (2005). Direct and indirect longitudinal effects of parental involvement on student achievement: Second order latent growth modeling across ethnic groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97,* 32-42.

Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., Walker, J.M.T., Sandler, H.M., Whetsel, D., Green, C.L., Wilkins, A.S., & Closson, K. (2005b). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal, 106(2),* 105-130.

Hughes, J. & Kwok, O. (2007). Influence of student-teacher and parent-teacher relationships on lower achieving readers' engagement and achievement in primary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(1),* 39-51.

Izzo, C.V., Weissberg, R.P., Kasprow, W.J., & Fendrich, M. (1999). A longitudinal assessment of teacher perceptions of parent involvement in children's education and school performance. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27(6),* 817-839.

Iyengar, S.S. & Lepper, M.R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 349-366.

Janosz, M., Archambault, I., Morizot, J., & Papani, L.S. (2008). School engagement trajectories and their differential predictive relations to dropout. *Journal of Social Issues, 64(1),* 21-40.

Jimerson, S.R., Campos, E., & Grief, J.L. (2003). Toward an understanding of definitions and measures of school engagement and related terms. *The California Psychologist, 8*, 7-28.

Jouseemet, M. Landry, R., & Koestner, R. (2008). A self-determination theory perspective on parenting. *Canadian Psychology, 49(3*), 194-200.

Kim, J., Kim, M., & Schallert, D.L.(2010). An integrative cultural view of achievement motivation: Parental and classroom predictors of children's goal orientations when learning mathematics in Korea. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(2*), 418-437.

Lareau, A. (1989). *Home advantage: Social class and parent intervention in elementary education.* New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Lareau, A. (2003*). Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lehr, C.A., Sinclair, M.F., & Christenson, S.L. (2004). Addressing student engagement and Truancy prevention during the elementary school years: A replication study of the check and connect model. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 9,* 279-301.

Little, M. & Kobak, R. (2003). Emotional security with teachers and children's stress reactivity: A comparison of special education and regular education classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 32,* 127-138.

Lopez, G.R. (2011). The value of hard work: Lessons on parent involvement from an immigrant household. *Harvard Educational Review, 71(3*), 416-437.

Lopez, G.R., Scribner, J.D., & Mahitivanichcha, K. (2001). Redefining parental involvement: Lessons from high performing migrant-impacted schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 38(2),* 253-288.

Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (2003). Models of agency: Sociocultural diversity in the construction of action. In V.M. Berman & J.J. Berman (Eds.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: *Cross-cultural differences in perspectives on the self* (Vol. 49, pp.1-57. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Mehan, H., Villanueva, I., Hubbard, L., Lintz, A. (1996). *Constructing school success: The Consequences of untracking low achieving students.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Mena, J.A. (2011). Latino parent home-based practices that bolster student academic persistence. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 33(4),* 490-506.

Miller-Johnson, S., Maumary-Gremaud, A., & Conduct Disorders Research Group (1995). Parent-Teacher Involvement Questionnaire (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Durham, NC: Duke University.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31(2),* 132-141.

National Center for Education Statistics (2004). *Education Longitudinal Study of 2002*: Base Year data file user's manual. Washington, DC: Author.

National PTA. (1997). *National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs.* Chicago: Author.

No Child Left Behind. (2002). U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved September 1, 2014, From http://www.ed.gov/nclb

Oshby, B. (2008). *Seeing systems: Unlocking the mysteries of organizational life*. San Francisco: Berret-Kochler Publishers.

Peixoto, F. (2011). "Is it beneficial to stress grades to my child?"-Relationships between parental Attitudes towards academic achievement, motivation, academic self-concept and Academic achievement in adolescents. *International Journal about Parents in Education, 5(2),* 98-109.

Pianta, R.C. (2006). Teacher-child relationships and early literacy. In D. Dickinson & S. Neuman (Eds.), Handbook of early literacy research: Vol. 2 (pp. 149-162). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Pomerantz, E.M., Kim, E.M., & Cheung, C.S. (2012). Parents' involvement in children's
        learning. In K.R. Harris, S. Graham, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *APA educational psychology
        handbook, Vol. 2. Individual differences and cultural and contextual factors* (pp. 417-
        440). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Purcell-Gates, V. (Ed.). (2007). *Cultural practices of literacy: Complicating the complex.*
        Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Quilliams, L., & Beran, T. (2009). Children at risk for academic failure: A model of individual
        and family factors. *Exceptionality Education International, 19(2),* 63-76.

Rimm-Kaufman, S.E., LaParo K.M., Downer, J.T., & Pianta, R.C. (2005). The contribution of
        classroom setting and quality of instruction to children's behavior in kindergarten
        classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal, 105,* 377-394.

Rogers, M.A., Theule, J., Ryan, B.H., Adams, G.R., & Keating, I. (2009). Parent involvement
        and children's school achievement: Evidence for mediating processes. *Canadian Journal
        of School Psychology, 24(1),* 34-57.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies of internal versus external control of
        Reinforcements. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1-28.

Sigel, I.E. & Laosa, L.M. (Eds.). (1983). *Changing families*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Sinclair, M.F., Christenson, S.L., Lehr, C.A., & Reschly-Anderson, A. (2003). Facilitating
        school engagement: *Lessons learned from check and connect longitudinal studies. The
        California School Psychologist, 8*, 29-41.

Smith, M. (1968). School and home: Focus on achievement. In A.H. Passow (Ed.), Developing
        Programs for the emotionally disadvantaged (pp. 106-107). New York: Teachers College
        Press.

Stevenson, H.W., Lee, S., Chen, C., Stigler, J.W., Hsu, C.C., & Kitamura, S. (1990). Contexts of
        achievement: A study of American, Chinese, and Japanese children. *Monograph of
        the Society for Research in Child Development, 221(55),* 1-2.

Sudduth, C.D. (2011). Our voices: A descriptive account of African American parental
        involvement in an urban elementary school. Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI Number
        3476218.)

Suizzo, M., & Soon, K. (2006). Parental academic socialization: Effects of home-based parental
        involvement on locus of control across U.S. ethnic groups. *Educational Psychology,
        26(6),* 827-846.

Suizzo, M., & Stapleton, L.M. (2007). Home-based parental involvement in young children's education: Examining the effects of maternal education across U.S. ethnic groups. *Educational Psychology, 27(4),* 533-556.

Trusty, J., & Lampe, R.E. (1997). Relationship of high school seniors' perceptions of parental Involvement and control to seniors' locus of control. *Journal of Counseling Development, 75(5),* 375-384.

Urdan, T. (2004). Can achievement goal theory guide school reform? In P.R. Pintrich & M.L. Maehr (Eds.), Advances in motivation and achievement (Vol.13, 361-392). New York, NY: Elsevier.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2013). Table 219.70. Retrieved from nces.ed.gov/programs/coe.indicator_coj.asp

Valencia, R.R., & Black, M.S. (2002). "Mexican Americans don't value education!" On the basis of myth, mythmaking, and debunking. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 1(2),* 81-103.

Vansteenkiste, M., Zhou, M., Lens, W., & Soenens, B. (2005). Experiences of autonomy and control among Chinese learners: Vitalizing or immobilizing? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 468-483.

Vargas, M., & Busch-Rossnagel, N.A. (2003). Teaching behaviors and styles of low-income Puerto Rican mothers. *Applied Developmental Science, 7,* 229-238.

Vickers, H.S., & Minke, K.M. (1995). Exploring parent-teacher relationships: Joining and communication to others. *School Psychology Quarterly, 10*, 133-150.

Wang, M., & Sheikh-Khalil, S. (2014). Does parental involvement matter for student achievement and mental health in high school? *Child Development, 85(2),* 610-625.

Wang, Q., Pomerantz, E.M., & Chen, H. (2007). The role of parents' control in early adolesents' psychological functioning: A longitudinal investigation in the United States and China. *Child Development, 78,* 1592-1610.

Wentzel, K.R. (1999). Social-motivational processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding motivation at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 76-97.

Whitaker, M., & Hoover-Dempsey, K. (2013). School influences on parents' role beliefs. *Elementary School Journal, 114(1),* 73-99.