

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

10-2022

Removing Barriers That Prevent Parents From Low Socioeconomic Backgrounds From Being Involved in Their Children's High School Education

Jason E. Shepherd
jes20b@acu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shepherd, Jason E., "Removing Barriers That Prevent Parents From Low Socioeconomic Backgrounds From Being Involved in Their Children's High School Education" (2022). Digital Commons @ ACU, *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 541.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

This dissertation, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the College of Graduate and Professional Studies of Abilene Christian University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

Nannette W. Glenn, Ph.D.

Dr. Nannette Glenn, Dean of
the College of Graduate and
Professional Studies

Date 12 / 02 / 2022

Dissertation Committee:

Amy Barrios

Dr. Amy Barrios

Laura A. Perry, Ed.D.

Dr. Laura Perry

Sonerka Mouton

Dr. Sonerka Mouton

Abilene Christian University
School of Educational Leadership

Removing Barriers That Prevent Parents From Low Socioeconomic Backgrounds From Being
Involved in Their Children's High School Education

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by
Jason E. Shepherd
December 2022

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my beautiful daughters, Jada and Jordyn. To my fiancé, Ashley, thank you for being the best mother I have ever seen and a great team player throughout this journey. I also want to dedicate this dissertation to my brothers and sisters. Thank you for always being there for me. Thank you to my mother and father for giving me the life people dream of having. Aunt Jean and Aunt Helen, I love you so much. I dedicate this dissertation to you guys. I know if you were here, Aunt Jean, you would be so proud of me.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I want to give my dedication to my Savior, Jesus Christ. This dissertation has been an up-and-down process and frustrating at times. Since this journey began, I got engaged, had a baby girl, and had a job change. However, through it all, God did not put anything on my shoulders that I could not bear. I continued to persevere. With my faith in God, I continued to the finish line.

I want to give genuine appreciation and gratitude to my chair, Dr. Amy Barrios, who challenged me, believed in me, and continually motivated me not to give up and to keep going forward. Thank you to my committee members, Dr. Laura Perry and Dr. Sonerka Mouton, for supporting this research study. I would also like to give special thanks to a classmate, Tara Marshall, for reminding me of deadlines and giving me courage and strength. We survived job changes, COVID, and this dissertation journey together, so you will forever be my sister.

To Don “Chief” Jackson, thank you for your mentorship and for providing your basketball players with a blueprint to success. Thank you for making me a team captain, which was the beginning of my journey to leadership. Thank you, Dr. Kent Willis, for being an inspiration to me and encouraging me to pursue my doctorate. Thank you to Chanel Veazy for being a great mentor and teacher. The best principal I have ever been around.

To my dad, Edward Shepherd, we did it pops!! Your son is Dr. Shepherd now. Being the son of Edward Shepherd is the best feeling in the world. You sacrificed so much for your children, and you worked so hard so that we could have the best life in the world. You made sure that we had everything that we wanted and needed, and you still do that now. Every weekend when we would go fix fences, load the cows, move some hay, plant grass, and feed the horses in

the rain, sleet, or sunshine, I remember the talks we would have. Education was so important to you. You instilled so many values into me that still live inside me to this day. I love you, man!!!!

To Ashley, thank you for being the best team player and future wife any man could hope for. You are the most intelligent person I have ever met. You keep our home intact, and you are an awesome mother to our two beautiful children. You are an inspiration to us all, and I love you so much.

To Jada and Jordyn, you guys are my greatest accomplishments. You inspire me to keep growing and educating myself to provide for you guys the way my dad did for me. You mean the world to me. I want you guys to take from this that when you dream of something, don't stop until you get there. No one can tell you what you can and can't do. Make sure you watch the people that you surround yourself with. You guys are destined to be something special, and I am excited to be a part of that process. I love you.

Tami, thank you for being my big sister, always believing in me, and being proud of me. To my big brother Moon and Anthony, thank you for being my heroes. You taught me so much about life and people. Being called "Little Moon" is an honor to me. My cousins, Kelly, Juju, Russell, and Carey, thank you so much for looking out for me growing up. You guys are the best, and you constantly motivate me. Jeff and Donnett, thank you for being my best friends. You guys are like brothers to me and have been like brothers to me since the day we started hanging out together.

© Copyright by Jason Shepherd (2022)

All Rights Reserved

Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to describe the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas. Fifteen high school teacher participants were interviewed and provided their experiences and perceptions to support the interviews and focus groups. The primary findings identified teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parental involvement, parents' commitment to their children's high school education, and the teacher's role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. Building solid partnerships, attending cultural and parental involvement training, creating shared commitments with parents, and developing positive perceptions of parents were strategies teachers used to help remove barriers that prevented parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. Increasing two-way communication with parents, being culturally sensitive, and improving COVID-19 safety measures created a welcoming environment for parents. School districts must improve professional development practices throughout the school year to increase parental involvement through creative strategies and programs. This study is important because of the decrease in parental involvement for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and it provides pertinent information for parents and teachers to create a sustainable partnership.

Keywords: partnerships, communication, barriers, low socioeconomic

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	v
List of Tables	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study	7
Definition of Key Terms	8
Chapter Summary	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review	12
Literature Search Methods.....	12
Conceptual Framework Discussion	12
Literature Review.....	14
Parental Involvement	16
Federal Legislation.....	19
Types of Parental Involvement	21
Barriers to Parental Involvement	22
COVID-19 and Parental Involvement	31
Types of Volunteers.....	32
Parent Mentors as Volunteers	33
Drawbacks of Parent Volunteers	35
The Benefit of Parent Volunteers	35
Parental Involvement: System Level	37
Parental Involvement and Ethnicity.....	39
Teacher’s Perception of Low Socioeconomic Parents.....	41
Role of the Teacher in Removing Barriers for Parents.....	43
Low Socioeconomic Parents’ Perceptions of Teachers.....	45
Parental Involvement From Elementary to Secondary School	46
Mental Health.....	48
Chapter Summary	49
Chapter 3: Research Methods and Design	51
Population and Sample	52
Sample Selection Population	53
Materials and Instruments.....	55
Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis Procedures	55
Trustworthiness.....	57
Researcher’s Role	59
Ethical Considerations	60

Assumptions.....	60
Limitations	60
Delimitations	61
Chapter Summary	61
Chapter 4: Results	63
Description of the Sample.....	64
Summary of the Results	66
Research Question 1	67
Theme 1: Limits to Parent’s Technology Access	68
Theme 2: Potential Parental Involvement Barriers	69
Research Question 2	72
Theme 1: Shared Commitment and Partnerships.....	72
Theme 2: Perception of Parent’s Commitment.....	75
Research Question 3	79
Theme 1: Teacher’s Responsibility or Role.....	79
Theme 2: Parent Inclusion Activities.....	82
Theme 3: Parental Involvement Training	83
Detailed Analysis	85
Chapter Summary	88
Chapter 5: Summary, Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusions	89
Discussion of the Findings.....	90
Research Question 1 Findings	91
Research Question 2 Findings	93
Research Question 3 Findings	95
Limitation.....	97
Implications.....	98
Recommendations for Practical Application	100
Recommendations for Future Research	101
Chapter Summary	101
References.....	103
Appendix A: Questionnaire	145
Appendix B: Email to Participants	146
Appendix C: Informed Consent	147
Appendix D: One-on-One Interview Protocol.....	150
Appendix E: IRB Approval	151
Appendix F: Focus Group Questions.....	152

Appendix G: Question Correlation	153
--	-----

List of Tables

Table 1. Participants.....	65
Table 2. Emerging Themes	67

Chapter 1: Introduction

Students from low socioeconomic backgrounds in academic achievement levels are a significant concern in public education (Harper, 2015). Snyder et al. (2007) stated that students from low socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to struggle with academics than students from high socioeconomic backgrounds. A notable scholar stated that underachieving students from low socioeconomic backgrounds might stem from a lack of parental involvement (Harper, 2015). However, in another study, students labeled as low socioeconomic mentioned that their parents played a crucial part in their academic success by holding them accountable with passing grades and setting high expectations (Carey, 2016).

Parental involvement is a cultural-bound, multidimensional, and bidirectional concept involving the community, school, and parents (Carey, 2016). Family social status does not accurately predict student achievement, but a home environment that encourages learning communicates high expectations for student achievement (National PTA, 2000). Scholars define parental involvement as methods parents use to become active and supportive of their children at school and home (Magwa & Mugari, 2017). A notable research scholar found that parental involvement in schools consists of parents or guardians volunteering at school events, having two-way communication with school staff, helping children with homework and projects, attending parent–teacher meetings, and becoming a parent–teacher association (PTA) member (Berkowitz et al., 2021). According to a national survey, 95% of public school parents stated that creating a collaborative partnership with their child’s school is essential (Muller, 2018). Parents gain gratification when they contribute to their child’s education (Jeynes, 2018). Parental involvement at school gives parents access to the school’s curriculum, which makes parents comfortable with the school’s quality of education (Jeynes, 2018).

However, for many years some schools performed under huge disadvantages such as having a lack of resources, students from poverty-stricken neighborhoods, and unhealthy parent–teacher relationships (Reddy et al., 2015). According to data, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds perform worse in school than their high socioeconomic counterparts partly because their parents have fewer financial resources because of low educational levels, single-parent households, teen pregnancy, mental health, and other characteristics (Reddy et al., 2015).

In rural East Texas, over 50% of K–12 public school students live in poverty and meet free and reduced lunch requirements (McFarland et al., 2019). As a result, many schools lack parent involvement, and adverse outcomes seem inevitable (Berkowitz et al., 2021).

An integral part of a school's success is active parental involvement and investment in parent volunteering with the school system (Epstein, 2019). Volunteering is an activity in which a person or group of people give their time and energy to benefit another person, place, or thing (Povey et al., 2016). In addition, volunteering may produce positive benefits for the volunteer and the person(s) or community it serves (Povey et al., 2016). For example, students tend to align their morals with their mentors, parents, and peers' positive energy. Building a close-knit group of volunteers who give their energy and time helps build a foundation of support and positively impacts the school community (Llamas & Tuazon, 2016). Schools in low-income areas that face the challenges of poverty, such as low morale and low test scores, can benefit from increased parental involvement (Hamlin & Li, 2020; Musu et al., 2019).

A recent study mentioned that parents who seek involvement in their child's education by volunteering their time are passionate about helping make a difference in their child's school (Tighe & Davis-Kean, 2021). Furthermore, parent volunteers and mentors sometimes feel underutilized and unappreciated when teachers ask them only to copy papers and drop off items

or when teachers do not engage in positive, rapport-building communication with the parents as they complete volunteer activities (Tighe & Davis-Kean, 2021). Zenda (2021) emphasized that volunteers want to do more than go on field trips, sell cupcakes, and chaperone the school dance; they would like to become mentors, work the halls, and help in the classroom.

Parent volunteers appreciate the hard work and dedication teachers put in each day. Zenda (2021) pointed out that some teachers were uncomfortable with having parents in their rooms because they felt obligated to be perfect teachers. In addition, some administrators establish cultures that view parent opinions, ideas, and questions as annoying (Tan et al., 2020). However, when teachers become annoyed by parents' viewpoints and their willingness to be more involved in their child's education, the involved parent morale declines (Tan et al., 2020). Therefore, teachers should commit to equitable parental engagements and build positive partnerships with parents that involve trust and valuing each other's perspectives (Blair & Haneda, 2021).

Current research indicates that teacher perceptions about parental involvement and school volunteers may influence their interactions with parents and children (Herman & Reinke, 2017). For example, teachers feel that parents play favorites by spending more time tending to their children and not the rest of the students while volunteering in the classroom (Herman & Reinke, 2017). Researchers pointed out that parents will spend more time with their children than helping the whole group, which can be frustrating for teachers (Nichols et al., 2020; Zenda, 2021). Therefore, administrators must support and advocate for parents and volunteers to be present more often inside classrooms to be trained to help all students (Herman & Reinke, 2017).

Over the years, researchers determined that parents play a significant role in a child's life by instilling morals, values, and principles to help children have a productive public school

experience (Ceka & Murati, 2016). In the long run, parents want to feel comfortable and reassured that their children are educated and receive the proper training to be productive citizens after high school (Ceka & Murati, 2016). Parental involvement is responsible for improving school and community partnerships and increasing student attendance, behavior, and academic success (Avnet et al., 2019). Likewise, Benner et al. (2016) noted that national academic achievement includes higher attendance, grades, and graduation rates resulting from effective parent-to-school communication.

In addition, parental involvement plays a significant role in closing academic achievement gaps in public school education (Johnson et al., 2021). Students are more likely to excel in the workforce or college when school administrators and teachers create effective partnerships with families (Boonk et al., 2018). Students with parental support at school and home usually obtain higher grades and regularly attend school (Bartz & Karnes, 2018). In addition, parental involvement improves mental and emotional health, such as increased self-esteem, higher morale, and greater ambitions and motivation toward education (Tillmann et al., 2018).

Borkowski et al. (2016) mentioned that inequities in the educational system were evident and affected low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking families. For example, some students from low socioeconomic backgrounds experience punishment and grade retention and are more likely to receive special education and 504 services than students from high socioeconomic backgrounds (Anderson et al., 2017). Therefore, administrators and teachers must create an inclusive culture that effectively communicates with parents and establishes strategies and systems to increase school involvement for parents (Cetin & Taskin, 2016). To promote an inclusive culture, administrators and teachers must foster programs that promote outreach

activities to strengthen parents' and teachers' relationships (Stein, 2016). Similarly, administrators and teachers are responsible for facilitating a school vision and a mission statement that is inclusive and ensures equity for all students (Stein, 2016). Together, they set expectations to create a welcoming and safe school environment for parent volunteers. Programs that include parental involvement should be integral to the mission and vision of the school (Restler & Glant, 2020).

However, some public school district superintendents notice that some principals lack the necessary skills to improve and focus on culturally responsive family engagement (Restler & Glant, 2020). This qualitative case study explored the perceived barriers preventing low socioeconomic parents from participating in high school education. This case study explored teachers' role in removing barriers that prevented parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education (Lavery, 2016). Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. Despite the challenges of improving parental involvement, high school public school principals and teachers are responsible for creating and sustaining opportunities at school that are transparent, inclusive, and welcoming for all parents and community volunteers (Siegel et al., 2019). Additionally, school principals and teachers bridge the relationship gap between parents and teachers to align their goals for students (Siegel et al., 2019).

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study was the lack of parental involvement from low socioeconomic parents in high schools in District X in rural East Texas (Park & Holloway, 2018). This lack of participation stemmed from COVID-19, socioeconomic, and school

communication challenges that prevent low socioeconomic parents from actively participating in their children's educational endeavors (Kerbaiv & Bernhardt, 2018). Some of these examples were (a) cultural and language differences in their children's school, (b) undertones of racism from teachers and parents, and (c) being the primary caregiver or sole provider for their children" (Kerbaiv & Bernhardt, 2018, p. 116). Another challenge parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds face is teachers' negative perceptions of their commitment to their child's education (Lenstra, 2020). As a result, parents become reluctant to get involved, and disconnection between the school and the parents develops (Lenstra, 2020). The law establishes an initiative with PTA to advance parental engagement in Texas. PTA and their publication are responsible for providing a training manual for improving parental involvement entitled Parent Involvement in Every School (Sharp, 2016). According to the Every Student Succeed Act (ESSA), a parent is responsible for supporting their children's learning and participation in important decisions made about their child and the opportunity to volunteer as they see fit. Schools must also provide consistent parental reports on their child's development (Sharp, 2016).

Parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds have higher absenteeism rates at school conferences, programs, and volunteering than parents from high socioeconomic backgrounds (Child Trends, 2017). This is important because a lack of parental involvement and volunteering negatively impacts adolescents' schooling (Llamas & Tuazon, 2016). For instance, disengaged parents may negatively affect their child's educational growth and academic accomplishments (Llamas & Tuazon, 2016).

Some parents feel teachers and administrators hold stigmatizing perceptions regarding their socioeconomic status and question their commitment to their child's education (Park & Holloway, 2018). In contrast, some teachers feel parents pass off their parental obligations to

educators (Ricard & Pelletier, 2016). These obligations include nurturing, financially supporting, and instilling morals and values in children, which can be overwhelming for educators (Ricard & Pelletier, 2016).

Numerous students become affected by the absence of parental involvement and parent volunteers despite constant efforts to prevent obstacles caused by socioeconomic status (Lechuga-Peña & Brisson, 2018). Over the years, there have been three main reasons even the most involved parents miss, such as PTA meetings, volunteer opportunities, and teacher conferences. First, they have difficulty balancing numerous tasks such as Little League practice, work, babysitting, and other conflicting circumstances (Jeynes, 2016). Second, the stereotype of being an overinvolved parent sometimes pulls parents away from being involved. Third, there are language, racial, or class barriers (Miller et al., 2016). Parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds whose children attend a school where most students come from higher socioeconomic neighborhoods are hesitant to volunteer at school because they believe they have nothing to bring to the table, a problem in public school education (Jeynes, 2016). Some school principals and teachers think parent volunteers are liabilities on the campus, making parents uncomfortable when volunteering on their child's school campus (Thompson et al., 2017). For example, some principals and teachers mentioned that parents being excessively involved can cause them to feel obligated to deal with school issues that teachers are only qualified to handle (Thompson et al., 2017). Also, some students may become distracted by the presence of a strange adult, which can cause a distraction in the classroom (Jeynes, 2016).

Purpose of the Study

This qualitative case study explored teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from being involved in high school education. This case study also

explored teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education (Lavery, 2016). Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. This research generated findings that can guide future research and help implement a parental inclusion program to foster students' success.

The research questions that guided this study are as follows:

RQ1: What are teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ2: What are teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ3: What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

Definition of Key Terms

At-risk. An at-risk student is a student that has a greater chance of struggling academically or is more likely to drop out of school because of extreme circumstances such as homelessness, a parent being incarcerated, teen pregnancy, or severe health problems (Lindt & Blair, 2017).

Barrier. A barrier is an obstacle that prevents or blocks movement from one place to another. It is a law, rule, or problem that makes something difficult or impossible (Aranda-Balboa et al., 2020).

English language learner. This term is often preferred over Limited English proficiency (LEP), highlighting accomplishments rather than deficits (Tarasawa & Waggoner, 2015).

High socioeconomic status. People with a high socioeconomic status (SES) are likely to work in prestigious places, have higher salaries, and have more advanced education. These individuals have greater access to resources that can contribute to their success and the perpetuation of similar benefits for their families (Castillo-Vergara et al., 2018).

Low socioeconomic status. SES refers to a person's work, social, economic, and educational status or level. Low SES often refers to people with minimal education or income that usually falls on or below poverty levels (Ware, 2019). Schools define this based on the free and reduced lunch program; those eligible to participate must provide evidence that their family incomes are below 130% of the poverty level or are directly certified (Amin et al., 2015).

No Child Left Behind. A policy aimed to ensure that all students, regardless of race or SES, have the opportunity for a solid education (Lavery, 2016). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was a U.S. Act of Congress that reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; it included Title I provisions applying to disadvantaged students (McGuinn, 2016). No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was established to close the educational achievement gap with accountability, parental options, and flexibility (McGuinn, 2016).

Parental involvement. A combination of commitment and active participation from the parent to the school and the student. Full parental involvement is when parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in their child's education (Tighe & Davis-Kean, 2021).

Parent-teacher association. An organization that consists of parents, teachers, and staff intended to facilitate parental participation in a school (Berkowitz et al., 2021).

Public school. Schools that the state or national government funds and controls (Rowe & Perry, 2020).

School administrator. K–12 school administrators supervise the daily operations of schools on their campus. School administrators provide various leadership styles throughout each school year so students experience a safe and conducive learning environment (Fullan & Quinn, 2016).

School staff. K–12 public school staff consists of principals, teachers, custodians, secretaries, counselors, maintenance workers, paraprofessionals, and grounds people that ensure students are learning in a safe and supportive learning environment (O’Brennan et al., 2017).

School volunteer. A person who completes hours of service for civic, charitable, or humanitarian reasons at the school, regardless of the lack of compensation or rewards in a school setting (Buys et al., 2018).

Stakeholder. Stakeholders can significantly impact decisions regarding an organization’s operations and finances (Freeman, 1984).

Title I. A federal entitlement program funds schools in need based on student enrollment, each school’s free and reduced lunch percentage, and other informative data (Guffey et al., 2013).

Chapter Summary

Chapter 1 included the problem statement, purpose and rationale, research questions, definitions of the terms, and a summary. Chapter 2 contains a literature review and the theoretical framework, identifying the barriers that prevent parental involvement in schools and the effects of COVID-19 on parental involvement. Chapter 2 also consists of the types of volunteers, mentors as volunteers, drawbacks of school volunteers, benefits of school volunteers,

parent involvement from a systematic level, parental involvement and ethnicity, and teachers' perception of low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking parents. Chapter 2 describes the role of the school leader in removing parental involvement barriers for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds and non-English-speaking parent perceptions of the school staff and the effects technology has on low SES and non-English-speaking parental involvement. Lastly, Chapter 2 discusses parental involvement as students transition from elementary to secondary school and how mental health affects parental involvement.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This qualitative case study focused on exploring teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parental involvement from low socioeconomic parents from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas. The literature review contains the theoretical framework, barriers that prevent parental involvement in schools, effects of COVID-19 on parental involvement, types of volunteers, mentors as volunteers, drawbacks of school volunteers, benefits of school volunteers, parent involvement from a systematic level, parental involvement and ethnicity, school staff perception of low socioeconomic parents, role of the school leader in promoting parent involvement, low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking parent perception of the school staff, and parental involvement as students transition from elementary, to middle school, to high school.

Literature Search Methods

The literature collected for this study resulted from searches of databases such as the Abilene Christian University Library, Google Scholar, and scholarly journal articles dating from 2015 to 2022, except for the theoretical framework. Furthermore, this study contains critical phrases such as *parental involvement*, *barriers*, and *parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds*.

Conceptual Framework Discussion

Hornby and Lafaele (2011) created an explanatory framework describing factors inhibiting parental involvement in their child's education. The model offers broad factors related to the child, an individual parent, and the whole family, the relationship between the parent and the teacher (or school), and societal factors. Parental involvement (PI) in education is a significant issue that has raised much concern. Hornby and Lafaele (2011) proposed a framework

to relate the issue of PI and children's education. An extensive gap exists between the rhetoric and the reality of PI (Hornby & Lafaele, 2011). The model's primary purpose sought clarification and elaboration on the effect these factors have on the children's education (Hornby & Lafaele, 2011).

Based on those concerned with parents and family, parents' beliefs on PI are essential. The way parents take their role associated with the children's education is significant (Hornby, 2011). Some parents and other family members only believe their responsibility involves taking their children to school. Apart from the parents' beliefs, parents' current life context can also affect how they are involved in their child's education (Hornby, 2011). For instance, parents' level of educational success affects a child's educational experience. Parents' level of education will determine how they are involved in matters concerning their children's progress in school. In addition, a parent who completed a high school education will handle their children's education differently compared to those who did not (Hornby, 2011). For example, parents that completed high school are prone to read to their children at night and help them with their homework (Hornby, 2011). In contrast, parents that did not complete high school tend to be reluctant to help their children with schoolwork (Hornby, 2011).

In comparison, gender and ethnicity associated with parents and family members can also affect how they participate in their children's education (Fan et al., 2019). In some cases, female parents participate more in children's education than males, depending on cultural setups. In most societies, a woman's role is more significant than a male's in raising children (Solis & Lopez, 2015). For example, a father's role is to provide for the family financially, while the mother's role is to provide financial resources, care, and nurturance (Solis & Lopez, 2015). Some

women possess an internal maternity instinct that develops into strong child-rearing skills that most men or fathers may or may not develop over time (Steiner et al., 2018).

The other factors that interfered with PI in a child's education included the child's behavioral problems and grade level (Montgomery et al., 2017). Some parents understand their child is a constant distraction and leave work early too often to deal with their child's discipline (Montgomery et al., 2017). Regarding age, the parent's involvement in their children's education decreases (Hoglund et al., 2015). In addition, PI tends to be at the lowest level in secondary school (Hoglund et al., 2015). Children are optimistic about how their parent's involvement in their education matters at a younger age (Hoglund et al., 2015). On the other hand, older children are reluctant when their parents are involved in their educational matters (Montgomery et al., 2017).

Additionally, parents are very active in being involved in issues with children's education when their child struggles with schoolwork due to challenges and disabilities faced during learning (Liermann & Norton, 2016). Some learning institutions advise parents to support their children when they are not doing well academically (Montgomery et al., 2017). However, some schools disagree with the parents when their children are not doing well due to disabilities and other difficulties. The children's talent becomes a barrier when the parents consider their children talented and the teachers do not give out school-related information to them (Montgomery et al., 2017). As a result, parents tend to be less involved in their child's education.

Literature Review

PI is an ongoing process that systematically assists students' academic, mental, and social development at school (Boonk et al., 2018). The lowest PI and volunteer rates came from school districts with a high percentage of at-risk students (Hoglund et al., 2015). In addition, PI

embraces effective policies and communication with administrators, teachers, parents, and stakeholders in the community (Boonk et al., 2018). The United States Department of Education put a policy in place that stated that by the year 2000, all schools would increase parent participation and promote children's growth socially, academically, and emotionally (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994). This policy is mandatory and requires the inclusion of parents in their child's educational process.

A few recent studies show that the PI policy goes as far back as 1642, when a law that ordered all parents to educate their children in reading, religion, and trade passed in Massachusetts (Marschall & Shah, 2020; Nyemba & Chitiyo, 2018). Then, on February 17, 1897, over 2,000 stakeholders founded the PTA (Syed, 2018). The overall purpose of the PTA is to empower the school community to advocate for all students to reach their full potential (Syed, 2018). Indeed, PTA emphasized adequate curriculums, school buildings' information structure, and student welfare and eventually became the foundation of PI in education (Fisher, 2018).

The PTA movement was one of the most hopeful and essential educational movements (Thompson et al., 2017). When parents and teachers develop partnerships, the educational system profits by increasing positive educational experiences for students (Thompson et al., 2017). Therefore, it takes significant staffing for the school to partner with parent volunteers to help parents communicate with teachers, join the PTA, donate time and energy to beautify the school, and use resources and connections to benefit the school (Liang et al., 2020). Looking into the establishment of the PTA will aid school staff in understanding how to meet the needs of parents and how the school is to respond to teaching and volunteering (Liang et al., 2020).

A vital part of a student's academic experience relates to PI (Oswald et al., 2018). One of the essential factors in improving the effectiveness of a school involves PI due to the role that households and school settings play in a child's developmental process (Cetin & Taskin, 2016). Research shows schools with PI and volunteers result in students with higher test scores and attendance rates, minimal substance abuse, fewer out-of-school suspensions, less student defiance, and increased graduation rates (Park et al., 2017). Similarly, Hirano et al. (2016) found that researchers associated family engagement with improved student educational outcomes, a significant decline in dropout rates, and increased motivation. Students' homework assignment completion, school absenteeism and tardiness, self-esteem, and classroom behavior improvement are other benefits associated with family engagement (Hirano et al., 2016). PI consists of reading books to children at night, providing safe learning environments at home, and discussing schoolwork and various achievements (Ansari & Gershoff, 2016). Thompson et al. (2017) divided parents' motivation to get involved in their child's education into three themes. The themes included the following:

- a) Parents wanting to create partnerships with teachers.
- b) Parents wanting to be a part of their child's educational success.
- c) The key to success is education.

Parental Involvement

Secondary schools need parent volunteers more now than ever due to the budget cuts, stressed-out parents, and teacher shortages that schools face (Malluhi & Alomran, 2019). Numerous benefits are helpful to the classroom teacher when parents volunteer to help in their child's classroom. Assisting in the classroom, library, field trips, and tutoring students in core subjects are ways to volunteer at school (Jeynes, 2018). Research showed positive academic and

behavioral outcomes that connected PI and student academic success (Jeynes, 2018). For example, researchers noted that PI and school volunteers connect to many students' academic success indicators, including passing grades, attendance, potential, and standardized test scores (Boonk et al., 2018). In addition, PI results in lower dropout rates, fewer retentions, and fewer special education placements (Krane & Klevan, 2019). Each year, student detention rates, discipline referrals, and suspensions decrease due to an increase in PI in activities such as volunteering (Marcucci, 2020). Researchers reported that the parent volunteer intervention method reduced students' insubordination, hostility, and mental breakdowns once parents volunteered more at school functions (Hunt et al., 2020).

The core relationship between families and educators is essential to the academic success and quality of each child's school experience (Miller et al., 2016). Positive and negative student outcomes are associated with parents' and teachers' perceptions of each other (Miller et al., 2016). However, parents' and teachers' negative perceptions of each other may have adverse outcomes due to the quality of their partnership (Harris & Robinson, 2016).

Nevertheless, administrators sometimes think of all the negative things that could happen instead of volunteers' positive impact. Ample evidence supports that administrators often think volunteers will see something and spread negative news throughout the community, and they will not be able to react to stressful situations accordingly (Thompson et al., 2017). This thinking can discourage parents, students, and corporations from participating in students' educational journeys (Looney et al., 2018). Possible reasons for these misconceptions are the teachers and parents having different expectations of volunteering and PI and each other's role in school involvement (Lechuga-Peña & Brisson, 2018). Teachers expect parents to volunteer and work at school events, attend parent-teacher conferences, and help with the governance of a school

council. However, teachers also expect parents to make sure their kids have the materials needed for study, provide an area free from distractions for homework, make sure their children get their lessons done, make sure their child is rested so they can be alert at school, and teach their child to respect the teacher but not be afraid of them so that when they are having difficulty, they feel comfortable asking the teacher for help (Wentzel et al., 2016). On the other hand, parents expect teachers to communicate with them consistently, create a welcoming culture, and make informed and intelligent decisions about the practice to achieve various outcomes with and for students in their classroom. Another expectation parents have for teachers is to make judgments about how best to help their students learn in the environments in which they teach (Houri et al., 2019).

Parent-to-school communication is effective when home and school establish a two-way system to transfer information regarding the child's mental state and the curriculum (Cetin & Taskin 2016). Parents and teachers communicating with each other are essential to the partnership to help students succeed. For example, schools communicate through meetings with teachers, mailing documents to homes, or sending text and email alerts to families (Cetin & Taskin, 2016). Recent studies noted that at the beginning of the school's calendar year, school-family communication begins and does not end until that student has graduated or withdrawn, which results in school staff sharing a student's and parents' productive school experiences (Cetin & Taskin, 2016; Goodall, 2016). As a result, parent and teacher partnerships increase, and teachers assess students' needs and the home environment through consistent contact with parents, which helps the student develop plans and goals to succeed in the classroom (Harrison et al., 2017).

More importantly, stakeholders are responsible for making numerous decisions regarding a student's plans and success. Decision-making occurs as school staff empowers families to get

involved with the school board and state education agency, making crucial decisions that affect their children (Harrison et al., 2017). For collaborative decision-making to come to fruition, stakeholders must take responsibility and ownership and devote their energy to ensuring parents are involved in the decisions made at the school (Ni et al., 2018).

Federal Legislation

District, state, and local legislation enforced policies that require public schools to afford all parents ample opportunities to be involved in their child's educational experience (Arce, 2019). The significance of PI propelled legislators into creating laws and programs to initiate and sustain PI in schools (Malone, 2017). A reform movement transformed the U.S. federal, state, and local education policy to improve K–12 public schools and educational results from an accountability rating system called NCLB (Lavery, 2016). Likewise, Barger et al. (2019) noted that in the United States, parents' involvement is a targeted area of federal education programs, such as Head Start, national education policies, and NCLB. Before the activation of NCLB, parents' SES determined if they had the time to volunteer at the school (Lavery, 2016). NCLB states that PI contributes time, money, and resources from parents to the students, including student educational learning and various school events (Lavery, 2016). In addition, Malone (2016) noted that NCLB ensures that families and schools develop partnerships and collaborate on school decisions. Therefore, PI programs established by school administrators and staff will result in a friendlier and more welcoming atmosphere. Families are willing to volunteer and become more involved in their child's educational experience when the school climate is open, friendly, and inviting (Berkowitz et al., 2021). Researchers noted that parents would like school staff to approach them with involvement opportunities instead of the traditional expectations that parents should get involved at their convenience (Brown et al., 2019).

NCLB has several requirements to improve parental knowledge, leading to more parent engagement (McGuinn, 2016). For example, schools are responsible for setting up meetings with families to notify them of their parental rights and federal education guidelines such as school improvement and information regarding their child's teacher (McGuinn, 2016). High schools must send information that explains the school's curriculum and student progress instruments (McGuinn, 2016).

Under NCLB, public school communication must extend beyond parent newsletters (Markowitz, 2018). Public schools should communicate via phone, texts, emails, and social media to reach parents and the community (Markowitz, 2018). Furthermore, Markowitz's (2018) noted, like McGuinn (2016), that certain states require schools to detail their procedures to collect and distribute PI improvement strategies with NCLB. In addition, researchers noted that the law states Title I school districts must devise a written PI policy with parent approval and collaboration (Markowitz, 2018). Under NCLB, families can examine district and state-level report cards on all academic indicators and hold their school accountable for its ratings (Lavery, 2016).

Schools must accommodate non-English-speaking families in their native language (Markowitz, 2018). In addition, NCLB can require public schools to provide translators, adequate transportation, and affordable childcare, if necessary, for a parent to get involved with their child's education (McGuinn, 2016). NCLB also has rules and regulations that pertain to English Language Learner (ELL) families due to their linguistic challenges and lack of resources. School districts use their bilingual education budget to help ELL families with literacy, resources, and training to become consistently engaged in their child's education (Parsons & Shim, 2019).

ESSA was passed in 2015 to replace and revise the NCLB Act and to hold K–12 public schools accountable for providing quality education to all children (Sharp, 2016). ESSA is a partnership between the government and public schools that work together to ensure at-risk students receive equity and are prepared to succeed in college and the workforce (Sharp, 2016). According to McGuinn (2016), one of ESSA’s main agendas is to empower parents and give them the tools to have a stake in their child’s education.

Types of Parental Involvement

PI involves various engagement methods at high schools in rural East Texas. Several forms of PI, such as providing encouragement, helping with homework, and reading with children, are methods that describe PI in education (Park & Holloway, 2018). Additionally, PI includes volunteering at school events, communicating with teachers, assisting with school projects, and joining the PTA (Berkowitz et al., 2021).

Parents who encourage their children to be successful at school can cultivate the unknown potential in their children, leading to positive educational results. Encouragement from parents is an important goal that positively affects academic achievement (Narad & Abdullah, 2016). Parental encouragement is associated with higher test scores, positive classroom attitudes, and an excellent school experience (Lawrence & Barathi, 2016). Parents can encourage their children through family discussions or by leading by example (Lawrence & Barathi, 2016). Family discussions consist of effective conversations associated with daily educational experience, school programs, postsecondary plans, mental stability, and addressing unresolved teacher issues (Narad & Abdullah, 2016). Parents’ discussions with their children were impactful and had positive academic results (Zhang, 2020). Parents can lead by example, such as doing the right thing, because children will treat their friends the way they see their parents treat people

(Coto et al., 2019). PI can help mold students into ongoing learners through homework assistance (Bempechat, 2019).

Some teachers view homework as a connection between school, students, and parents, even though homework is not a component of guaranteed success for students (Bempechat, 2019). However, Núñez et al. (2015) found that parental support for homework is directly related to academic success in elementary and secondary students.

Another PI method includes parents helping their children with literacy and cognitive skills (Baumann, 2012). Researchers associated various literacy skills and cognitive benefits with parents reading to their children (Baumann, 2012). A child's mind stimulates, and their imagination expands when parents read aloud to them daily (Baumann, 2012). In addition, children develop literacy and listening skills that prepare them to comprehend instruction when parents read aloud to them daily (Baumann, 2012).

Volunteering is an unselfish action that intends to improve the status of the people, place, or thing it serves (Eftimie, 2016). Additionally, volunteering can produce a sense of pride and self-respect for the people involved (Eftimie, 2016). Parents volunteer at their child's schools in different ways. Parent volunteers organize events, cater to school functions, or work at events that collect money, such as bake sales, concession stands, and book fairs (Wu et al., 2018).

Barriers to Parental Involvement

Researchers suggest several barriers hinder low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking parents' involvement in their child's education (Baker et al., 2016). Parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds must overcome several issues in Texas high schools to get involved and engaged in their child's education. According to Merriam-Webster (n.d.), a barrier is a rule, law, or policy that impedes something, creating hardships that block completion. Formidable

data validates how schools and parents should collaborate for students' success; however, some barriers block parents from attempting to become involved in their child's education (Uslu & Gizir, 2017). Stakeholders informed school administrators about numerous challenges such as low SES, lack of communication from school to home, linguistics, logistics, and systematic policies that cause parents not to be available for their child's education (Alameda-Lawson & Lawson, 2019).

Low SES Barrier. A few recent studies reported that low SES is a significant barrier to PI (Ishimaru et al., 2016; Leggett & Harrington, 2021). For example, some minority and low-income parents may be perceived as incompetent or uncaring when they do not participate in traditional PI at schools, such as PTA meetings, parent conferences, or volunteering (Ishimaru et al., 2016). Parents from lower SES find it challenging to be involved in their child's educational process with challenges such as transportation, lack of resources, and parents' educational level (Vega et al., 2015). Researchers found that parents who are unemployed, homeless, and lack family support, sometimes struggle to meet their children's needs (Tobin, 2016). Suffering from homelessness is unquestionably tough for parents. However, research demonstrates that it can be overwhelming for teenagers since homeless parents' needs may be so uncontrollable that it eclipses the needs of their children (Tobin, 2016). Homeless parents and parents involved in the child welfare system usually come from low SES populations and broken homes, fostering different parental values and parenting styles (Zilberstein, 2016). For example, scholars reported that warm and structural parenting practices resulted in high academic accomplishments as they entered grade school (Herbers et al., 2014). In contrast, Trieu and Jayakody (2018) found that firm and consistent discipline practices are necessary for at-risk and homeless students to succeed. There have been reports that society exaggerates crime rates, domestic violence cases,

drug addiction, and teenage pregnancy statistics or low socioeconomic parents, which causes preconceived notions from school staff (Kong, 2020).

Parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds sometimes decide not to get involved in their child's education and focus on surviving each day due to socioeconomic circumstances, illegal drugs, lack of food, and lack of adequate shelter (Baker et al., 2016). In addition, struggling parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds found it challenging to volunteer at school programs due to having multiple children, no babysitter, and feeding all the kids before the event starts (Baker et al., 2016). Similarly, Povey et al. (2016) found evidence that an essential factor impeding PI is time pressures that cause barriers, such as work and family obligations and the timing of the school event. Furthermore, parents' disinterest in participating in or attending school events is another barrier preventing PI in 9–12 public schools (Povey et al., 2016). Furthermore, low-SES families face barriers such as adoptive parents, passing a background check, and single-parent homes (Baker et al., 2016). The students of adoptive parents sometimes experience attachment issues, school challenges, and other mental health challenges, and the adoptive parents tend to respect their space and not come to the school to be overbearing (Drozd et al., 2018). Some parents feel that background checks limit low socioeconomic fathers' access to their children, making them feel unwelcome. According to Restler and Glant (2020), a significant barrier to single-parent participation was parents' comfort level in coming to the school and teachers asking about absent mothers or fathers (Baker et al., 2016).

Socioeconomic barriers that parents have faced play a significant role in preventing parents from participating in schooling. A similar theme in the literature on public 9–12 education is the challenge of low socioeconomic students experiencing academic outcomes much

lower than students from high socioeconomic backgrounds (Assari, 2018). Low socioeconomic public school students are more likely than high socioeconomic public school students to struggle academically, be placed in out-of-school suspension, be suspended from school, quit school, and suffer from truancy (Lindt & Blair, 2017). Healthy relationships with stakeholders promote positive adjustment among teenagers, especially teenagers from low SES communities and environments overwhelmed by violence and impoverished households in their communities (Fix et al., 2019).

Language Barrier. Non-English-speaking parents become instrumental in the academic achievement of public school students, although they lack linguistic fluency in English (MacPhee, 2021). Barriers such as unwelcoming school climates and lack of linguistic proficiency are school-based barriers that non-English-speaking parents experience (Baker et al., 2016). Furthermore, logistical barriers, such as job-related duties and lack of adequate childcare, often make it challenging for families to attend school functions (Hornby & Blackwell, 2018). As documented by Lechuga-Peña and Brisson (2018), parents' volunteer opportunities lack fidelity because of challenges such as language preference, job demands, culture shocks, and past negative experiences. McFarland et al. (2018) reported that almost five million school-aged children in the United States identified as ELL during the 2016–2017 school year. Teachers may articulate pedagogical practices and perceptions of PI due to their own culture's school experience since they have had minimal exposure to culturally and linguistically diverse populations (Gonzalez & Gabel, 2017). Non-English-speaking parents were deemed less engaged in their children's school experience (Wassell et al., 2017). Furthermore, the authors stated that those parents were involved in less informal conversations, engaged in less frequent informal talks with teachers, and were less likely to commit to volunteering at the school or in

the classroom (Wassell et al., 2017). School teachers noted that they are not as familiar with culturally different parents and believe these parents are not as interested in their child's education as people with the same cultural background (Wassell et al., 2017).

A significant barrier for ELL families is communicating with the school in fluent English (Tarasawa & Waggoner, 2015). ELL parents' communication abilities prevent them from volunteering and attending school events (Shim & Shur, 2018). ELL parents with limited English speaking and comprehension skills may feel intimidated or unprepared to help with schoolwork or come to the school to meet with teachers (Tarasawa & Waggoner, 2015). Additionally, reading and replying to school correspondence and documents are affected by limited English language skills and place heavy burdens on parents (Gonzalez & Gabel, 2017). Secondary schools must train their staff to exhibit compassion and understanding about any linguistic barriers while interacting with limited English proficient parents (Alexander et al., 2017).

Communication Barrier. Communication is also a significant barrier between families and school staff (Baker et al., 2016). Recent scholars have shown that effective communication between families and teachers is the groundwork of a dynamic partnership that helps student progression, problem-solving, and positive interactions (Baker et al., 2016). Likewise, many researchers mentioned that communication effectiveness between families and school staff is a stronger predictor of increased volunteer and PI than actual family and school staff contact (Pal et al., 2016). It is vital to keep open communication among school managers, teachers, and students, understand students' problems and increase parental support, mental health counseling, and student success (Ozmen et al., 2016). In addition, school staff must create a culture of open communication to promote PI and ensure parents have access to all school events (Malone,

2015). Low-quality communication between school parents and staff is a precursor to parents' negative perceptions of education (Kocabaş & Bavlı, 2022).

Furthermore, disheartened and annoyed parents unfavorably impact the potential for effective and persistent parental volunteer engagement (Kocabaş & Bavlı, 2022). Schools are perceived as less friendly and welcoming when there is poor communication, resulting in families finding out about programs too late or receiving incorrect communication from the school regarding events (Bordalba & Bochaca, 2019). In addition, when there is a lack of publicity on school events, parents are not privy to the time and place of the event at school (Bordalba & Bochaca, 2019). Educators must recognize and respect the type of communication channel each family prefers (Murray et al., 2015).

Technology Barrier. Another barrier to PI for low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking families is the school's transition to technology (Hornby & Blackwell, 2018). Technological barriers include children not having access to online platforms consistently, and financial barriers include parents being laid off from work and not having access to funds. Technology has modified the education outlook in the past two decades, and children from low socioeconomic backgrounds and non-English-speaking families struggle to access technology at home for their children (Hornby & Blackwell, 2018).

The use of current technology in the school system promotes communication, allows for easy access to information, and aids in explaining complex subjects. While technology benefits education, some variables, such as cost, hinder access to alternative approaches to meeting educational needs. Parents who are financially deprived or do not speak English like their children face difficulties assisting them in coping with changing technology (Bernacki et al., 2020).

In addition, technology refers to the creation of devices and equipment through scientific knowledge. Information visualization technologies, classroom response systems, online project communication tools, and electronic databases are all used in the educational system (Bernacki et al., 2020). Investing in technology is critical since it increases the quality of education in schools and PI. Technology is used in education to improve the efficiency and efficacy of skills and knowledge passed down to students. Technology has made education interactive and reactive as students participate actively in school programs and activities (Bernacki et al., 2020). However, low-SES parents find it difficult to access training on internet programs to help their children stay current with school trends (Schueler et al., 2017).

The internet has made it easy to conduct research and obtain necessary information. Tutorials and other visual resources can be accessible on the internet, aiding memory recall in educational issues. When comparing what pupils have seen to what they have heard, students find it easier to remember what they have seen. Adopting information and communications technology applications such as Microsoft Excel has made data calculation and analysis more efficient. By lowering the possibility of human error, technology has made education easier. Calculators and other equipment improve the accuracy and reliability of education. Modern technology contains various intriguing information sourced from podcasts and films (Bodsworth & Goodyear, 2017).

Using computers and smartphones to promote online learning has improved collaborative and cooperative learning (Bodsworth & Goodyear, 2017). Schools had to close during the COVID-19 pandemic to prevent the virus from spreading among kids and school personnel like teachers and workers (Harris & Jones, 2020). As a result, the educational system had to devise methods for assuring learning continuity (Harris & Jones, 2020). Technology is vital in making

online learning more accessible, allowing teachers and students to engage in learning despite their geographical separation (Bernacki et al., 2020). Through online learning, teachers and students can collaborate with people from various geographical and cultural backgrounds (Bernacki et al., 2020).

Teachers have created follow-up programs using current technologies such as Skyward and student databases to evaluate students' performance and learning development (Raja & Nagasubramani, 2018). Teachers have been able to follow the individual progress of their students and identify individuals with needs thanks to the use of a student database. Teachers' and parents' relationships are maintained because contact is primarily online, allowing easier access than actual engagement, saving time and money. Personalized learning and PI via the internet are possible (Raja & Nagasubramani, 2018).

Many technological barriers constrain the application of technology for non-English-speaking parents from low SES (Hornby & Blackwell, 2018). Regarding technology, parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds who do not speak English have little involvement in their children's education (Ahmadi, 2018). Lack of resources, for example, limits access to educational technologies (Hornby & Blackwell, 2018). The usage of electronic resources necessitates the use of power. Laptops and cell phones cannot access critical information for the educational process without electrical power.

In addition, parents from low-income families are more likely to have limited knowledge of modern education. This feature restricts their ability to assist their children with homework and tasks. Because of a lack of resources, such as money, parents cannot purchase vital technical equipment and machinery for learning, such as smartphones, tablets, and laptops (Ferri et al., 2020). Parents from low-income families are more likely to be financially strapped, limiting their

access to the internet. When low socioeconomic children do not have access to the internet, their confidence and capacity to adapt to educational technologies suffer, restricting the quality of their education (Harriss et al., 2020). Some of these parents work overtime, so they do not have time to check in on their children's progress in school or assist them with their homework. Parents who do not understand English may have difficulty communicating with their children and feel embarrassed about their lack of knowledge (Ahmadi, 2018). A language barrier further limits their participation in their children's education (Baker et al., 2016). Due to a lack of translation resources, teachers and parents cannot communicate effectively regarding their child's performance (Ahmadi, 2018). Illiterate parents cannot contribute to ideas concerning technology, restricting their involvement in their children's education (Ahmadi, 2018).

Technology is critical in PI regarding communication with parents, homework, and school updates (Cristia et al., 2017). Technology improves the collaboration and engagement between teachers, parents, and students despite the geographical distance. Despite the various advantages technology has provided, it has also curtailed parental engagement among financially challenged or linguistic challenges (Cristia et al., 2017). Parents from low-income families are less likely to have the financial resources to support the use of technology in their children's education. Parents who do not speak English find it challenging to communicate with their children and instructors about educational issues (Ahmadi, 2018).

School administrators play a significant role in developing and using technology with students and parents (Yu & Prince, 2016). The school administrator should work collaboratively with classroom teachers to integrate technology into the culture of the school and the community (Yu & Prince, 2016). For example, the school administrator's role includes securing and preparing resources such as models of technology use, computer hardware, software system, and

other equipment to encourage technology use (Murphy et al., 2018). School administrators should take the lead and model technology daily with emails, school websites, mass text alerts to the parents, and a solid social media presence (Murphy et al., 2018). As a result, teachers understand their leaders' value in performing daily and efficient tasks with technology (Murphy et al., 2018).

COVID-19 and Parental Involvement

In 2020, COVID-19 restrictions were influential in creating challenges for parents in their child's education. For example, the government developed and installed special emergency procedures, such as complete lockdowns and school closures (Ribeiro et al., 2021). This new and unexpected challenge, COVID-19, negatively affected parents in their attempt to support their children at home with schoolwork. Similarly, this stoppage of instruction and events at school might have negatively affected students, both scholastically and mentally, because schools began to teach instruction virtually and revise their educational traditions of teaching and learning (Ribeiro et al., 2021). Recent studies have linked COVID-19 to the lack of PI because it causes logistical barriers for parents. For example, COVID-19 forced siblings to stay at home, so the parent must attend to multiple kids on different educational levels (Jones et al., 2021). Then, some parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds with homebound children mentioned that their children would likely attempt their schoolwork on a cell phone (Colao et al., 2020). Another barrier for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds was public Wi-Fi because there was no reliable internet connection at home for parents to provide for their children to perform schoolwork (Colao et al., 2020). Also, parents were reluctant to return to school and get involved after the state legislature mandated schools to reopen (Van Lancker & Parolin, 2020).

Types of Volunteers

Volunteering acts show that parents give their time, effort, money, and personal skills to help the school and community advance (Epstein, 2018). For example, parents volunteering at extracurricular activities, university interscholastic league events, and events during school is key to forming school engagement (Epstein, 2018). School volunteers aim to enhance the instructional, mental, and social support resources offered to learners using their unique abilities and skills (Tekin, 2014). Research has shown a rising understanding of how significant the partnership between school staff and stakeholders plays in establishing a successful institution (Malluhi & Alomran, 2019). Different types of volunteers can go to the school and help in other areas (Tekin, 2014).

First, there is formal volunteering which are long-term positions that require some form of commitment (Clerkin & Fotheringham, 2017). Many recent studies have reported that formal volunteering involves structured policies, procedures, trainers, and supervisors critical to the program's recruiting and evaluation (Torres & Serrat, 2019). For example, volunteers check in with their appointed supervisor and tutor students every Tuesday and Friday, greet parents at the door, and help at after-school events (Clerkin & Fotheringham, 2017).

Informal volunteering is most known for not having many structures in place and rarely receiving funding or support (Pettigrew et al., 2019). Various researchers have shown that informal volunteering is a kind act done for the community and usually by the community (Pettigrew et al., 2019). Numerous researchers have stated that many people who volunteer informally consider themselves family, stakeholders, or pillars of the community (Bradford et al., 2016). For example, assisting elementary students crossing the street before and after school is an example of informal volunteering (Ackermann, 2019).

Social action volunteering involves collaboration by a group of people with common goals that get together to accomplish a task. Scholars have noted that this type of volunteering has become an efficient means to educate people on social awareness to help provide positive solutions and resources for disadvantaged citizens (Liu et al., 2017). Additionally, social action volunteering is a socioemotionally rewarding action that increases various facets of people or groups' mental, physical, or social welfare (Carr et al., 2015).

School volunteering refers to organizing and recruiting support and help from parents for student activities and school programs. Typically, parents volunteer in four ways: helping teachers as assistant tutors, promoting the school in the community, fundraising for events, and volunteering as members of an audience by attending school performances and programs (Fisher & Kostelitz, 2015). In this case, they engage in such activities as attending meetings, carrying out various schoolwork, and annual postcard surveys to identify school resources.

Parent Mentors as Volunteers

Mentoring is a productive way to address issues that result from a person missing parental figure support, resulting from decreasing adult availability, support, and guidance. In addition, mentors offer compassionate and helpful relationships to struggling teenagers who miss significant adult mentorship in their lives (Haslip et al., 2019). Researchers have suggested that teacher mentors positively affect academics, students, and family relationships (Oreopoulos et al., 2017).

A community volunteer mentor program involves stakeholders spending their time, money, and resources serving the community. Volunteering allows people to partner with the school, families, local businesses, and churches to increase academic achievement and school safety (Beel et al., 2017). Additionally, community volunteer mentoring assists families with

recognizing and implementing amenities, resources, and information within the community to support and connect the school to parents and children from the community that attends school with services that will help their child advance in life (Beel et al., 2017). Since 1983 public schools in the United States have partnered more with private sector companies (Oreopoulos et al., 2017). However, in 2015, public schools rallied to ensure that schools were responsible for more than 50% of all mentoring programs in the United States (Hickman & Anderson, 2019). Initially, schools' corporate mentoring programs focused on developing young people's social and work-related skills. Still, more recently, such programs have focused on supporting children and adolescents in attaining critical skills such as reading and developing positive attitudes toward life-long learning (Hickman & Anderson, 2019).

It is highly beneficial to the success of many high schools when successful students volunteer as peer mentors. Likewise, researchers mentioned that peer mentoring is influential in discussing and helping students reach the appropriate academic and social support system as they transition from high school to the next phase in life (Colvin, 2015; Cornelius et al., 2016). Few scholars mentioned peer mentoring as a strategy to usher in a student-to-student engagement where students serve other students (Goodrich, 2018; Hall et al., 2020). As mentioned previously, bottom and top-tier student retention can be positively influenced and impacted with the assistance of peer mentoring (Hall et al., 2020). On the other hand, adult mentors are just as crucial to a student's success in education as peers are. For example, San Antonio et al. (2020) found evidence that students whom adults tutored scored significantly higher on state assessments than those students who did not have the opportunity for tutoring. Likewise, findings suggest that natural mentoring, which comes from adults, grandparents, or family

friends, can have a long-term positive impact on students' developmental process (Hagler & Rhodes, 2018).

Drawbacks of Parent Volunteers

Some teachers are comfortable with a parent volunteering in class. However, some teachers think volunteers should possess specific skills, be competent in specific subject matter, and resolve student conflicts without bias (Homan et al., 2020). Scholars have mentioned how daunting a task it is to identify volunteers with specific and desired characteristic skill sets and train them to be proficient for positive student outcomes (Homan et al., 2020). According to Li and Fischer (2017), many students become distracted by their parent's existence, which causes focus problems for students. Parents tend to focus only on their children instead of the entire classroom while volunteering. School leaders who neglect to develop effective volunteer programs cause confusion and conflict between staff members and parent volunteers (Li & Fischer, 2017). As a result, staff members and parent volunteers become irritated and frustrated with each other's roles (Restler & Glant, 2020).

The Benefit of Parent Volunteers

Parental volunteering refers to teachers and parents sharing responsibility to help their children meet educational objectives through learning (Hunter, 2018). Therefore, parental volunteering occurs when teachers engage parents in school events and meetings, and the parents volunteer their support to the children at school and home. In this regard, parents prioritize the children's educational goals while teachers listen and provide room for collaboration with the respective parents (Tan et al., 2020).

Many families in the United States are struggling with financial challenges. This has become a significant obstacle to effective parenting because such parents are involved in

economic activities. Therefore, children from low socioeconomic backgrounds have parents who switch from one job to another with minimum wages, leaving them in poverty. As a result, low socioeconomic students in high schools bear the brunt of poor learning abilities, eventually leading to behavioral and intellectual challenges (Hunter, 2018). Furthermore, studies indicate that poverty often makes families have poor mental and physical health, and the most susceptible family members are children. The risk of failing in school, developing suicidal thoughts, and even falling into depression is apparent for such children.

Most non-English-speaking students emanate from low-income families who have fled their countries for safety due to civil or political wars (Wright et al., 2018). Thus, such children find learning challenging because their parents cannot speak English. Nevertheless, schools should not underestimate the role of parent volunteers in high schools for low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking students (Wright et al., 2018). To help non-English-speaking parents become more involved, school administrators should provide a campus interpreter available throughout the school day, employ bilingual secretaries to answer phones and questions, and send school information in multiple languages to families (Pratt-Johnson, 2015).

One significant benefit for parent volunteers in high schools for low socioeconomic non-English-speaking students is enriching education. In contrast, with the absence of parent volunteers, some low socioeconomic non-English-speaking students tend to embroil themselves in stressful situations, making them seem unlikely to go to school and learn effectively like others (Pratt-Johnson, 2015). Parents volunteering in schools help teachers offset any negative attitude or loss the students may feel (Wright et al., 2018). Thus, low social economic non-English-speaking students with parent volunteers position themselves to do better socially and

academically because the involvement of parents signals how much education is valued. This will often result in better test scores, grades, and extracurricular activities.

Another benefit of parent volunteers is improving the student's behavior while also getting a socializing opportunity. Students from low socioeconomic non-English-speaking families face other challenges that negatively impact their learning ability. In such a context, teachers may not have enough time to watch every student's moment (Ezikwelu, 2022). Thus, when schools have more parents to volunteer, it helps address the fundamental social and economic challenges the child may be facing. This motivates them to behave better and perform better in school. Alternatively, parental volunteering allows parents to meet and talk to one another about how to model their children positively, which often validates one another's concerns or provides a different perspective that can benefit the other parent and the school administration. (Tan et al., 2020).

Parental Involvement: System Level

All stakeholders should be directly involved in the education of all students (Reynolds et al., 2015). Several scholars have suggested that educational institutions that expect students' academic achievement must ensure that parents are involved in the planning phase (Reynolds et al., 2015). In contrast, Lasater (2016) reported that school staff is reluctant to include parents because of the fear of confusion with family members, worries about parents' capabilities to help with school-related matters, and natural bias regarding their children. A recent study noted a significant power struggle in some school systems between parents and teachers, especially when educators think they oversee a student's educational process, which ultimately creates an unfit partnership (Dawson & Wymbs, 2016). On the other hand, many educators are thrilled to welcome and invite the notion of parent involvement (Jeon et al., 2021).

Some secondary schools have a significant lack of PI despite strategies used in the past, and schools are perplexed (Gonzalez-DeHass, 2016). According to recent research, outdated strategies for PI are a problem (Day & Dotterer, 2018; Jaiswal & Dhar, 2017). School districts that regularly evolve their PI strategies find it beneficial and improve PI (Gonzalez-DeHass, 2016). Educators understand that it is highly beneficial to involve parents; however, educators constantly criticize parents and believe they do not help their child's educational journey (Gonzalez-DeHass, 2016). School staff should avoid assuming parents understand the process of engaging in their child's education at school or home. Some parents need access to the knowledge and proper procedures to be involved in their child's education. A recent study showed that parents are not as equipped with the knowledge of teaching strategies as teachers and need the training to teach their kids at home (Smith & Sheridan, 2019).

The National PTA (2021) provided the following recommendations on strategies to improve PI: (a) school staff should provide PI orientation sessions for parents that give resources for involvement, (b) provide translators and on-site community centers on school needs for children, (c) distribute handouts on instructional strategies to families, (d) find ways to inspire parents to want to participate at school events, and (e) offer parents the opportunity to attend decision making meetings. Likewise, parents should not expect educators to instinctively understand and practice strategies that promote PI in their classrooms and homes. Most teachers lack adequate training, including parents, and lack the appropriate professional development on how to increase PI. School leaders could effectively provide teacher workshops to instruct and role-play how to involve parents (Smith & Sheridan, 2019).

Parent engagement is as essential as PI (Smith & Sheridan, 2019). The research found that family engagement is the philosophies, actions, and attitudes toward helping parents support

their child's education at home, school, and community (Smith & Sheridan, 2019). For example, campaigning for better education on behalf of their children, navigating their child's educational journey through a complicated school system, and advocating that schools are held accountable for providing their kids with quality education and an effective school (Ferrara, 2017). School administrators and stakeholders also feel that school involvement plays a similar role in education.

Parental Involvement and Ethnicity

Parents play a crucial role in the student's educational triumph by interacting with their children at home and school to advance their academic success (Dettmers et al., 2019). Involvement starts at home, with parents offering healthy and safe surroundings suitable for support, positive attitudes, and learning experiences in school (Dettmers et al., 2019). Research indicates that when parents involve themselves in school and encourage a learning culture at home, their children tend to be more fruitful at all grade levels. More specifically, PI connects to increased students' accomplishment and motivation, better attendance, emotional adjustments, declines in school dropout rates, and advances in interactions and social behaviors with peers. In this case, the advantages of PI in children's schooling are vital to all ethnic groups (Kocayörük, 2016). However, it is worth noting that the association between student accomplishment and PI is more likely to be bidirectional. Parents normally regulate how they involve themselves per the student's accomplishment levels. Besides, the participation of parents is displayed differently in diverse cultural contexts and ages. Therefore, the roles and responsibilities of PI are not similarly pertinent to all groups of students (Rattenborg et al., 2019).

Although there are various studies on the relationship between PI and student academic achievement, there are minimal studies on PI among different ethnicities (White et al., 2016).

Researchers noted that PI is more prevalent among White students than African American or Hispanic students (Zhang et al., 2016). In addition, a negative association exists between ethnicity (African American and Hispanic students) and academic performance as students enter middle and high school (White et al., 2016). Essentially, more educational research has examined the role of ethnicity in PI. Wang et al. (2016) posited that studies have provided convincing evidence that Black parents interact less with their child's school when compared to White parents. The status of the ethnic minority in society is associated with teacher rankings regarding the quality and levels of PI (Wang et al., 2016). Other researchers indicate that Black parents agree with getting involved in their student's education and tend to express a strong interest in assuming parental roles but face some barriers (Wang et al., 2016). Therefore, such obstacles as non-English proficiency and low income among some minority parents may prevent them from being involved in their children's education.

Historically and practiced, White bias exists in parental volunteerism in school programs and organizations. According to Fisher and Kostelitz (2015), the number of minority participants in school associations dwindles each year. Studies suggest that the historical segregation of school volunteer ranks has significantly impacted people's perception, such that volunteerism is synonymous with White activity (Fisher & Kostelitz, 2015). Essentially, minority volunteers have no choice but to accept the developed structures that favor White traditions (Kocayörük, 2016). However, parents from different ethnicities have different ways of relating to the school (Kocayörük, 2016). Asian Americans are often involved in home-based activities, Hispanic Americans volunteer within the family, and African Americans volunteer to assist the community and family (Kocayörük, 2016). Therefore, minority parents support their children's educational activities via culturally explicit programs (Kocayörük, 2016).

Teacher's Perception of Low Socioeconomic Parents

According to Schueler et al. (2017), teachers may feel uncomfortable with parent volunteers coming into their classrooms because they perceive that parents are there for the wrong reasons. Schueler et al. (2017) discovered that educators who established a strong belief and a more positive approach toward PI and school volunteers were more likely to reach out to the community and become a more welcoming school. Researchers also found that educators with the same cultural background as their students are not as likely to know or have met their families (Lenstra, 2020; Schueler et al., 2017). Therefore, educators believed that the parents were not interested in coming to the school to volunteer or help their children. The fewer teachers and administration felt the parents cared about their involvement, and fewer opportunities existed for parents to become involved. Educators' ideas and perceptions sometimes define the extent and probability of parents' involvement (Schueler et al., 2017).

School administration and teachers perceive that low socioeconomic PI hurts their children's learning process (Jafarov, 2015). PI exists on many levels, from giving children aid with homework assignments to involving parents directly with the school's administration (Jafarov, 2015). Teachers feel that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds are less equipped with the resources to engage in their child's education actively and meaningfully when compared to parents from high socioeconomic backgrounds (Ayoub et al., 2018).

School staff perceives that challenges arise from parents' lack of education or experience with how schools operate and how their child learns. While low socioeconomic parents may be motivated, communicating at home what the child needs to know to succeed is typically not their strength. In addition, unfamiliarity can limit parents' ability to do homework with their children because of the school materials and experiences outside their childhood. Low socioeconomic

parents are sometimes associated with a lack of skills and resources to engage meaningfully in their child's education (Yulianti et al., 2022). Still, low socioeconomic parents are committed to their child's progress and want to do what they can to make productive students out of their children (Yulianti et al., 2022). In trying to overcome these barriers, low socioeconomic parents may seek outside help from their children's teachers or community members with whom their children interact outside of school.

In some cases, toxic partnerships between parents and the school prevent parents from being involved and partners with teachers. A questionable partnership emerges when teachers perceive that the parent is not involved in their child's educational process (Santiago et al., 2016). According to Santiago et al. (2016), a dysfunctional partnership between parents and teachers sometimes results from a difference in culture, socioeconomic status, and language of the school and community. Their explanation of the tension could be due to cultural differences, socioeconomic status, and language contrasts with the lack of mainstream PI and volunteering practices. More specifically, this pressure creates resistance from the parents and students, ultimately hindering PI (Santiago et al., 2016). The partnership between parental engagement and student academic achievement remains a constant theme in the conversation about access, retention, and accomplishments.

Alternatively, non-English-speaking parents may not effectively communicate with the school's staff. A parent is the first teacher to their child. Their responsibility is to ensure that adequate daily home instruction is rich in language, knowledge, and skills development to ensure success at school (Đurišić & Bunijevac, 2017). The non-English-speaking parents teach their children their native languages, which complicates children's learning when they join the school as they first have the English language (Andrade, 2015). Most teachers feel that a non-English-

speaking parent is not as involved as the child's English-speaking parent (Andrade, 2015). The students' learning depends on the language of their parents and their interaction with their children at home.

Teachers mention that their English language is not ideological for non-English-speaking parents, and most teachers cannot contribute to non-English parental needs (Kalayci & Ergül, 2020). Non-English-speaking parents have poor communication with teachers and students, given that the primary language in school is English (Kalayci & Ergül, 2020). These parents are not as involved in their child's education as their English-speaking parents would be if they were at home because of limited access to education (Kalayci & Ergül, 2020). After all, they have difficulty understanding and speaking English. It is difficult for them to help their children with their homework assignments. In such cases, there is a compromise in the learning environment for children (Kalayci & Ergül, 2020). Teachers believe that the English proficiency of parents determines their involvement in the children's learning process (Parsons & Shim, 2019). Non-English-speaking parents have less engagement with their children in social and economic assistance, affecting their education development (Andrade, 2015). Languages carry some characteristics that determine their level of PI (Andrade, 2015).

Role of the Teacher in Removing Barriers for Parents

Teachers expressed the significant benefits they experience when prioritizing PI on campus (Manna, 2015). Furthermore, teachers create a climate of trust and inclusiveness among the school and parents (Manna, 2015). Researchers recognize the importance of collaboration between parents and teachers in developing and educating children in the United States. Sheridan et al. (2018) argued that principals and teachers are role models to students in school and life. The author further argues that the teacher's role in PI is to foster an environment that encourages

partnership between themselves and parents (Sheridan et al., 2018). Schools whose teachers encourage positive teacher–parent connections have improved students’ social competencies, academic achievement, and emotional well-being (Sheridan et al., 2018). In an investigation exploring the role of teachers in promoting PI in American rural schools, Preston and Barnes (2017) noted that teachers are the agents of change by balancing cultural practices and department of education policies. Further, the investigation notes that teachers offer instructional leadership that encourages a School–Family–Community Partnership (SFCP; Preston & Barnes, 2017).

The cultural barrier significantly hinders involvement in the American education system. In their investigation involving rural schools in Texas, DeMatthews and Izquierdo (2018) found that language barriers between teachers and parents hinder effective collaboration. However, DeMatthews and Izquierdo (2018) noted that teachers must encourage dual language education and the social justice system. Leaders and principals opine that by creating dual language programs and accommodating different cultural practices, teachers will promote social justice in the education sector and encourage PI (DeMatthews and Izquierdo, 2018). The teachers’ role in enhancing PI in schools is to develop trust and teamwork among their students and parents (Wieczorek & Manard, 2018).

According to Reynolds et al. (2017), parent engagement among private schools was higher than in public schools. The investigators concluded that teachers encourage PI through communication, family days, or encouraging parents to visit the school frequently. While exploring the role of teachers in encouraging PI, Jeynes (2018) argued that teachers assist in crucial decision-making. For instance, they noted that the transformational leadership model from school leaders had shown great academic success among students through direct

engagement between school and home partnerships (Jeynes, 2018). The home–school involvement programs show tremendous success in student–teacher interaction and positive social change (Jeynes, 2018).

Through their experience and expertise, teachers guide and educate young teachers and parents on collaboration in the education sector (Reynolds et al., 2015, 2018). This argument is in line with an investigation by Heinrichs (2018) that showed that teachers and parents engage through seminars, meetings, and coffee sessions. Therefore, the role of the teacher is to assist the principal in developing various programs to create capacity development and building between parents (Heinrichs, 2018). Researchers mentioned that public schools facing PI challenges need more intervention from teachers (Reynolds et al., 2015).

Low Socioeconomic Parents' Perceptions of Teachers

Some parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds have negative perceptions of teachers, which creates a significant barrier to PI (Protacio et al., 2020). Most learning institutions stated that it is challenging to engage low socioeconomic parents in their children's academic activities (Protacio et al., 2020). Learning institutions are slowly becoming unbearable for parents coming from financially challenged backgrounds (Bumpus et al., 2020). Some parents believe teachers have repeatedly made it harder for financially disadvantaged parents to advocate for their children as there is a clear distinction that the school system has created between parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds and parents from high socioeconomic backgrounds (Marrero, 2016). Despite the amount of research done to counter this level of distinction in the education system, the efforts have seemingly proven futile. Parents with low SES constantly encounter schoolteacher discrimination (Marchand et al., 2019). This act has made it challenging for low-SES parents to be involved with their children's academic endeavors

(Turner et al., 2021). Some parents perceive that school staff only want to associate themselves with high-class or, at least, elite parents (Siegel et al., 2020). Doing that ignores the needs of the students, as their sole purpose in attending a school is to gain knowledge that will help them conquer the world (Losinski et al., 2019). This predicament has existed for a while and will continue to be so until teachers decide to accommodate everyone despite their backgrounds, which will likely prevent parents with low SES from perceiving teachers negatively.

Low SES parents feel that school staff, in most cases, focuses on students whose parents are known to be financially stable, and this narrative needs to dismantle for a better future (Santiago et al., 2016). In addition, low SES parents think school systems need to unite people but not disintegrate people, as is the case (Farrell, 2015). The ideology that parents from a high socioeconomic status get treated differently than those from a low economic level should cease, as it promotes inequality (Burgess et al., 2015). Therefore, parents' negative perceptions of schoolteachers prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's education (Farrell, 2015).

Parental Involvement From Elementary to Secondary School

One researcher examined the relationship between parental participation in a child's learning and student success. However, the research rarely focuses on the rate of PI as the child transitions from one grade to the other (Garbe et al., 2020). For example, when the child moves from elementary to middle and high school, examining the potential shift in PI in the academic setting is minimal. However, Boonk et al. (2018) presented a unique perspective in examining the transition process, which entailed developing a multidimensional construct to recognize the internal and external factors that define PI. Accordingly, PI in school activities continues to evolve into a complex array of actions that require thorough investigation. Arguably, some of the

requirements are parental participation in discussions about the school with the child, in school activities, assistance with homework, and engagement in school debates (Hill et al., 2018). However, a shift in the participative process is apparent during the transition process, and diversification of forms of PI is emergent at different times during the student's school life (Hamilton et al., 2018). PI throughout the transition can be positive or negative, with the need for a comprehensive assessment of the underlying enabling factors (Wandasari et al., 2019).

Bubb and Jones (2020) affirmed that monitoring is a deliberate action of parents in elementary and middle school. Parents show extensive concern about class activity during elementary school due to its formative role in growth and development. Hence, monitoring denotes direct and regular assessment of the child's progress. Concerns are considerable for the parents with the need to ensure success and self-confidence as the parameter of advancement of the child (Hornby & Blackwell, 2018). Nonetheless, a slight reduction in monitoring occurs as the child transitions to middle school. At this level, situational awareness of the progress made by the child is apparent, and parents at this level focus on promoting a level of independence. (Duppong Hurley et al., 2017).

However, Graber et al. (2018) emphasized that during middle school, parents show concern about daily conduct, with a weekly assessment of the common feature of PI. Despite nurturing independence, the parents usually acknowledge the need to allocate time to determine their child's progress (Grewenig et al., 2021). The prospect of transitioning to high school is of concern that requires the parent to evaluate the steps made by the child (Garbacz et al., 2018). Equally, consultations with the teachers happen regularly but not at a similar rate as when the child was in elementary (Pineda et al., 2018). The approach ensures that the child is accomplishing their goals and that the potential transition to high school is imminent. However,

the transition to high school promotes extensive independence as a feature that shapes the parental strategy (Bal-Taştan et al., 2018). Few parents at the secondary level intervene in their child's education (Laffend, 2021).

Consequently, helping kids with their homework is rare and almost nonexistent for fathers (Lee et al., 2021). Concerns about schoolwork are disproportionate among parents. Consequently, parents believe that children can be responsible and conform to the set obligations in learning institutions (Lebowitz et al., 2020). Completing the work on time and conforming to the set instructions are some of the child's expectations that the parents assume their child will complete. Therefore, the misconceptions of independence and responsibility among children in high school translate into low levels of PI.

Mental Health

Contemporary research into the parent's mental health and its effect on involvement in education continues to be influential in the research process (Yang et al., 2022). Mental illness can significantly affect the child's education process. The probability of ceasing education to care for the parent is a facet of concern that impedes the progressive initiatives of the child. Recognition of mental health's direct effects on the family's economic situation plays a central role in educational promotion (Yang et al., 2022).

Children becoming disadvantaged and opting for early school leave are influential aspects of mental health problems. The linkage between adverse school outcomes and mental health requires in-depth review, as Shao et al. (2021) noted, and is usually the case for parents and children. Mental health is a significant disadvantage that can distort the progress made by the parents in their involvement in K–12 education. Arguably, the study by Huck and Zhang (2021) revealed that parental mental illness harms children's learning, growth, and development.

Specifically, at the 9–12 level, it is apparent that mental illness can lead to distortion in the level of parental participation in learning. The perceptions about the learning process usually change for the parents whose concerns shift toward dealing with mental health problems. Accordingly, the illness haunts the effectiveness of PI, which translates into a deviation of attention and adverse implications in promoting effectiveness in educational participation (Macaraan, 2021). Equally, the problem increases for a parent with low SES and mental health problems. The possibility of suicidal tendencies due to the inability to meet the child's educational needs is emergent, significantly leading to detrimental outcomes (Huck & Zhang, 2021). Hence, mental illness leads to distortion of the progress made in PI.

Chapter Summary

It remains essential that administrators, teachers, parent volunteers, and stakeholders understand the importance of creating an effective partnership that will benefit students (Gilmore, 2021). How well these constructs work together rests on the capabilities and sensitivities of everyone involved (Mann & Gilmore, 2021). This chapter delivered background information on PI, barriers to PI, COVID-19, changing demographics, the theoretical framework, types of volunteers, mentors as volunteers, drawbacks of volunteers, benefits of PI, PI from the system level, PI and ethnicity, school teachers perception of PI, parent perception of school staff, the role of the school teacher in promoting PI, and how technology prevents low socioeconomic parents from PI. This chapter also presented information on low socioeconomic parent perception of the schoolteachers and the impact of PI in transitioning from elementary to middle to high school. A collaborative parent-centered environment results from identifying barriers related to PI, and justification is warranted.

Chapter 3 provides and describes the study's research design and thorough methods. The information in Chapter 3 also consists of the proper population, its qualitative sample size, instruments used, data collection, and analytic procedures. Chapter 3 provides information on the study's trustworthiness, researcher's role, ethical considerations, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations.

Chapter 3: Research Methods and Design

This qualitative case study explored high school teachers' perceptions of barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. This case study explored teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education (Lavery, 2016). Furthermore, this study specifically examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. A case study's strength lies in its ability to analyze interviews, observations, and artifacts (Dautel, 2020). This study collected and analyzed teacher interviews, focus groups, and semistructured questionnaires. This case study aimed to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ2: What are teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ3: What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

In this qualitative case study, I conducted a descriptive case study to add dimensions to the study from detailed data about personal human experiences (Hopkins et al., 2017; Valentine et al., 2018). A descriptive case study is appropriate for this research because it facilitates the researcher in analyzing facts and describing the participant's actions in a natural setting (Harrison et al., 2017). I organized, analyzed, and interpreted qualitative data from interviews,

focus groups, and questionnaires (Terry et al., 2017). As a result, the data analysis demonstrated why the design would accomplish the study goals and the right design for this research study (Terry et al., 2017). This qualitative case study also explored teachers' perceived barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. This case study investigated teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education.

Population and Sample

This study focused on District X in rural East Texas, with approximately 1,700 students and 115 staff members. District X has increased its racial diversity over the past 15 years from a population nearly 100% White for teachers and students to the current makeup of 81% White, 10% Hispanic, 5% African American, and 4% Asian American teachers. The student population is 49% Hispanic, 25% African American, 22% White, and 4% Asian. In addition, 55% of the staff are women, and 45% are men (Texas Education Agency, 2012). I chose District X for this study due to a 2019–2020 protest about the lack of teacher diversity and because it is presently one of the most racially diversified schools in rural East Texas. In this protest, stakeholders took to the school board in droves after two strong candidates raised in East Texas and from low socioeconomic backgrounds did not get hired, even though they were more qualified than the candidates who were hired and grew up in East Texas but were from high socioeconomic backgrounds.

Sample Selection Population

The qualitative case study followed school district procedures to obtain permission from the board of school directors to collect data from teachers (Peterson, 2019). District X's administrator approved research methods prior to data collection. This study focused on participants' demographics, job experience, and knowledge of the research issue (Sutton & Austin, 2015).

This study used purposive sampling to choose participants who provided the most information and produced maximum differences within the samples. This allowed me to identify participants with the most experience regarding the studied issue (Palinkas et al., 2015; Stratton, 2021). Roberts (2012) asserted that the credibility of a study relies heavily on the type of procedures used to select the sample. I recruited seven teachers through word of mouth to help to identify novice, midlevel, and veteran teachers to participate in the study. These participants completed a guided protocol based on the study's research questions. In this study, 25 participants completed a questionnaire via a Google Form (see Appendix A). Google Forms allows the participants to answer questions from their mobile phones or laptops, and the study received instant results with charts and graphs (Anderson, 2019). The questionnaire consisted of 10 open-ended questions. This allowed the participants to give specific answers that helped develop commonalities (Hyman & Sierra, 2016).

I selected 15 teachers who self-identified as heavily involved in their child's education or grew up in a low SES household. If 15 teachers could not be identified, I would have conducted a stakeholder focus group to redefine some selection criteria (TenHouten, 2017). For example, the study focused on teachers who self-identified as working at a Title I high school with students' parents that are reluctant to get involved with their children's high school education. In

addition, selected participants identified themselves as novice teachers with 1–5 years of experience, midlevel teachers with 6–10 years of experience, or veteran teachers with 11 years or more of experience teaching and leading extracurricular programs in high school education.

Snowball sampling is a popular approach where research participants recruit other participants through relationships and acquaintances for a particular study (Naderifar et al., 2017). I found a few teachers and asked them to recruit colleagues they knew who identified as heavily involved in their child's education or who came from a low socioeconomic background to be involved in the study. After submitting the selected participants' names, contact with candidates was made by phone and email requesting participation (see Appendix B).

In addition, the study described the research project to participants before their interview, the purpose of the discussion, the use of data, and an overview of the subjects covered in the interview (DeJonckheere & Vaughn, 2019). All participants' confidentiality and responses were priorities in this study. A reminder was communicated to all participants that they could decline to answer any question asked during the interview. Interviewees were informed about the importance of being open and honest during the interview and focus group so that feedback could be meaningful and valuable. Once I recorded the data, pseudonyms substituted participants' names to ensure confidentiality (Ethicist, 2015). Pseudonyms provide anonymity and confidentiality, protecting the identity of participants who agree to participate in the research (Ethicist, 2015). This study consisted of informed and signed consent from participants, confidentiality, discretion, high morality, and integrity (Arifin, 2018). Participants received a written consent form verbally and electronically agreeing to participate in the study (see Appendix C). Written consent forms provide vital information to selected research participants and confirm that the participant agrees to the terms (Larson et al., 2015).

Materials and Instruments

I interviewed 15 participants in this study through 10 semistructured, open-ended questions recorded digitally and transcribed manually (see Appendix D). Interviewing participants allowed me to investigate experiences and feelings rather than simply recording factual matters and exploring topics in-depth (DeJonckheere & Vaughn, 2019).

The results of the interviews consisted of field notes, audio recordings, and transcriptions stored in computer software. The interviews aimed to gather background information on the issue from the interviewee's perspective and understand why they came to their conclusion (Meyer, 2001). Each interview session lasted approximately 60 minutes at the place where each participant felt most comfortable to ensure comfort. Last, member-checking verified the accuracy of the transcripts (Candela, 2019). Notable scholars referenced member-checking as a valid method for verifying information observed or transcribed by the researcher (Candela, 2019).

Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

This study obtained permission from District X and Abilene Christian University's Institutional Review Board (IRB; see Appendix E) before collecting data. The qualitative case study method used interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires for data collection to help inform this research approach (Morgan et al., 2017; Yin, 1989). This study used semistructured interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires for teachers to answer research questions about study participants' various perceptions of PI. According to Patten (2012), semistructured interviews collect data because they allow the interviewer to stretch questions and responses. The study formed interview questions and performed follow-up questions when necessary, probing for a deeper understanding of the parent's experience. To further enhance immediacy in the

interview scenario, semistructured interviews endorse back-and-forth dialogue between the participant and interviewer (Patton, 2012). The semistructured interview in this case study explored teachers' perceptions of parents' commitment to their child's education, teachers' role in removing barriers, and the barriers preventing parents from being involved in high education at District X in rural East Texas. Semistructured interview questions involve numerous vital questions that help describe the study's problem (Gill et al., 2008). As part of case study research methods, semistructured interviews include several essential questions that help define the areas to be explored (Brown & Danaher, 2019).

Focus groups allow the investigators to reveal personal and authentic beliefs that many other investigative methods cannot duplicate (Guest et al., 2017). In this study, participants met at the end of the day in the school's library. Along with being the researcher, I was also the moderator, and I asked the group 10 predetermined semistructured questions. The predetermined questions ignited authentic responses and generated explicit discussions on issues revolving around PI from low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking parents. I aimed to produce explicit discussions and opinions to the maximum extent. This focus group produced data drawn from participants' raw attitudes, beliefs, and experiences (Guest et al., 2017). The focus group lasted 60 minutes and consisted of five questions (see Appendix F).

The critical data from interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires were derived from real-life and real-time experiences, making a qualitative case study the logical choice. Participants formed a snapshot of previous and current experiences that have molded their perceptions of PI through their narratives. The interviews began with narratives from the interviewee, leading to open coding and thematic analysis.

This study was designed to discover patterns and themes around the following areas: (a) barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education, (b) teachers' perception of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education, and (c) teacher's perception of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education.

In this qualitative study, open coding analyzed, organized, and marked the data, which is very important (Richards, 2017). Open coding is one of the essential processes in analyzing research data (Cascio et al., 2019). During the open coding process, investigators summarize the data points derived from multiple observations and the reading of transcribed notes (Cascio et al., 2019). Coding methods help disclose various themes rooted in the data and ultimately categorize data meanings (Williams & Moser, 2019).

This qualitative case study selected 15 teachers with various years of teaching experience. Five teachers had 1–5 years of experience, five had 6–10 years of experience, and five had over 11 years of experience. Choosing teachers with various experience levels gave the study balance (Martínez-Mesa et al., 2016). Participants received questionnaires and emails detailing the study's purpose. I contacted selected teachers to conduct semistructured interviews face-to-face, via Zoom, or by telephone.

Trustworthiness

This study's trustworthiness consisted of credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability. Trustworthiness strengthens the case that data results are relative and worth studying (Cope, 2014). Furthermore, trustworthiness stimulates and empowers action and others'

constructions (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Research studies are made credible and rigorous through multiple strategies researchers use (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

Credibility is a significant part of establishing trustworthiness (Wood et al., 2020). Therefore, this study used triangulation, which entails the usage of various approaches such as notes taken during interviews and observation of body language, gestures, and facial expressions during focus groups (Wood et al., 2020). In addition, I conducted member-checking. I asked selected participants to assess and give feedback about the exactness of my understanding of the themes and interpretations (Bloor, 1997; Rodwell, 1998). Credibility challenges investigators to connect the results of a research study with reality to establish truthful outcomes (Liao & Hitchcock, 2018).

Study findings become dependable when participants share the exact likeness and have similar experiences (Koch, 2006). I evaluated dependability in this study by measuring the value of the cohesive developments of data collection and analysis. Dependability plays a significant role in trustworthiness by establishing the research study's findings as steady and duplicated (Chowdhury, 2015). Therefore, this study verified the findings and ensured they reflected the collected raw data.

Transferability is effective when a researcher applies data results to various settings or clusters (Houghton et al., 2013; Polit & Beck, 2014). The study ensured that data findings related to people outside the case study, and readers would reflect on their personal experiences and see themselves in the study (Cope, 2014). Future investigators will be able to take certain concepts from research and use them in other contexts, and can carefully detail the investigation's context and assumptions (Cope, 2014).

In addition to credibility, dependability, and transferability as a measure of trustworthiness, confirmability happens when researchers display that the data reflects the participants' perceptions and not the researcher's biases (Polit & Beck, 2014; Tobin & Begley, 2004). Therefore, confirmability validates that participants' findings shape themselves (Renz et al., 2018). This study exhibited confirmability by describing results derived from triangulated data and not my perspective (Renz et al., 2018). Last, I conducted an audit trail to establish confirmability. The audit trail allows the audience to navigate through the investigator's logic regarding the data collection (Carcary, 2020).

This study used interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups to gather the data (see Appendix G). This study achieved a detailed description by attaching each participant's perception of PI to different themes and comprehensively depicting each case.

Researcher's Role

I have 15 years of experience as an educator and am a witness to the decline of PI in high school education. I do not have any connection with any of the participants, and I aspire to own a school soon and would like to instill a welcoming culture for all parents. I am responsible for describing a concept to design, interview, transcribe, analyze, verify, and report (Sanjari et al., 2014). In addition, my role is to transform data from interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires into various themes (Sanjari et al., 2014). I assessed the views and outlooks of the selected research study participants.

Biases are influences that distort the outcomes of a study (Polit & Beck, 2014). I intentionally addressed all details in the study design to prevent bias from participants and frame and structure interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires.

Ethical Considerations

Selected participants' identities must be protected, and appropriate ethical principles will apply to any research (Orb et al., 2000). I followed the American Psychological Association (APA) ethical guidelines and guidelines set by Abilene Christian University's IRB. The study was cognizant of sensitive topics and conflicts of interest because it can be challenging to predict ethical dilemmas that may occur from an interview (Orb et al., 2000). I identified risks in partaking in this investigation, such as the recurrence of "old wounds" and sharing secrets could be difficult for some participants (Orb et al., 2000). During the research design phase of the case study, I incorporated ethical principles that I followed throughout the study. Therefore, this study was cautious in ensuring participants felt safe and calm and had the choice to remove themselves from the investigation if they felt the need (Arifin, 2018).

Assumptions

Researchers formulate problems and develop research questions from their theories and perspectives that people refer to as assumptions (Creswell, 2013). Conducting a qualitative study allowed me to go in-depth and connect with the participants to gather as much information as possible about the study (Ngulube, 2015). Therefore, subjective evidence was the base of personal views and experiences (Ngulube, 2015). In this study, I assumed that 10 participants were a large enough sample size to complete the study and gather essential data. Next, I assumed that all participants would answer questions honestly and thoroughly.

Limitations

The limitations of a research study signify flaws and weaknesses that sometimes impact the results of a research design (Ross & Bibler Zaidi, 2019). A study sometimes consists of characteristics of methodologies that can manipulate results from the research (Köhler et al.,

2022). This qualitative study discovered limitations within the procedure, setting, and survey. Participants formed a snapshot of previous and current experiences that have molded their perceptions of PI through their responses. As a result, biases formed in the participants. Another limitation was that the study was conducted in rural East Texas, affecting the participants' responses because they may not feel comfortable explaining their cultural biases to the opposite sex, race, and age. The sample size is limited with this study at District X in rural East Texas. In addition, this study was limited to only the teacher's perception.

Delimitations

Scholars do not consider delimitations as negative or positive. However, scholars consider delimitations as a thorough explanation of reasoning which highlights the scope of the study's primary concern according to the research design and philosophical makeup (Theofanidis & Fountouki, 2018). This study was delimited to high school teachers affiliated with District X in rural East Texas.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the research design for this qualitative study of exploring teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. This case study explored teachers' roles in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education (Lavery, 2016). Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. In this chapter, I described the research design and method, population, and sample used and identified the materials and instruments needed to conduct the study and the data collection and analysis procedures. The detailed data collection

process involved semistructured interviews and focus groups with 15 teachers working at District X in rural East Texas. This chapter also described how this study established trustworthiness, the researcher's role, and ethical considerations. This study provided a more robust analysis and identified common themes in the participants' experiences through assumptions, limitations, and delimitations. Last, this study provided a chapter summary.

Chapter 4: Results

The primary goal of this qualitative case study was to explore teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from being involved in their children's high school education. This case study explored teachers' roles in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education (Lavery, 2016). Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. This study gathered data from semistructured interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups from five novice, five midlevel, and five veteran teacher participants. The information from the data analysis revealed the answers to the following research questions:

RQ1: What are teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ2: What are teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ3: What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the results from semistructured interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires. The study results contain emerging themes from research questions; organizing the study into themes allowed future readers to relate this study to their situation and identify transferability.

Description of the Sample

This study focused on District X in rural East Texas, with approximately 1,700 students and 115 staff members. District X has increased its racial diversity over the past 15 years from a population nearly 100% White for teachers and students to the current makeup of 81% White, 10% Hispanic, 5% African American, and 4% Asian American teachers. The student population is 49% Hispanic, 25% African American, 22% White, and 4% Asian. In addition, 55% of the staff are women, and 45% are men (Texas Education Agency, 2012). The target population consisted of schoolteachers that self-identify as being raised in a low socioeconomic environment or parents that are heavily involved in their child's education. Participants completed a questionnaire that asked them to describe their childhood SES. Participants that were selected explained their parents' low poverty level, the free lunch they received at school, and the inconsistent work status of their parents. In addition, the selected participants explained how involved they were with their children. The games, events, and the partnership they established with their children's teachers were also on the questionnaire.

Data collected from this study consisted of interviews with 15 schoolteachers from District X. There was a diverse group of participants with 1–20 years of experience representing African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian communities that gave their perspectives on various topics surrounding PI. Selected participants answered questions from the interview, focus group, and questionnaire that detailed their personal experiences and perceptions of barriers to PI, parents' commitment to their child's education, and teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent PI. I identified similarities in developing themes after transcribing and coding interview results from the selected participants. Pseudonyms protected each participant's identity. Each participant provided specific details of their perspective of PI throughout the

study. Member-checking concluded the study to ensure its validity. Each participant checked for the accuracy of the transcripts, and all but six participants made minor edits. Table 1 presents an overview of teachers' demographic, experience, and position titles. All data was current at the time of this study.

Table 1

Participants

Pseudonym	Job title	Years of service	Demographics
Mike	Science	8	African American
Janae	History	7	African American
John	Basketball	9	Hispanic/African American
Julius	Art	8	Caucasian
Dakota	Sociology	6	Caucasian
Lacy	English	19	Hispanic
Jared	Math	20	Caucasian
Keisha	Fine Arts	13	Caucasian
Clemmon	Dance	15	American Indian
Mia	Science	18	Asian
Duran	Health	3	Hispanic
Mary	Business	2	American Indian
Jaime	Special Ed	1	African American
Samuel	Speech	2	Asian
Summer	Cosmetology	1	Caucasian

Summary of the Results

This qualitative case study explored teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from being involved in high school education. This case study also explored teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education (Lavery, 2016). Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. This research generated findings that can guide future research and help implement a parental inclusion program to foster students' success.

Themes were revealed in interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups through manual coding that I performed. The first cycle of the coding process varied from single words to complete sentences from participants' interviews and focus groups. Next, I thoroughly searched through the data, improving the list of codes and adding specific detail. After detailed coding, data were grouped into categories and themes. These emerging themes helped answer research questions and give insight into the PI of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds in rural East Texas. Table 2 illustrates the research questions and the emerging themes.

Table 2*Emerging Themes*

Research questions	Emerging themes
Research Question 1	
What are teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education in District X in rural East Texas?	Limits to Parents' Technology Access Potential Barriers
Research Question 2	
What are teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?	Shared Commitment and Partnerships Parent's Commitment to Their Child's Education
Research Question 3	
What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education in District X in rural East Texas?	Teacher's Responsibility or Role Parent Inclusion Activities Parental Involvement Training

Research Question 1

The primary goal of Research Question 1 was to explore teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas. The themes that emerged from the interviews were the limits to parental technology access and potential barriers.

Theme 1: Limits to Parent's Technology Access

Twelve participants (80%) discussed how technology addresses students' and parents' needs and provides effective and efficient communication. Participants emphasized that digital technology facilitated supplemental means for human and social communication across communities and cultures. In addition, 12 participants (80%) mentioned that the lack of access to technology prevented parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education. The participants agreed that technology changes so fast that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds lack the time and resources to create the financial capacity it takes to keep up. For example, the participants mentioned that teachers post school events and information on the school's Instagram page, and most parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds do not have Instagram. Teachers distribute information such as grades, discipline referrals, attendance, and a student's well-being through email, Google Classroom, Class Dojo, and Skyward. Therefore, parents who lack access to technology to access essential information can affect their children. Participants mentioned they constantly receive messages from parents that they do not understand how to access Google Classroom, get onto the skyward app, or make an Instagram page to keep up with their child's schoolwork and events. Theme 1 details critical statements from Mia, who stated:

Schools shifted to a technology-driven communication style after COVID-19, and parents that lack access to the internet sometimes miss information the school distributes and access to their child's classes, grades, and attendance. This technological divide causes parents to not receive most of the important information from the school, such as programs, volunteer opportunities, homework assignments, grades, and their children's attendance. With the emergence of technology, parents from low socioeconomic

backgrounds cannot afford to get smartphones, iPads, or laptops and fail to communicate with teachers and receive important school information. Technology evolves daily, and parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds sometimes lack the resources, knowledge, and time to keep up with the new advances.

Additionally, parents' ability to access technology was the primary concern for teachers and their communication with the community. Participants collectively agreed that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds felt more supported, valued, and accepted by the school staff when provided the resources to access technology. The participants also described parents feeling more included and empowered to get involved in their child's education. In addition, participants collectively stated that technology access allows parents to go beyond the scope of education and know their children's social circle, social media platforms, apps, and the different sites that are viewed during school hours. Participants also agreed that when parents' work schedule is complicated, advanced technology such as text messages, social media, Google translator, and emails was the easiest way to stay connected to their child and teachers during school hours via text, email, and social media. They mentioned that technology access is a true benefit to the entire community and contributes to students' success.

Theme 2: Potential Parental Involvement Barriers

The second emerging theme to the research questions explored teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from engaging in high school education at District X in rural East Texas. Twelve participants (80%) discussed a few barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education. They felt that COVID-19 and lack of cultural awareness played significant roles in preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in education. Participants

talked about how teachers' insensitivity to cultures that are opposite to theirs can negatively impact students' learning and parents not feeling welcome at school. Parents may become offended and therefore be reluctant to create a partnership with the teacher and dislike the teacher. According to 12 participants (80%), Black and Hispanic cultures are sometimes mocked the most by some teachers. This creates a divide and solidifies parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds for not being involved in their child's high school education. In addition, participants agreed that some teachers are culturally ignorant and fail to adjust and appreciate cultures that are different from theirs. This ultimately prevents parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education. Participants said that teachers spend more time judging cultures than understanding cultures. One of the participants stated, "I heard a teacher mention that a parent with gold teeth would never get a parent meeting with him. The teacher said that gold teeth are for thugs and gangsters."

Ten of the 15 selected participants (67%) talked about how COVID-19 affected PI and became a barrier. They mentioned that COVID-19 caused unwanted stress, anxiety, and depression in parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Participants commented on these symptoms as the root causes of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds not participating in their child's high school education. Eight of these 10 participants (80%) discussed parents saying the fear of infection, frustration, insufficient information given to the public about the pandemic, and financial loss contributed to their absence from their child's education. Julius stated:

I have tried to meet with parents all the time since COVID-19, and many refuse to come to school because of the risk of getting COVID. They sometimes mention their underlying health conditions and our safety measures to keep people safe. Therefore,

participation in parent meetings, parent volunteering, and help with school events declined significantly. A couple of parents told me that they nearly died of COVID-19, so they will never come to our school on behalf of their child.

Ten of the 15 selected (67%) participants clarified that school closures in March 2020 because of COVID-19 were unprecedented and complicated for school children, parents, and educators. Participants mentioned that teachers and parents of District X differ on politics, world issues, ethics, and morals, which ultimately prevents parents from a low SES from being involved in their children's high school education; they go on to say COVID-19 exposed mental health issues that many parents deal with daily. Participants described COVID-19's impact as a key factor in the lack of PI from parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. They concluded that school closures in response to COVID-19 forced parents to take on important educational responsibilities to support remote learning for their children, which caused major challenges for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition, parents were forced to handle their child's social-emotional learning and learning disabilities and provide financially for the family. They also agreed that many parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds experienced complications managing their child's attention and behavior and prioritizing the needs of multiple siblings in the household. In addition, parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds struggled with their children not understanding subject content, turning in work on time, lack of internet access, and lack of educational resources at home.

The work stoppage caused parents to be unable to afford their medicine due to a lack of insurance. Untreated mental illness may spiral into panic attacks, and neglecting to address trauma can become posttraumatic stress disorder, ultimately preventing people from being involved in usually enjoyable activities. Participants mentioned that COVID-19 created changes

in mental health from stress, substance abuse, emotional responses, and anxiety about job security. As Mike explained, “A parent expressed that she could not attend the parent–teacher meeting because she has been without her medicine for three months and her anxiety is through the roof. She began to cry because she was fired from her job.” In addition, Keisha explained, “I received three emails from parents stating that their child’s education is not a priority right now. They explained that they are stressed because their job ceased, and they are looking for a job to feed their family.”

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 explored teachers’ perceptions of low socioeconomic parents’ commitment to their child’s education at District X in rural East Texas. The themes identified for the second research question were shared commitment, parent–teacher partnerships, and parents’ commitment to their child’s education.

Theme 1: Shared Commitment and Partnerships

After interviewing all 15 participants, four veteran teachers, four midlevel teachers, and one novice teacher (60%) felt that parents and teachers should create a partnership to remove barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child’s high school education. These nine participants mentioned that when teachers and parents share commitments and create partnerships, they build trust and create open lines of communication. In doing so, school becomes a more welcoming space for parents to get involved. Participants mentioned that shared accountability and commitment are the keys to success because it allows parents and teachers to have a “seat at the table,” and both are responsible for improving PI. Eight of the 15 participants (53%) said shared commitment between teacher and parent would form a positive partnership and trust, develop an open line of

communication, and create a welcoming atmosphere for PI. They also stated that teachers should be the foundation and the leading force that creates a steady and healthy partnership. In their opinion, this holds teachers accountable for initiating opportunities for parents to become involved. Keisha stated:

Schoolteachers and parents both play unique roles in promoting students' social, emotional, and intellectual well-being here at District X. When teachers and parents work collectively as partners, opportunities for success occur with students. For example, students begin to work harder, experience fewer discipline problems, and have more positive teacher interactions. In addition, students' grades improve, and they have a more positive social experience. When teachers and parents create a partnership, communication is more effective and transparent.

Eleven participants (73%) mentioned the opportunities for the shared commitment they provide for parents at the beginning of the school year. They agreed that it was beneficial when they hosted a parent-teacher meeting during an open house and allowed parents to fill out a questionnaire stating their best mode of communication so they would always be able to be contacted. According to the participants, not many parents attended, but the ones who showed up could always be contacted, and two-way communication with them was clear and compelling. Mia stated, "I had eight parents show up to open house, and they now attend all events and volunteer. We were able to establish their easiest form of communication which was through text or email." As Dakota explained, "I had six parents show up to open house and taught them how to get into skyward to check their child's attendance and grades. I communicate with those parents weekly now." Based on the focus group, 10 participants (66%) agreed that it is important to communicate effectively with parents to make them feel important, listen, ask follow-up

questions, and not make negative assumptions about parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition, participants said that effective two-way communication practices are parent conferences, weekly newsletters, phone calls home, home visits, social media posts, school websites, and emails. The participants continued to talk about the positive feedback they received from parents on the implementation of suggestion boxes for parents to leave notes on the type of events they would like to see and be a part of throughout the school year. They mentioned that suggestion boxes give parents a sense of belonging and ownership in classroom events. Six participants said they conducted face-to-face or Zoom meetings with their students and parents at the beginning and end of each school year. Together they develop a success plan for the student, and the parent gives the teacher their availability schedule. In that meeting, participants stated they welcomed suggestions for school activities parents would love to be involved in. The participants also give the parents opportunities to let them know what resources or help they will need to ensure their child's success. Participants stated that those meetings were successful and noticed an increase in PI from the parents who came to the meeting. Participants concluded that it would take collective commitment from teachers, parents, and the students to ensure the student is successful in school and parents become more involved in high school education. In addition, when teachers and parents create partnerships, they can work collectively to create an open-door policy for parents to get involved in high school education. Mia stated:

Teachers are responsible for establishing an effective partnership with parents to understand their best mode of communication and what they need to become more involved in high school education for their children. Partnerships are most effective when teachers and parents communicate, collaborate, and remain consistent throughout the school year.

Ten participants (66%) thought teachers were responsible for initiating the partnership between teachers and parents. Participants agreed that parents would make sacrifices to provide and become more involved in high school education when they are allowed to partner with teachers. Two participants (13%) agreed that teachers should have plans to reach out to all parents, especially parents who are reluctant to get involved with their child's education. They mentioned strategies such as newsletters, text alerts, social media, and home visits are some of the ones they use.

Theme 2: Perception of Parent's Commitment

Participants were divided on the perception of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. The focus group responses presented several commonalities in teachers' perceptions of PI of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Six participants (40%) felt parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds were committed to their child's education. These participants mentioned that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds care about their child's education and do as much as their resources allow them to do. In addition, these six participants (66%) said that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds are passionate about their children receiving a high school diploma and are willing to do whatever it takes. In addition, a parent committed to their child's education models positive behavior toward school at home. Participants mentioned that when a parent models positivity toward the school and encourages their child, that child's attitude is reflected toward the school, classroom, and teacher. In addition, students are motivated to learn, their conduct improves, and they have higher self-esteem. Participants discussed the importance of defining parent commitment. Seven participants (46%) defined parental commitment as providing their children with sufficient clothing, housing, and food. Seven participants (46%)

defined parent commitment as helping a child with homework, modeling positive behavior, and providing security and emotional support for a child. As expressed by Julius, “A parent’s job is to make sure their child has support mentally, physically, and emotionally when they are at home.” In addition, participants think commitments from parents include financially supporting their child and providing safety, supervision, and medical care. Jared stated:

Parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds are committed to their child’s education and are loving parents, misunderstood by some teachers. They often struggle with committing to their child’s education because of their harsh circumstances. However, they are committed and want their children to excel in school.

Regarding commitment, Jaime stated:

I believe a parent’s commitment to their child’s education can result in parents and teachers working collaboratively to improve the student’s learning and social–emotional development. Parents that are committed usually encourage their child[ren] to complete schoolwork, and they are actively involved in school activities and attend parent–teacher conferences.

Three participants (20%) discussed the commitment they experienced from the parents in their classrooms. Participants mentioned some of the sacrifices they witnessed parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds make for their children’s education. Dakota stated:

Parents of my students would call me before each event and ask if there was any way they could help. Some would tell me they would love to help if they had a ride or babysitter. Some would also send some of their groceries to the school. After all, they felt guilty because they could not be involved. Parents would also help their children with homework even though they struggled with school themselves.

Six participants (40%) agreed that students and schools are more successful when teachers perceive parents and the community in a positive light. Additionally, the six participants (40%) mentioned that when teachers positively perceive parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds, they would more likely become optimistic about their commitment to their child's education. The six participants mentioned that when teachers are optimistic about parents' commitment, parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds are likely to become more involved in their child's high school education.

Seven participants (46%) believed parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds were not committed to their child's education. Six participants (40%) defined parental commitment as parents who support their children by attending school events and parent-teacher conferences. Participants also described PI as parents who talk to their children about their school day, help with their children's homework, help with homework, and volunteer in the classroom. Seven participants (46%) discussed the constant struggle parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds have with committing to some teachers' expectations or definitions of PI. Participants mentioned that school becomes a struggle for students when parents do not commit to being involved in their child's education. In addition, the participants believe it is hard to develop a partnership with parents reluctant to commit to their child's education. Seven participants (46%) mentioned that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds that are not committed to their child's education neglect to help their child with their homework, come to parent-teacher meetings, check on their child's progress, and support teachers. Therefore, their children sometimes struggle with attendance, behavior, and credit issues. As Summer stated, "Parents I talked to said they do not have time to help their child and that is the teacher's job to help their child. Some parents mentioned that helping students is what teachers get paid to do." Seven participants

(46%) believed parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds love their children and care about their child's well-being. Samuel stated:

Teachers perceive parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds as caring people who love their children but are not committed to their child's education. I believe parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds struggle to provide the positive experiences, resources, and social interactions that many high-SES parents provide for their children. Therefore, they do not commit to their child's education.

Another participant had a different perception of parents' commitment to their child's education. Clemmon stated, "Parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds are lazy, uneducated, and not willing to be held accountable for upholding their role in their child's education." In addition, he mentioned, "those parents are uninvolved, neglectful, and fail to meet the needs of their children beyond a place to stay and food."

Participants believe perception is reality. They mentioned that perceptions affect their decision-making ability with or without noticing its strong influence on the outcome. Therefore, when teachers perceive that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds are not committed to their child's education, it causes teachers to focus more on the students of parents they perceive as committed to their children's education. Participants believe parents notice this behavior and become reluctant to be involved in their child's behavior. Mary stated, "How teachers perceive parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds will shape teachers' behavior toward those specific parents, shaping the behavior of the way the teacher interacts with a parent."

Twelve participants (80%) agreed that parents are treated based on how teachers perceive them. Therefore, participants concluded that teachers should have only positive perceptions of parents, which would change teacher-parent partnerships. They mentioned that when teachers

have positive perceptions of a parent's commitment to their child's education, they have a positive perception that teachers would be more welcoming and understanding of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition, participants agreed that teachers' positive perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education would lead to more frequent positive behaviors from teachers. Lacy stated, "When I think positively about parents, I treat them with respect and dignity. I don't have any negative thoughts in my mind. Parents feel more welcomed and willing to get involved in their child's education."

Research Question 3

The primary goal of Research Question 3 was to explore teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education in District X in rural East Texas. The themes discovered were teacher's responsibility, parent inclusion activities, and PI training.

Theme 1: Teacher's Responsibility or Role

Eight of the 15 participants (53%) felt that teachers play a significant and essential role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in high school education. They think teachers are responsible for more than just educating a student. From their perspective, teachers play a significant role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education in District X in rural East Texas. These eight participants believe teachers can bridge significant PI gaps. Seven of these eight participants mentioned that teachers hold the primary role in setting educational goals and expectations. Six of these eight participants stated that teachers are responsible for creating multiple strategies and systems to help the parent get more engaged in

their child's education. Participants agreed that teachers are responsible for involving parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds in creating authentic and respectful partnerships. John stated, "As teachers, we have a moral and professional obligation to the community to reach out to tax-paying parents and welcome them to our school so they can be involved in their child's education."

Additionally, teachers are responsible for embracing partnerships and sharing power with parents. Participants also agreed that parents and teachers should understand that the responsibility for students' educational success is collaborative. Based on one-on-one interviews, eight participants (53%) agreed that teachers' roles include inviting parents to observe the hallways and classrooms, reviewing the curriculum, and meeting with teachers from various schools to gain insight and PI ideas.

Furthermore, participants concluded that teachers should have the authority to invite parents to attend professional learning sessions and staff meetings. Participants believe this will result in positive partnerships with parents and student success. Janae stated:

I believe teachers should reach out to parents when they are concerned about a student. We should work with parents and not judge them negatively. Teachers need to make it a point to support parents and make it clear that they are there to work with them, not against them. Keeping an open line of communication with parents is essential to our role as educators.

In contrast, two participants (13%) thought parents played a significant role in removing barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in high school education. They think parents should step up and take the initiative, and teachers will follow their lead in involving them in their child's high school education. Julius stated:

I believe parents are used to teachers doing everything for their children and are hesitant to step in and help. With high school children, the parent should take more of the lead role because they know their child's needs more than the teacher at that age. Parents need to stop relying on teachers to be parents to their children because high schools are much larger than most middle schools and elementary schools. This becomes a numbers game, and there are sometimes too many students to get to them, so parents taking more of a lead role will benefit the student.

Three participants (13%) agreed that teachers do not play any role in removing barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in high school education. They concluded that teachers' primary role is to create a safe environment so students can learn and remain healthy mentally, physically, and socially. Based on their interviews, these three participants decided that parents are responsible for getting involved in high school education and participating in their child's educational journey. In addition, they believe it is up to the parent to establish consistent two-way communication between teachers and themselves to stay updated on school events and the well-being of their children. Summer expressed that "Parents need to stop relying on teachers to raise their children." Clemmon stated:

Teachers sometimes have different morals and values that sometimes do not align with a parent. Parents get upset when a teacher is teaching their children something they do not believe in. Therefore, parents must take responsibility for their child's education. They need to step up and become more involved in their child's education.

These three participants agreed that parents must initiate communication, check grades, attend school events, and join the PTA. They believe this will result in parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds feeling more involved and appreciated.

Theme 2: Parent Inclusion Activities

Eleven of the 15 participants (73%) believed PI activities significantly removed barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. In addition, they felt as though PI activities created positive teacher and parent interactions and dialogue about students and school information. Those 11 participants thought PI activities would help parents be more responsive and understand their child's emotional, social, and intellectual needs. Seven of these 11 participants commented on PI being the foundation for a more positive school experience for students. Duran stated:

I believe teachers should host parental involvement events such as hall monitor volunteering and open house before school begins for students and parents to talk to their teachers in person. Teachers should make fliers with important school event information and a place to sign up and volunteer for events to remove barriers.

Duran thinks it is important for teachers to train parents on school tasks, so both parties have a shared commitment to accomplish the assigned task.

Six participants (40%) talked about teachers developing committees that partner with local businesses to have monthly activities, such as a job fair at the school that recruits parents to work cultural festivals and family game nights. Five participants (33%) said they would appreciate it if teachers would teach adult classes once a week for parents that lack a high school diploma or those who struggle with speaking English. The schools should host PI activities such as Daddy–Daughter Dance, Mother–Son Dance, and School and Community Food Pantry to increase PI. Eight participants discussed creating volunteer shifts for parents to volunteer consistently and felt welcomed. Participants also mentioned that teachers should form a parent–teacher group and have family literacy nights for non-English-speaking families. Three

participants (23%) described home visits as an essential activity that enhances PI. They mentioned home visits as practical strategies to contact parents to get them involved in their child's high school education. Two participants (13%) commented on teachers visiting students' homes at least twice a semester to establish clear communication with parents. Furthermore, they agreed that teachers should develop PI activities such as Mother-Son proms, parent focus groups, and biweekly meetings to increase PI. At the beginning of each school year, teachers should hand out surveys to parents, asking them about various activities they would like to be a part of and the type of school events that pique their interest.

Theme 3: Parental Involvement Training

Thirteen participants (86%) discussed the need for PI training that the district should provide yearly. Five of these participants mentioned monthly PI training. They mentioned that professional development training could help teachers plan for various PI activities and stay organized throughout the school year. Seven participants (46%) stated that professional development training to increase PI could enable teachers to expand their knowledge base and involve parents in high school education through creative techniques. John stated:

I feel educators are valuable assets of today's society, and we will influence the next generation. We understand that there is a gap in parental involvement of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Therefore, the first step in closing the gap and the best way to address this shortage is by having more teachers attend parent training programs to develop them into welcoming, cultured, and equipped to develop authentic partnerships with parents.

Four participants (26%) in the focus group discussed training that teachers and parents should attend together. They discussed how collaborating and brainstorming together would help close

PI gaps. These four participants mentioned that school districts focus on training teachers and parents instead of just teachers or parents. Participants continued by discussing the benefits of having parents trained on proper ways to volunteer, checking student grades, setting up parent–teacher meetings, accessing their child’s attendance and grades, and effective communication strategies. Jaime stated:

As a parent and teacher, I understand the importance of training parents and teachers together. I am an educator, and sometimes I struggle with advocating for my child without upsetting the teacher. I would love to attend a training course with my child’s teacher to collaborate and develop a partnership that will ensure my child’s success and increase parental involvement.

In the interviews, seven participants (46%) discussed training teachers and parents on ways to communicate with each other clearly and effectively. Participants talked about the training teaching parents and teachers skills to communicate with each other effectively. Four of these seven participants mentioned that the training would focus on different types of communication, improving communication skills, and tips for effective communication. Jared stated:

I believe professional development training each month on ways for teachers and parents to communicate effectively would benefit parents, teachers, and students. Teachers and parents training together would enhance parental involvement and give each other a sense of communication preferences. I think the training should be conducted monthly because of the constant technological advances so that we are not behind.

Two out of 15 participants (13%) discussed school districts not wasting money, time, or resources to help parents get involved. The participants mentioned that school supplies, advanced

technology devices, and students' academics should take precedence over training parents on how to get involved with their child's education or training teachers to help adult parents commit to their child's education. These two participants agreed that teachers do not have time to go to the district office when planning lessons and developing ways to elevate their students. Summer stated, "We need to use school funds for students and not the parents." The participants concluded that teachers should let parents be adults and figure out the best way to advocate for and support their children. They discussed that parents would somehow figure out ways to get involved in high school education. Participants mentioned that the state gives schools so much money, so why not spend it on student training instead of parent training?

Detailed Analysis

This case study provided an opportunity to explore the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas. Participants could transfer their knowledge and experience with PI through a questionnaire, focus group, and interview questions. The focus group explored various aspects of PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. I investigated the details that emerged from the interviews that discovered various perspectives about identical issues. Additionally, focus groups helped me gain insights into other participants' shared understandings of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. I member-checked, recorded, and transcribed the interviews. I also reviewed the transcripts for accuracy. One-on-one interviews helped participants clarify and explore their views, actions, and understanding of PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds and their involvement with their child's education.

Interviewers' presence in face-to-face interviews contributed to a comfort level that encouraged participants' honest responses. All data were uploaded into a Google Doc for storage.

I organized and prepared the data for use in this study. The transcripts of focus groups and one-on-one interviews were analyzed several times. Data from the interviews allowed me to interpret, organize, and structure observations and interpretations into themes. In addition, manual coding was conducted to allow me to be critical of the results by requiring me to read through data and create codes and themes. Excel spreadsheets were created and uploaded to categorize participants' perspectives. I conducted thorough member checks with all participants in agreement with the transcripts making only minor edits. I restated and summarized information and questioned all participants to determine accuracy.

The study findings revealed how teachers and parents could create healthy partnerships to increase PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition, this study revealed the teacher's responsibility or role in PI, parent inclusion activities, and PI training that increases PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Findings also revealed themes of technology awareness and potential barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education, which emerged from three research questions.

Research Question 1 attempted to address two themes. The first theme was parents' technology access. Findings from this theme included the need for teachers to understand that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds struggle with accessing advanced technology. Participants agreed that technology is key to communicating with students and parents. Limited access to technology prevents parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their children's high school education. The second theme for Research Question 1 was

potential barriers. Findings from this theme concluded that technology, COVID-19, and cultural ignorance are barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education.

Data from the study yielded two different themes from Research Question 2. The first theme that emerged was shared commitment or partnerships. Findings from the study revealed that PI increases, and students are more successful when teachers and parents collectively commit to the child's education and develop meaningful partnerships. The second theme that emerged from Research Question 2 was parents' commitment to their child's education. Findings revealed that when teachers positively perceive parents' commitment to their child's education, parents are more inclined to be involved in high school education. In addition, findings revealed that teachers and parents work better together and are more welcoming and willing to work toward developing a shared partnership.

Findings from Research Question 3 yielded three themes. The first theme that emerged was the teacher's role. Findings from the study revealed that teachers play a significant role in promoting and initiating strategies and programs that would embrace, welcome, and sustain PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. The second theme that emerged from Research Question 3 was parent inclusion activities. Findings from the study suggested that several activities promote and involve parents that would increase PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. The third theme that emerged was PI training. Findings indicated that school districts should provide training throughout the year to train teachers to create PI strategies. Furthermore, the findings suggested that school districts should train teachers to address PI barriers and ways to develop meaningful partnerships with parents to increase PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education, teachers' perceptions of low socioeconomic parents' commitment to their child's education, and teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school public schools in rural East Texas. This chapter analyzed the data collected from semistructured interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups with selected teachers from District X. Once the interviews were transcribed, open and theme coding analysis took place, which helped identify and comprehend the teachers' perceptions of the research questions. The emerging themes provided a comprehensive understanding of teachers' perceptions of various aspects of PI of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. The emergent themes included shared commitment and partnerships, technology awareness, teachers' role, teachers' perception of low-SES parents' commitment, PI activities, and PI barriers. Some of the participants exhibited similar perceptions of the research questions. However, participants' responses differed on certain questions. Chapter 5 presents the study's discoveries to the research questions that each participant answered.

Chapter 5: Summary, Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education is essential to their children's success in high school. Data from the research study suggested that students from low socioeconomic backgrounds are not as successful in school as their high socioeconomic peers partly because their parents have fewer financial resources because of low educational levels, single-parent households, teen pregnancy, mental health, and other characteristics (Reddy et al., 2015). This qualitative case study explored teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. This case study also explored teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education (Lavery, 2016). Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. The research questions in this study concentrated on the experiences and perceptions of novice, midlevel, and veteran teachers with PI. Analyzing the data from semistructured interviews with the study participants provided insights into these research questions. The research questions were:

RQ1: What are teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ2: What are teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?

RQ3: What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?

Chapter 5 summarizes the findings and explains the study's conclusions and recommendations for future studies on the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. The chapter ends with reflections and closing comments. In addition, Chapter 5 discusses the study findings as they relate to each research question. I also discuss the study's implications and limitations.

Discussion of the Findings

Findings from this study revealed the importance of removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. Selected study participants first noted the barriers that prevented parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. Hornby and Lafaele (2011) created an explanatory framework describing factors inhibiting PI in a child's education. Participants discussed the reality of barriers such as limited access to technology, COVID-19, and cultural differences, which significantly prevented parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education. Participants agreed that if these systematic barriers ceased, parents might begin to trust their children's high school education and become more involved. In addition, participants mentioned that this might help parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds gain the knowledge and resources to engage more in their child's high school education.

Parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds defined their roles as significant and essential to their children's education (Hornby, 2011). In this study, participants talked about

their perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. Participants had different perceptions of parents' commitment to their child's education. Participants from District X continued to describe their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education. Based on the data analysis, study findings indicated a few barriers that prevented parents from low socioeconomic barriers from being involved in their child's high school education. Participants further explained more factors, such as teachers playing a significant role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education at District X in rural East Texas. Consequently, PI from parents living in low socioeconomic conditions contributes to a student's success when teachers create partnerships, communicate, and set aside cultural differences.

Research Question 1 Findings

Research Question 1 asked about teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas. Only three participants (20%) agreed that zero barriers prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. They mentioned that parents control their choices and can step up and get involved in their child's high school education. From these participants' perspectives, parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds prioritize their social life and work over their children's education.

In contrast, 12 participants (80%) believed several barriers prevented parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. The barriers cited most frequently by participants were parents' limited technology access, COVID-19, and the cultural differences between teachers and parents from low socioeconomic

backgrounds. Participants talked about the communication gap that technology created between parents and teachers, which was a significant barrier. Participants also described the mental, physical, and social barriers COVID-19 created for high school education. For example, parents were reluctant to get involved, and some parents' anxiety and depression increased due to COVID-19. Participants identified the cultural differences between teachers and parents that affect PI, including teachers negatively judging parents based on their race, demeanor, and cultural traditions.

Therefore, the study findings suggest that teachers develop creative ways to communicate with parents and determine their preference for the technology they prefer to use. School administrators should provide parental access to updated technology. According to the findings, teachers embrace new technology daily to enhance communication, schoolwork, and PI.

The second finding of Research Question 1 suggested that teachers should consistently communicate with parents and the community about the safety measures schools take each day that align with the local authorities' COVID-19 restrictions and guidelines. The findings also suggested that teachers provide safety masks and hand sanitizer and structure their classes so that students feel safe and comfortable. Based on the findings, teachers should direct students anxious about contracting COVID-19 to crisis counselors. Furthermore, teachers should help students practice various safety measures such as opening multiple windows and doors, using fans, and reminding students to disinfect their desks when they leave the classroom.

The third finding from Research Question 1 suggested that teachers should take cultural awareness training each year to recognize their cultural biases when addressing parents from different cultures and backgrounds. Findings also suggested that cultural awareness training helps teachers remove cultural barriers, build bridges, and value and respect different cultures.

Furthermore, cultural awareness training would train teachers on how to relate to and understand different cultures resulting in more cultural connections and less cultural conflict. Also, findings suggested that cultural awareness training would help prevent cultural ignorance by setting the foundation for learning about and valuing different perspectives and backgrounds and developing cultural empathy. Study findings also suggested that the historical segregation of school volunteer ranks has significantly impacted people's perception, such that volunteerism is synonymous with White activity (Fisher & Kostelitz, 2015). Essentially, minority volunteers have no choice but to accept the developed structures that favor parents' traditions from high socioeconomic backgrounds (Kocayörük, 2016). Findings suggested that teachers should welcome parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds and include them in PI activities.

Research Question 2 Findings

Research Question 2 asked about teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas. Participants identified parental commitment to a child's education as essential to student success and effective PI. This finding is congruent with Muller (2018), who stated that high-level PI is crucial to produce positive academic and social–emotional results for their child. Participants' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education were divided. Six participants felt parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds were committed to their child's education. These participants believed parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds understood that no matter their income or background, their children would benefit from their involvement by maintaining passing grades, achieving higher attendance, and having fewer behavior problems. These participants believed struggling parents attempt to be involved in their children's education, but available resources are minimal. Parents

are fighting as hard as possible to be involved in their child's educational journey. However, technology, cultural differences, and COVID-19 were out of a parent's control, according to these six participants. However, seven participants believed parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds were not committed to their child's education. These negative perceptions create distrust between parents and teachers. Except for one veteran teacher participant, all participants believed that creating partnerships with parents would increase parents' commitment to their child's education and close the gap of distrust between teachers and parents. The veteran teacher's perspective was that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds as detached parents who made few to no demands to be involved in their child's education and were frequently uninterested or neglectful. Furthermore, they agreed that parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds were emotionally unstable, selfish, or possibly uncaring regarding being involved in their child's education.

The first findings of Research Question 2 suggested that teachers should have positive perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their children's education. Findings suggested that teachers should develop an emotional connection with parents, communicate with them consistently, and listen to what they say to build positive perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. The findings of this study indicated that teachers would feel more comfortable welcoming parents to the school if they turned their negative perceptions into positive perceptions of the commitment parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds have to their child's education.

The second finding of Research Question 2 suggested a need for shared commitment between teachers and parents to establish effective involvement for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Committed teachers and parents make decisions that benefit

students, the school, and the community. Furthermore, findings suggested that shared commitments between teachers and parents lead to collaboration on projects and ideas, stronger relationships, and increased PI for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

The third finding of Research Question 2 suggested that teachers develop a partnership with parents to demonstrate teachers' commitment to increasing PI at District X in rural East Texas. In addition, findings suggested that parent-teacher partnerships are essential to a child's high school education. Teachers and parents that develop partnerships have solid relationships and an effective two-way communication channel. Findings indicated that partnerships between parents and teachers play a key role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education.

Research Question 3 Findings

Research Question 3 asked teachers their perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education in District X in rural East Texas. Responses from the study participants indicated some differences in perceptions. Eight of the selected participants (53%) agreed that teachers play a significant and essential role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in high school education.

The first finding of Research Question 3 suggested that teachers play a significant role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. Furthermore, teachers are responsible for setting PI goals and expectations for parents. Findings indicated that teachers' roles were vital to removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. According to the findings, teachers should

first promote and welcome parents to the school's campus. This step makes parents feel more comfortable and willing to get involved in their child's education. However, two participants thought parents played a minimal role in removing barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. These two participants thought parents that step up and share a commitment to their child's educational journey would become an asset to the school. Findings suggested that when parents take the initiative to be more active in their children's high school education, they are more likely to create ties and strengthen relationships with teachers. In addition, parents and teachers would effectively collaborate to ensure barriers that prevent PI are no longer a concern. According to Hornby and Lafaele's (2011) theory, parents and other family members believe their primary responsibility involves taking their children to school. Therefore, two participants (13%) believed teachers should not play any role in removing barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. They think parents have a duty to their children and should do whatever it takes to be involved in their education. These two participants mentioned prioritizing as a factor preventing parents from involvement in their child's education. They expressed that PI would not be their concern if the parent puts their child's needs first. Life is all about the choices people make, and if parents choose not to get involved in their children's high school education, then teachers should not have to take the extra steps to make parents get involved, in their opinion.

The second finding of Research Question 3 suggested that teachers implement PI programs, activities, and resources to help remove barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education. In addition, teachers should hand out surveys to parents, asking them about various activities they

would like to be a part of and the type of school events that pique their interest. Programs such as adult classes, Daddy–Daughter Dance, Mother–Son Dance, and School and Community Food Pantries would help overcome parents’ challenges in getting involved in their children’s education. Furthermore, these programs seek to enhance school and parent communication and remove barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children’s high school education. Findings also suggested that teachers should develop work shifts for parents to volunteer consistently, form a parent–teacher group, have family literacy nights for non-English-speaking families, and make frequent home visits to contact parents to get them involved in high school education.

Third, findings from Research Question 3 suggested that teachers undergo PI training each year to learn different ways to promote, engage, and sustain PI programs and strategies. PI training can help motivate teachers and increase their creativity. Furthermore, findings suggested that PI training can also help teachers gain new skills and perspectives on removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children’s high school education. Findings from the research study indicated that PI training would improve teachers’ level of awareness, PI skills, and professional confidence.

Consequently, findings suggested that when teachers and parents create partnerships to remove barriers, share a commitment, and expand each other’s roles, there will be an increase in PI at District X. In addition, there will be a sense of belonging and ownership in this endeavor between teachers and parents.

Limitation

As a community leader at District X, there was a potential for personal bias from the interviews that may not have fully captured all the participants’ thoughts and experiences on the

barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic barriers from being involved in their child's high school education, parents' commitment to their child's education, and the teachers' role in removing barriers. The impact of the study was diminished once participants were notified about the premise of this research. Teachers who self-identify as coming from high socioeconomic backgrounds or not being involved in their child's education would have a different perspective on the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic barriers from being involved in high school education, parents' commitment to their child's education, and the teachers' role in removing barriers. However, this study consists of findings from teachers who self-identify as coming from a low socioeconomic background or are highly involved in their child's education at District X.

Implications

The study findings indicated that teachers at District X perceived parent-teacher partnerships as essential in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved and committed to their child's high school education in rural East Texas. These findings can be utilized by district administrators, community advocates, building principals, classroom teachers, and parents to remove the barriers that prevent PI from low socioeconomic parents. The implications of this study may help facilitate authentic conversations on technology, culture, and health barriers that prevent parents from being involved and committed to their child's high school education. In addition, the implications of this study may facilitate discussions about parent-teacher partnerships and programs that can be implemented to increase PI. Regarding the concerns about removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education, the following recommendations are based on the findings:

1. To promote an inclusive culture, administrators and teachers must foster programs that promote outreach activities to progress parents' and teachers' relationships (Stein, 2016).
2. Set expectations to create a welcoming and safe school environment for parent volunteer programs that are integral to the mission and vision of the school (Restler & Glant, 2020).
3. Establish a transparent school-to-parent communication system to transfer information regarding the child's state and the curriculum (Cetin & Taskin 2016).
4. Diversify the hiring of school staff and implement cultural awareness training (Kocayörük, 2016).
5. Provide effective PI programs and activities (Blair & Haneda, 2021).
6. Develop meaningful partnerships with parents (Santiago et al., 2016).

Teachers must dedicate themselves to educating students and developing meaningful relationships with parents that will include them and welcome them to their child's education (Manna, 2015). Teachers listen, coach, mentor, and set positive examples for students and parents (Manna, 2015). Teachers can help shape academic goals and are dedicated to getting their students to achieve them. The Texas public school system is responsible for meeting the cultural, social, mental, health, and technological needs of students, parents, and the community (Barger et al., 2019). Increasing PI requires teachers to use supportive programs, make equal and diverse decisions, and create a culture of inclusiveness (Barger et al., 2019).

Recommendations for Practical Application

Barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education at District X in rural East Texas are essential to the lack of PI. Based on the findings, the following recommendations are provided for District X:

1. Central office administration needs to administer formal and informal professional development for all teachers on effective PI strategies and partnerships.
2. Training also needs to include cultural awareness and effective technology implementation that teachers and parents can use to communicate as their partners.
3. Teachers and parents need to be educated on these strategies to prevent parents and teachers from being reluctant to implement the strategies and the partnerships they create.
4. Teachers must include students when developing and implementing these PI strategies and partnerships because it creates a sense of engagement and ownership with all parties.

These strategies will bridge the relationship gap between teachers and parents and allow them to connect on an intimate level that will establish an authentic partnership. This will ultimately result in parent–teacher collaboration, which will help remove barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child’s high school education, help parents become more committed to their child’s education, and increase the teacher’s role in the removal of barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child’s high school education.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study suggest a few areas for future research. For example, future qualitative research should focus on selecting more than 15 participants to provide deeper insights into the barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. Future research could also focus on barriers that prevent parents from high socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in education and compare the results to this study. This insight helps school districts identify their socioeconomic, cultural, or logistical issues. Another recommendation for future research is to explore the student's perception of their teachers and parents' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education. This research could benefit teachers, parents, students, and the community in their quest to develop meaningful partnerships and remove PI barriers. Additionally, future research should focus on barriers that prevent PI in urban school districts.

Furthermore, partnerships, shared commitment, and PI strategies were emphasized as essential components for teachers and parents to remove barriers preventing PI at District X. The data gathered from future research can help provide further insight into the barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. In addition, data gathered may shed light on parents' commitment to their child's education and teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education.

Chapter Summary

This qualitative case study explored teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from being involved in their child's high school education. This case

study explored teachers' role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their child's high school education (Lavery, 2016).

Furthermore, this study examined teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education. The findings of this study derived from the personal experiences and perspectives of novice, midlevel, and veteran teacher participants. The study findings can be used to gather further knowledge on barriers preventing parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from participating in their child's high school education. Additionally, these results contribute to the wealth of knowledge on parents' commitment to their child's education and teachers' roles in removing barriers that prevent PI.

References

- Ackermann, L. (2019, December). Metalla-electrocatalyzed C–H activation by earth-abundant 3d metals and beyond. *Accounts of Chemical Research*, 53(1), 84–104.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.accounts.9b00510>
- Ahmadi, M. R. (2018). The use of technology in English language learning: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 3(2), 115–125.
<http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-120-en.html>
- Alameda-Lawson, T., & Lawson, M. A. (2019). Ecologies of collective parent engagement in urban education. *Urban Education*, 54(8), 1085–1120.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0042085916636654>
- Alexander, J. D., Cox, R. B., Jr., Behnke, A., & Larzelere, R. E. (2017). Is all parental “noninvolvement” equal? Barriers to involvement and their relationship to Latino academic achievement. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 39(2), 169–179.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986317700837>
- Amin, S. A., Yon, B. A., Taylor, J. C., & Johnson, R. K. (2015). Impact of the National School Lunch Program on fruit and vegetable selection in northeastern elementary schoolchildren, 2012–2013. *Public Health Reports*, 130(5), 453–457.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4529829/>
- Anderson, A. (2019, November). The influence of sheltering or protective, parental behaviors following child trauma: Hurricane Katrina. *Journal of Mental Health and Social Behaviour*, 1(104), 1–7. <https://gexinonline.com/uploads/articles/article-jmhsb-104.pdf>

- Anderson, K. T., Stewart, O. G., & Kachorsky, D. (2017). Seeing academically marginalized students' multimodal designs from a position of strength. *Written Communication*, 34(2), 104–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088317699897>
- Andrade, B. M. (2015). *The parental involvement of non-English speaking Latino parents in secondary education* [Master's thesis, California State University, Monterey Bay]. Digital Commons @ CSUMB. https://digitalcommons.csumb.edu/caps_thes/512/
- Ansari, A., & Gershoff, E. (2016). Parent involvement in Head Start and child development: Indirect effects through parenting. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(2), 562–579. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12266>
- Aranda-Balboa, M. J., Huertas-Delgado, F. J., Herrador-Colmenero, M., Cardon, G., & Chillón, P. (2020). Parental barriers to active transport to school: A systematic review. *International Journal of Public Health*, 65(1), 87–98. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31728600/>
- Arce, S. (2019). Exploring parent and teacher perceptions of family engagement. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 10(2), 1–13. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1244923.pdf>
- Arifin, M. N. (2018, September). *Teaching speaking skills in the young learners' classroom*. English Language Teaching for Young Learners. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327529276_Teaching_Speaking_Skills_in_the_Young_Learners'_Classroom
- Assari, S. (2018). Parental education better helps White than Black families escape poverty: National survey of children's health. *Economies*, 6(2), 30–44. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies6020030>

- Avnet, M., Makara, D., Larwin, K. H., & Erickson, M. (2019, September). The impact of parental involvement and education on academic achievement in elementary school. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 8(3), 476–483.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1232316>
- Ayoub, W., Samhat, A. E., Nouvel, F., Mroue, M., & Prévotet, J.-C. (2018). Internet of mobile things: Overview of LoRaWAN, DASH7, and NB-IoT in LPWANs standards and supported mobility. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 21(2), 1561–1581. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8502812>
- Baker, T. L., Wise, J., Kelley, G., & Skiba, R. J. (2016). Identifying barriers: Creating solutions to improve family engagement. *School Community Journal*, 26(2), 161–184.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1124003.pdf>
- Bal-Taştan, S., Davoudi, S. M. M., Masalimova, A. R., Bersanov, A. S., Kurbanov, R. A., Boiarchuk, A. V., & Pavlushin, A. A. (2018, March). The impacts of teacher's efficacy and motivation on student's academic achievement in science education among secondary and high school students. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(6), 2353–2366. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/89579>
- Barger, M. M., Moorman Kim, E., Kuncel, N. R., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2019). The relation between parents' involvement in children's schooling and children's adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 145(9), 855–890.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31305088/>

Bartz, D. E., & Karnes, C. (2018). Effective parent involvement/family engagement programs.

National Forum of Teacher Education Journal, 28(3), 1–14.

<http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Bartz,%20David%20E%20Effective%20Parent%20Involvement-Bartz%20NFTEJ%20V28%20N3%202018%20.pdf>

Baumann, N. (2012). Autotelic personality. In S. Engeser (Ed.), *Advances in flow research* (pp. 165–186). Springer Science and Business Media.

Beel, D. E., Wallace, C. D., Webster, G., Nguyen, H., Tait, E., Macleod, M., & Mellish, C.

(2017). Cultural resilience: The production of rural community heritage, digital archives and the role of volunteers. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 54, 459–468.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2015.05.002>

Bempechat, J. (2019). The case for (quality) homework: Why it improves learning, and how

parents can help. *Education Next*, 19(1), 36–44. <https://www.educationnext.org/case-for-quality-homework-improves-learning-how-parents-can-help/>

Benner, A. D., Boyle, A. E., & Sadler, S. (2016). Parental involvement and adolescents'

educational success: The roles of prior achievement and socioeconomic status. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(6), 1053–1064. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26847424/>

Berkowitz, R., Astor, R. A., Pineda, D., DePedro, K. T., Weiss, E. L., & Benbenishty, R. (2021).

Parental involvement and perceptions of school climate in California. *Urban Education*, 56(3), 393–423. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0042085916685764>

Bernacki, M. L., Greene, J. A., & Crompton, H. (2020, January). Mobile technology, learning,

and achievement: Advances in understanding and measuring the role of mobile

- technology in education. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 60(Article 101827).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101827>
- Blair, A., & Haneda, M. (2021). Toward collaborative partnerships: Lessons from parents and teachers of emergent bi/multilingual students. *Theory Into Practice*, 60(1), 18–27.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1284517>
- Bloor, M. (1997). Techniques of validation in qualitative research: A critical commentary. In G. Miller G. & R. Dingwall (Eds.), *Context and method in qualitative research* (pp. 37–50). SAGE Publications.
- Bodsworth, H., & Goodyear, V. A. (2017). Barriers and facilitators to using digital technologies in the cooperative learning model in physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 22(6), 563–579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2017.1294672>
- Boonk, L., Gijssels, H. J., Ritzen, H., & Brand-Gruwel, S. (2018). A review of the relationship between parental involvement indicators and academic achievement. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 10–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.001>
- Bordalba, M. M., & Bochaca, J. G. (2019). Digital media for family-school communication? Parents' and teachers' beliefs. *Computers & Education*, 132, 44–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.01.006>
- Borkowski, J. W., Samples, E. S., & Lunningham, K. J. (2016, May). *U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights guidance: An update*. Council of the Great City Schools.
https://www.cgcs.org/cms/lib/DC00001581/Centricity/Domain/4/OCRReport_R4.pdf
- Bradford, S., Hills, L., & Johnston, C. (2016). Unintended volunteers: The volunteering pathways of working-class young people in community sport. *International Journal of*

Sport Policy and Politics, 8(2), 231–244.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2016.1161654>

Brown, A., & Danaher, P. A. (2019). CHE principles: Facilitating authentic and dialogical semi-structured interviews in educational research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 42(1), 76–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2017.1379987>

Brown, M. H., Lenares-Solomon, D., & Deaner, R. G. (2019). Every student succeeds act: A call to action for school counselors. *Journal of Counselor Leadership Advocacy*, 6(1), 86–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2018.1557574>

Bubb, S., & Jones, M.-A. (2020). Learning from the COVID-19 home-schooling experience: Listening to pupils, parents/carers and teachers. *Improving schools*, 23(3), 209–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480220958797>

Bumpus, J. P., Umeh, Z., & Harris, A. L. (2020). Social class and educational attainment: Do Blacks benefit less from increases in parents' social class status? *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 6(2), 223–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649219854465>

Burgess, S., Greaves, E., Vignoles, A., & Wilson, D. (2015). What parents want: School preferences and school choice. *Economic Journal*, 125(587), 1262–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12153>

Buys, Y. F., Aznan, A. N. A., & Anuar, H. (2018). *Mechanical properties, morphology, and hydrolytic degradation behavior of polylactic acid/natural rubber blends*. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, Volume 290, International Conference on Advances in Manufacturing and Materials Engineering (ICAMME 2017) 8–9 August 2017, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1757-899X/290/1/012077>

- Candela, A. G. (2019). Exploring the function of member checking. *Qualitative Report*, 24(3), 619–628. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol24/iss3/14/>
- Carcary, M. (2020). The research audit trail: Methodological guidance for application in practice. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 18(2), 166–177. <https://doi.org/10.34190/JBRM.18.2.008>
- Carey, R. L. (2016). “Keep that in mind ... You’re gonna go to college”: Family influence on the college going processes of Black and Latino high school boys. *Urban Review*, 48(5), 718–742. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2016-50547-001>
- Carr, D. C., Fried, L. P., & Rowe, J. W. (2015). Productivity and engagement in an aging America: The role of volunteerism. *Daedalus*, 144(2), 55–67. https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00330
- Cascio, M. A., Lee, E., Vaudrin, N., & Freedman, D. A. (2019). A team-based approach to open coding: Considerations for creating intercoder consensus. *Field Methods*, 31(2), 116–130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X19838237>
- Castillo-Vergara, M., Galleguillos, N. B., Cuello, L. J., Alvarez-Marin, A., & Acuña-Opazo, C. (2018). Does socioeconomic status influence student creativity? *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 29, 142–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2018.07.005>
- Ceka, A., & Murati, R. (2016). The role of parents in the education of children. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(5), 61–64. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1092391>
- Cetin, S. K., & Taskin, P. (2016). Parent involvement in education in terms of their socio-economic status. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 66, 105–122. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1149044.pdf>

- Child Trends. (2017). *Families and parenting*. <https://www.childtrends.org/publications?filter-keyword=&research-topic%5B%5D=families-and-parenting&filter-year%5B%5D=2017>
- Chowdhury, I. A. (2015). Issue of quality in qualitative research: An overview. *Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences*, 8(1), 142–162.
http://www.iiass.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=994
- Clerkin, R. M., & Fotheringham, E. (2017). Exploring the relationship between public service motivation and formal and informal volunteering. *Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs*, 3(1), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.20899/jpna.3.1.23-39>
- Colao, A., Piscitelli, P., Pulimeno, M., Colazzo, S., Miani, A., & Giannini, S. (2020, May). Rethinking the role of the school after COVID-19. *Lancet Public Health*, 5(7), e370.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30124-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30124-9)
- Colvin, J. W. (2015). Peer mentoring and tutoring in higher education. In M. Li & Y. Zhao (Eds.), *Exploring learning and teaching in higher education* (pp. 207–229). Springer.
- Cope, D. G. (2014, May). Computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(3), 322–323. <https://www.ons.org/onf/41/3/computer-assisted-qualitative-data-analysis-software>
- Cornelius, V., Wood, L., & Lai, J. (2016). Implementation and evaluation of a formal academic peer-mentoring program in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 193–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1469787416654796>
- Coto, J., Pulgaron, E. R., Graziano, P. A., Bagner, D. M., Villa, M., Malik, J. A., & Delamater, A. M. (2019). Parents as role models: Associations between parent and young children's weight, dietary intake, and physical activity in a minority sample. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 23(7), 943–950. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30656547/>

- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study*. Discipline-Based Education Research Group Speaker Series, University of Nebraska-Lincoln DigitalCommons.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1047&context=dberspeakers>
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ612281>
- Cristia, J., Ibararán, P., Cueto, S., Santiago, A., & Severín, E. (2017, July). Technology and child development: Evidence from the one laptop per child program. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 9(3), 295–320.
<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/app.20150385>
- Dautel, J. B. (2020). Applying a collective academic supervision model to the undergraduate dissertation. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 26(1), 18–26.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1257793.pdf>
- Dawson, A. E., & Wymbs, B. T. (2016). Validity and utility of the parent–teacher relationship scale–II. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 34(8), 751–764.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282915627027>
- Day, E., & Dotterer, A. M. (2018, June). Parental involvement and adolescent academic outcomes: Exploring differences in beneficial strategies across racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(6), 1332–1349.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29671243/>
- DeJonckheere, M., & Vaughn, L. M. (2019). Semistructured interviewing in primary care research: A balance of relationship and rigor. *Family Medicine and Community Health*, 7(2), 1–8. <https://fmch.bmj.com/content/fmch/7/2/e000057.full.pdf>

- DeMatthews, D., & Izquierdo, E. (2018). The importance of principals supporting dual language education: A social justice leadership framework. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 17(1), 53–70. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1170323>
- Dettmers, S., Yotyodying, S., & Jonkmann, K. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of parental homework involvement: How do family-school partnerships affect parental homework involvement and student outcomes? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(Article 1048), 1–13. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6521700/pdf/fpsyg-10-01048.pdf>
- Droz, F., Bergsund, H. B., Hammerstrøm, K. T., Hansen, M. B., & Jacobsen, H. (2018). A systematic review of courses, training, and interventions for adoptive parents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(2), 339–354. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10826-017-0901-7>
- Duppong Hurley, K. L., January, S.-A. A., & Lambert, M. C. (2017). Using caregiver strain to predict participation in a peer-support intervention for parents of children with emotional or behavioral needs. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 25(3), 170–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426616649163>
- Đurišić, M., & Bunijevac, M. (2017). Parental involvement as an important factor for successful education. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 7(3), 137–153. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1156936>
- Eftimie, S. (2016). Students' involvement in volunteer activities. *Journal Plus Education*, 14(1), 149–156. <https://uav.ro/jour/index.php/jpe/article/download/645/708/2038>
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools. Routledge.

- Epstein, J. L. (2019). Theory to practice: School and family partnerships lead to school improvement and student success. In C. L. Fagnano & B. Werber (Eds.), *School, family, and community interaction* (pp. 39–52). Routledge.
- Ethicist, P. (2015). Simplifying the complexity of confidentiality in research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 10(1), 100–102.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1556264614568783>
- Ezikwelu, E. (2022). Race, class, and community cultural wealth: Impacts on parental involvement among Black families in K–12 public schools. In Information Resources Management Association (Ed.), *Research anthology on racial equity, identity, and privilege* (pp. 689–708). IGI Global.
- Fan, Y., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., Waters, D., Stone, M., Abel, R., & Johnston, E. L. (2019). Gender and cultural bias in student evaluations: Why representation matters. *PloS ONE*, 14(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209749>
- Ferrara, M. M. (2017). Understanding family engagement through the focus of the national standards for family–school partnerships: Secondary preservice teachers’ perspectives. *School Community Journal*, 27(2), 145–166. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1165649>
- Farrell, C. C. (2015). Designing school systems to encourage data use and instructional improvement: A comparison of school districts and charter management organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(3), 438–471.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X14539806>
- Ferri, F., Grifoni, P., & Guzzo, T. (2020). Online learning and emergency remote teaching: Opportunities and challenges in emergency situations. *Societies*, 10(4), 86–104.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/soc10040086>

- Fisher, Y. (2018). Concealed and unconcealed motives for joining the parent-teacher association: Mapping sentence and smallest space analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(Article 1705), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01705>
- Fisher, Y., & Kostelitz, Y. (2015). Teachers' self-efficacy vs. parental involvement: Prediction and implementation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 14(3), 279–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2014.997938>
- Fix, G. M., Ritzen, H. T. M., Pieters, J. M., & Kuiper, W. A. J. M. (2019). Effective curricula for at-risk students in vocational education: A study of teachers' practice. *Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 11(1), 1–17. <https://ervet-journal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40461-018-0076-5>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). The politics of stakeholders' theory: Some future directions. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 4(4), 409–422. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3857340>
- Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (2016, June). Coherence making. *School Administrator*, 73(6), 30–34. https://www.scoe.org/files/Fullan_Quinn.pdf
- Garbacz, S. A., Hirano, K., McIntosh, K., Eagle, J. W., Minch, D., & Vatland, C. (2018). Family engagement in schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports barriers and facilitators to implementation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 33(3), 448–459. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-52049-001>
- Garbe, A., Ogurlu, U., Logan, N., & Cook, P. (2020). COVID-19 and remote learning: Experiences of parents with children during the pandemic. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 4(3), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/8471>
- Gill, A. M., Hyde, L. W., Shaw, D. S., Dishion, T. J., & Wilson, M. N. (2008, October). The family check-up in early childhood: A case study of intervention process and change.

Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 37(4), 893–904.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18991138/>

Gilmore, L. (2021, March). Navigating the murky middle: Understanding how career aspirations and experiences influence the career progression of women identifying, student affairs, middle managers [Doctoral dissertation, Annsley Frazier Thornton School of Education]. ScholarWorks @ Bellarmine. <https://scholarworks.bellarmino.edu/tdc/95/>

Goals 2000: Educate America Act. (1994, April 11). Public Law 103–227. U.S. Government Publishing Office. <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/COMPS-10707>

Gonzalez, S. M., & Gabel, S. L. (2017). Exploring involvement expectations for culturally and linguistically diverse parents: What we need to know in teacher education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 19(2), 61–81. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1148047>

Gonzalez-DeHass, A. (2016). Preparing 21st century learners: Parent involvement strategies for encouraging students' self-regulated learning. *Childhood Education*, 92(6), 427–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2016.1251791>

Goodall, N. J. (2016, May 31). *Can you program ethics into a self-driving car?* IEEE Spectrum. <https://spectrum.ieee.org/can-you-program-ethics-into-a-selfdriving-car>

Goodrich, A. (2018, February). Peer mentoring and peer tutoring among K–12 students: A literature review. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 36(2), 13–21. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1165724>

Graber, J. A., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Petersen, A. C. (Eds.). (2018). *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains and context*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315789286>

- Grewenig, E., Lergetporer, P., Werner, K., Woessmann, L., & Zierow, L. (2021). COVID-19 and educational inequality: How school closures affect low-and high-achieving students. *European Economic Review*, 140, 1–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2021.103920>
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2017). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for nonprobability sample sizes. *Field Methods*, 29(1), 3–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X16639015>
- Guffey, J. S., Payne, W., Jones, T., & Martin, K. (2013). Evidence of resistance development by *Staphylococcus aureus* to an in vitro, multiple stage application of 405 nm light from a supraluminous diode array. *Photomedicine and Laser Surgery*, 31(4), 179–182.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23484587/>
- Hagler, M. A., & Rhodes, J. E. (2018). The long-term impact of natural mentoring relationships: A counterfactual analysis. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 62(1-2), 175–188. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30058721/>
- Hall, B., Serafin, J., & Lundgren, D. (2020). The benefits of academically oriented peer mentoring for at-risk student populations. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 8(2), 184–199.
<https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.8.2.12>
- Hamilton, L., Roksa, J., & Nielsen, K. (2018). Providing a “leg up”: Parental involvement and opportunity hoarding in college. *Sociology of Education*, 91(2), 111–131.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040718759557>
- Hamlin, D., & Li, A. (2020). The relationship between parent volunteering in school and school safety in disadvantaged urban neighborhoods. *Journal of School Violence*, 19(3), 362–376. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1257684>

Harper, S. R. (2015). Success in these schools? Visual counter narratives of young men of color and urban high schools they attend. *Urban Education*, 50(2), 139–169.

[https://rossierapps.usc.edu/facultydirectory/publications/231/Harper%20\(2015\)%20Urban%20Ed.pdf](https://rossierapps.usc.edu/facultydirectory/publications/231/Harper%20(2015)%20Urban%20Ed.pdf)

Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID 19–school leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479>

Harris, A., & Robinson, K. (2016). A new framework for understanding parental involvement: Setting the stage for academic success. *Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2(5), 186–201.

<https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2016.2.5.09>

Harrison, J. R., State, T. M., Wills, H. P., Custer, B. A., & Miller, E. (2017). Transition goals for youth with social, emotional, and behavioral problems: Parent and student knowledge.

Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 61(3), 248–257. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1141445>

Harris, A., Johnson, A. M., Thompson, J. W. G., Walton, D. M., & Dickey, J. P. (2020).

Cumulative soccer heading amplifies the effects of brain activity observed during concurrent moderate exercise and continuous performance task in female youth soccer players. *Journal of Concussion*, 4, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2059700220912654>

Haslip, M. J., Allen-Handy, A., & Donaldson, L. (2019). How do children and teachers

demonstrate love, kindness, and forgiveness? Findings from an early childhood strength spotting intervention. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 47(5), 531–547.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-019-00951-7>

- Heinrichs, J. (2018). School leadership based in a philosophy and pedagogy of parent engagement. *School Leadership & Management*, 38(2), 187–201.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2017.1406905>
- Herbers, J. E., Cutuli, J. J., Monn, A. R., Narayan, A. J., & Masten, A. S. (2014). Trauma, adversity, and parent-child relationships among young children experiencing homelessness. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 42(7), 1167–1174.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-014-9868-7>
- Herman, K. C., & Reinke, W. M. (2017). Improving teacher perceptions of parent involvement patterns: Findings from a group randomized trial. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 32(1), 89–104. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27441549/>
- Hickman, G., & Anderson, S. (2019). The perceived impact of educational management organization mentors among former high school dropouts who subsequently graduated high school. *Journal of At-Risk Issues*, 22(1), 1–8. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1218305>
- Hill, N. E., Witherspoon, D. P., & Bartz, D. (2018). Parental involvement in education during middle school: Perspectives of ethnically diverse parents, teachers, and students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 111(1), 12–27. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1161558>
- Hirano, K. A., Garbacz, S. A., Shanley, L., & Rowe, D. A. (2016). Parent involvement in secondary special education and transition: An exploratory psychometric study. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(12), 3537–3553. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-016-0516-4>
- Hoglund, W. G., Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., & Aber, J. L. (2015). The evocative influence of child academic and social-emotional adjustment on parent involvement in inner-city

- schools. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(2), 517–532.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-27826-001>
- Homan, D., Epley, H. K., & Bloir, K. L. (2020). Are volunteers competent in positive youth development? Perceptions from three stakeholder groups. *Journal of Youth Development*, 15(4), 68–86. <https://jyd.pitt.edu/ojs/jyd/article/view/20-15-4-SIA-04>
- Hopkins, R. M., Regehr, G., & Pratt, D. D. (2017). A framework for negotiating positionality in phenomenological research. *Medical Teacher*, 39(1), 20–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2017.1245854>
- Hornby, G. (2011). Parental involvement in childhood education: Building effective school-family partnerships (Vol. 307). Springer.
- Hornby, G., & Blackwell, I. (2018). Barriers to parental involvement in education. *Educational Review*, 70(1), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1388612>
- Hornby, G., & Lafaele, R. (2011, February). Barriers to parental involvement in education: An explanatory model. *Educational Review*, 63(1), 37–52. <https://asset-pdf.scinapse.io/prod/2156441185/2156441185.pdf>
- Houghton, C., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2013, March). Rigour in qualitative case-study research. *Nurse Researcher*, 20(4), 12–17.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23520707/>
- Houri, A. K., Thayer, A. J., & Cook, C. R. (2019). Targeting parent trust to enhance engagement in a school–home communication system: A double-blind experiment of a parental wise feedback intervention. *School Psychology*, 34(4), 421–432.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2019-38080-008>

- Huck, C., & Zhang, J. (2021). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on K–12 education: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research and Development Journal*, 24(1), 53–84. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1308731.pdf>
- Hunt, B. D., Locklear, L., Bullard, C., & Pacheco, C. (2020, November). “Do you live in a teepee? Do you have running water?” The harrowing experiences of American Indians in North Carolina’s urban K–12 schools. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 52(4), 759–777. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1269258>
- Hunter, H. (2018, May). The effect of poverty on child education (K–12) in public schools: What schools and the government can do to help student achievement [Master’s thesis, New York State University at New Paltz]. Suny. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12648/1387>
- Hyman, M. R., & Sierra, J. J. (2016, February). Open-versus close-ended survey questions. *Business Outlook*, 14(2), 1–5. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282249876_Open-versus_close-ended_survey_questions
- Ishimaru, A. M., Torres, K. E., Salvador, J. E., Lott, J., Cameron Williams, D. M., & Tran, C. (2016). Reinforcing deficit, journeying toward equity cultural brokering in family engagement initiatives. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(4), 850–882. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216657178>
- Jafarov, J. (2015). Factors affecting parental involvement in education: The analysis of literature. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18(4), 35–44. <https://jhss-khazar.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/3.Javid-Jafarov.pdf>

- Jaiswal, N. K., & Dhar, R. L. (2017). The influence of servant leadership, trust in leader and thriving on employee creativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(1), 2–21. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-06480-001>
- Jeon, H.-J., McCartney, C., Richard, V., Johnson, S. J., & Kwon, K.-A. (2021). Associations between parent–teacher and teacher–child relationships and children’s socioemotional functioning. *Early Child Development and Care*, 191(15), 2407–2421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2020.1711747>
- Jeynes, W. H. (2016, April). A meta-analysis: The relationship between parental involvement and African American school outcomes. *Journal of Black Studies*, 47(3), 195–216. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43926939>
- Jeynes, W. H. (2018). A practical model for school leaders to encourage parental involvement and parental engagement. *School Leadership & Management*, 38(2), 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2018.1434767>
- Johnson, J. J., IV, Padilla, J. J., & Diallo, S. Y. (2021). Closing the academic achievement gap: A system dynamics study. *Journal of Simulation*, 15(4), 284–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17477778.2020.1718021>
- Jones, T. M., Williford, A., Spencer, M. S., Riggs, N. R., Toll, R., George, M., Becker, K., & Bruick, S. (2021). School mental health providers’ perspectives on the impact of COVID-19 on racial inequities and school disengagement. *Children & Schools*, 43(2), 97–106. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2022-14097-005>
- Kalayci, G., & Ergül, H. (2020). Teachers’ perceptions of the role of parental involvement in teaching English to young learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(3), 1167–1176. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1273374>

- Kerbaiv, D., & Bernhardt, A. (2018). Parental intervention in the school: The context of minority involvement. In J. S. Coleman (Ed.), *Parents, their children, and schools* (pp. 115–146). Routledge.
- Kocabaş, H. U., & Bavlı, B. (2022). The Montessori educational method: Communication and collaboration of teachers with the child. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(1), 443–462. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1308689.pdf>
- Kocayörük, E. (2016, August). Parental involvement and school achievement. *International Journal of Human and Behavioral Science*, 2(2), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.19148/ijhbs.65987>
- Koch, S. (2006, August). Home telehealth—current state and future trends. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 75(8), 565–576. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16298545/>
- Köhler, T., Smith, A., & Bhakoo, V. (2022). Templates in qualitative research methods: Origins, limitations, and new directions. *Organizational Research Methods*, 25(2), 183–210.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10944281211060710>
- Kong, K. (2020). Academic resilience of pupils from low socioeconomic backgrounds. *Journal of Behavioral Science*, 15(2), 70–89. <https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/IJBS/article/view/239864>
- Krane, V., & Klevan, T. (2019). There are three of us: Parents’ experiences of the importance of teacher–student relationships and parental involvement in upper secondary school. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 24(1), 74–84.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2018.1464482>

Laffend, K. J. (2021). Perceptions of underrepresented charter school students from low-income backgrounds on preparedness for transitioning to high school [Doctoral dissertation, Cabrini University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/771fbb41da4d5abb6e099a00d49efbd4/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

Larson, E., Foe, G., & Lally, R. (2015). Reading level and length of written research consent forms. *Clinical and Translational Science*, 8(4), 355–356.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25580939/>

Lasater, K. (2016). Parent–teacher conflict related to student abilities: The impact on students and the family–school partnership. *School Community Journal*, 26(2), 237–262.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1124013>

Lavery, L. E. (2016). What parents still do not know about No Child Left Behind and why it matters. *Journal of Education Policy*, 31(3), 343–361.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2015.1094576>

Lawrence, A. S., & Barathi, C. (2016). Parental encouragement in relation to academic achievement of higher secondary school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, 2(6), 1234–1239.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED571491>

Lebowitz, E. R., Marin, C., Martino, A., Shimshoni, Y., & Silverman, W. K. (2020). Parent-based treatment as efficacious as cognitive-behavioral therapy for childhood anxiety: A randomized noninferiority study of supportive parenting for anxious childhood emotions.

Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 59(3), 362–372.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30851397/>

- Lechuga-Peña, S., & Brisson, D. (2018). Barriers to school-based parent involvement while living in public housing: A mother's perspective. *Qualitative Report*, 23(5), 1176–1187. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss5/11/>
- Lee, S. J., Ward, K. P., Chang, O. D., & Downing, K. M. (2021). Parenting activities and the transition to home-based education during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 122, 105585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105585>
- Leggett, G., & Harrington, I. (2021). The impact of project based learning (PBL) on students from low socio-economic statuses: A review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(11), 1270–1286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1609101>
- Lenstra, M. (2020). Barriers to implementing communication education in the PK–12 schools. *Communication Education*, 69(1), 118–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2019.1683754>
- Li, A., & Fischer, M. J. (2017). Advantaged/disadvantaged school neighborhoods, parental networks, and parental involvement at elementary school. *Sociology of Education*, 90(4), 355–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040717732332>
- Liang, E., Peters, L. E., Lomidze, A., & Akaba, S. (2020). “I like being involved in school stuff”: Mothers' perspectives around their participation in family engagement in universal prekindergarten. *School Community Journal*, 30(1), 59–87. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1257662>
- Liao, H., & Hitchcock, J. (2018). Reported credibility techniques in higher education evaluation studies that use qualitative methods: A research synthesis. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 68, 157–165. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29602062/>

- Liermann, K., & Norton, C. L. (2016). Enhancing family communication: Examining the impact of a therapeutic wilderness program for struggling teens and parents. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal*, 38(1), 14–22.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10591-015-9371-5>
- Lindt, S. F., & Blair, C. (2017). Making a difference with at-risk students: The benefits of a mentoring program in middle school. *Middle School Journal*, 48(1), 34–39.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1128524>
- Liu, E. S. C., Ching, C. W. L., & Wu, J. (2017). Who is a volunteer? A cultural and temporal exploration of volunteerism. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 27(6), 530–545. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/10911359.2017.1295715>
- Llamas, A. V., & Tuazon, A. P. (2016). School practices in parental involvement, expected results, and barriers in public secondary schools. *International Journal of Educational Science and Research*, 6(1), 59–78.
https://www.academia.edu/23703434/SCHOOL_PRACTICES_IN_PARENTAL_INVOLVEMENT_ITS_EXPECTED_RESULTS_and_BARRIERS_IN_PUBLIC_SECONDARY_SCHOOLS
- Looney, A., Cumming, J., van Der Kleij, F., & Harris, K. (2018). Re-conceptualizing the role of teachers as assessors: teacher assessment identity. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(5), 442–467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2016.1268090>
- Losinski, M., Ennis, R., Katsiyannis, A., & Rapa, L. J. (2019). Schools as change agents in reducing bias and discrimination: Shaping behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28(10), 2718–2726. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10826-019-01452-2>

- Macaraan, W. E. R. (2021, June). Addressing the parents' mental wellness during their kids' online learning. *Journal of Public Health*, 44(2), e331–e332.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdab237>
- MacPhee, M. (2021). The differentiated parent support model: Enhancing the involvement of parents who do not speak the school language. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 44(1), 28–56. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1291369.pdf>
- Magwa, S., & Mugari, S. (2017). Factors affecting parental involvement in the schooling of children. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 5(1), 74–81.
<https://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Full-Paper-FACTORS-AFFECTING-PARENTAL-INVOLVEMENT-IN-THE-SCHOOLING-OF-CHILDREN.pdf>
- Malluhi, H. H., & Alomran, N. M. (2019). Family volunteers as alternative future resources: School leaders' beliefs and practices. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 14(10), 88–115. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i10.10189>
- Malone, D. (2015). Culture: A potential challenge for parental involvement in schools. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin: International Journal of Professional Educators*, 82(1), 14–18.
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/1770514326?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true>
- Malone, D. (2017). Socioeconomic status: A potential challenge for parental involvement in schools. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 83(3), 58–62. <https://tinyurl.com/yckr84c6>
- Malone, J. L. (2016). *The science of linguistics in the art of translation: Some tools from linguistics for the analysis and practice of translation*. State University of New York Press.

- Mann, G., & Gilmore, L. (2021, March). Barriers to positive parent–teacher partnerships: The views of parents and teachers in an inclusive education context. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1900426>
- Manna, P. (2015, September). *Developing excellent school principals to advance teaching and learning: Considerations for state policy*. Wallace Foundation.
<https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/pages/developing-excellent-school-principals.aspx>
- Marchand, A. D., Vassar, R. R., Diemer, M. A., & Rowley, S. J. (2019). Integrating race, racism, and critical consciousness in Black parents’ engagement with schools. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 11(3), 367–384. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/jftr.12344>
- Marcucci, O. (2020). Parental involvement and the Black–White discipline gap: The role of parental social and cultural capital in American schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 52(1), 143–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124519846283>
- Markowitz, A. J. (2018). Changes in school engagement as a function of No Child Left Behind: A comparative interrupted time series analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(4), 721–760. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218755668>
- Marrero, F. A. (2016). Barriers to school success for Latino students. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(2), 180–186. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1097395>
- Marschall, M. J., & Shah, P. R. (2020, June). Linking the process and outcomes of parent involvement policy to the parent involvement gap. *Urban Education*, 55(5), 699–729.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916661386>
- Martínez-Mesa, J., González-Chica, D. A., Duquia, R. P., Bonamigo, R. R., & Bastos, J. L. (2016). Sampling: How to select participants in my research study? *Anais Brasileiros de*

Dermatologia, 91(3), 326–330.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4938277/>

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Wang, K., Rathbun, A., Barmer, A., Forrest

Cataldi, E., & Bullock Mann, F. (2018, May). *The condition of education 2018*. National Center for Education Statistics.

<https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2018144>

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., Diliberti, M., Forrest

Cataldi, E., Bullock Mann, F., & Barmer, A. (2019). *The condition of education 2019*. National Center for Education Statistics.

<https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2019144>

McGuinn, P. (2016, June). From No Child Left Behind to Every Student Succeeds Act:

Federalism and the education legacy of the Obama administration. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 46(3), 392–415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjw014>

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Barrier. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved October 15,

2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/barrier>

Meyer, J. L. (2001). *Impact of family process and status variables on student academic*

achievement [Master's thesis, University of Northern Iowa]. University of Northern Iowa

ScholarWorks. <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/1179/>

Miller, H., Valentine, J. L., Fish, R., & Robinson, M. (2016). Is the feeling mutual? Examining

parent-teacher relationships in low-income, predominantly Latino schools. *American*

Journal of Education, 123(1), 37–67. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1086/688167>

- Montgomery, J. E., Chaviano, C. L., Rayburn, A. D., & McWey, L. M. (2017). Parents at-risk and their children: Intersections of gender role attitudes and parenting practices. *Child & Family Social Work*, 22(3), 1151–1160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12332>
- Morgan, S. J., Pullon, S. R., Macdonald, L. M., McKinlay, E. M., & Gray, B. V. (2017). Case study observational research: A framework for conducting case study research where observation data are the focus. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(7), 1060–1068. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27217290/>
- Muller, C. (2018). Parent involvement and academic achievement: An analysis of family resources available to the child. In J. S. Coleman (Ed.), *Parents, their children, and schools* (pp. 77–114). Routledge.
- Murphy, K. M., Yoshikawa, H., & Wuermli, A. J. (2018, May). Implementation research for early childhood development programming in humanitarian contexts. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1419(1), 90–101. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29791733/>
- Murray, E., McFarland-Piazza, L., & Harrison, L. J. (2015). Changing patterns of parent-teacher communication and parent involvement from preschool to school. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(7), 1031–1052. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/03004430.2014.975223>
- Musu, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. (2019). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2018*. National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2019047>
- Naderifar, M., Goli, H., & Ghaljaie, F. (2017, July). Snowball sampling: A purposeful method of sampling in qualitative research. *Strides in Development of Medical Education*, 14(3), 1–4. https://sdme.kmu.ac.ir/article_90598.html

- Narad, A., & Abdullah, B. (2016). Academic performance of senior secondary school students: Influence of parental encouragement and school environment. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 8(2), 12–19.
https://rupkatha.com/V8/n2/02_Academic_Performance.pdf
- National PTA. (2000). *Building successful partnerships: A guide for developing parent and family involvement programs*. National Education Service.
- National PTA. (2021). *National standards for family–school partnerships: An implementation guide*. <https://www.pta.org/home/run-your-pta/National-Standards-for-Family-School-Partnerships>
- Ni, Y., Yan, R., & Pounder, D. (2018). Collective leadership: Principals' decision influence and the supportive or inhibiting decision influence of other stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(2), 216–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17723427>
- Nichols, J. D., Kim, I. H., & Nichols, G. W. (2020). The effect of parent and community volunteerism on early literacy development. *Educational Review*, 72(4), 411–426.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1530638>
- Ngulube, P. (2015, June). Qualitative data analysis and interpretation: Systematic search for meaning. In S. Mutula (Ed.), *Addressing research challenges: Making headway for developing researchers* (pp. 131–156). South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science.

Núñez, J. C., Suárez, N., Rosário, P., Vallejo, G., Valle, A., & Epstein, J. L. (2015, December).

Relationships between perceived parental involvement in homework, student homework behaviors, and academic achievement: differences among elementary, junior high, and high school students. *Metacognition and Learning*, 10(3), 375–406.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1081622>

Nyemba, F., & Chitiyo, R. A. (2018). An examination of parental involvement practices in their

children's schooling by Zimbabwean immigrant mothers in Cincinnati, Ohio. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 12(3), 124–138. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1180375>

O'Brennan, L., Pas, E., & Bradshaw, C. (2017). Multilevel examination of burnout among high

school staff: Importance of staff and school factors. *School Psychology Review*, 46(2), 165–176. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1156208.pdf>

Orb, A., Eisenhauer, L., & Wynaden, D. (2000). Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of*

Nursing Scholarship, 33(1), 93–96.

<http://www.columbia.edu/~mvp19/RMC/M5/QualEthics.pdf>

Oreopoulos, P., Brown, R. S., & Lavecchia, A. M. (2017). Pathways to education: An integrated

approach to helping at-risk high school students. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(4), 947–984. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/692713>

Oswald, D. P., Zaidi, H. B., Cheatham, D. S., & Brody, K. G. D. (2018). Correlates of parent

involvement in students' learning: Examination of a national data set. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(1), 316. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10826-017-0876-4>

Ozmen, F., Akuzum, C., Zincirli, M., & Selcuk, G. (2016). The communication barriers between

teachers and parents in primary schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 66, 27–46. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1149130>

- Pal, N., Halder, S., & Guha, A. (2016, January). Study on communication barriers in the classroom: A teacher's perspective. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 6(1), 103–118. <https://www.ojcmt.net/download/study-on-communication-barriers-in-the-classroom-a-teachers-perspective.pdf>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4012002/>
- Park, S., & Holloway, S. (2018). Parental involvement in adolescents' education: An examination of the interplay among school factors, parental role construction, and family income. *School Community Journal*, 28(1), 9–36. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2018-37030-001>
- Park, S., Stone, S. I., & Holloway, S. D. (2017). School-based parental involvement as a predictor of achievement and school learning environment: An elementary school-level analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 82, 195–206. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0190740917303456>
- Parsons, M. W., & Shim, J. M. (2019). Increasing ELL parental involvement and engagement: Exploration of K–12 administrators in a rural state. *English Language Teaching*, 12(10), 29–43. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1228019>
- Patten, A. (2012, September). Liberal neutrality: A reinterpretation and defense. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 20(3), 249–272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2011.00406.x>
- Peterson, J. S. (2019). Presenting a qualitative study: A reviewer's perspective. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 63(3), 147–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219844789>

- Pettigrew, S., Jongenelis, M., Jackson, B., & Newton, R. U. (2019). "Charity begins at home": Informal caring barriers to formal volunteering among older people. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30(5), 921–931.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-018-0017-8>
- Pineda, R., Bender, J., Hall, B., Shabosky, L., Annecca, A., & Smith, J. (2018). Parent participation in the neonatal intensive care unit: Predictors and relationships to neurobehavioral and developmental outcomes. *Early Human Development*, 117, 32–38.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29275070/>
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2014). *Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing practice* (8th ed.). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Povey, J., Campbell, A. K., Willis, L.-D., Haynes, M., Western, M., Bennett, S., Antrobus, E., & Pedde, C. (2016). Engaging parents in schools and building parent-school partnerships: The role of school and parent organization leadership. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 79, 128–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2016.07.005>
- Pratt-Johnson, Y. (2015). Stressors experienced by immigrant and other non-native English-speaking students in U.S. schools and their families. *Journal of Social Distress and Homelessness*, 24(3), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1179/1053078915Z.000000000018>
- Preston, J. P., & Barnes, K. E. R. (2017). Successful leadership in rural schools: Cultivating collaboration. *Rural Educator*, 38(1), 6–15. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1225156>
- Protacio, S., Piazza, S. V., David, V., & Tigchelaar, M. (2020). Elementary teachers' initiatives in engaging families of English learners. *School Community Journal*, 30(2), 211–227.
<https://www.adi.org/journal/2020fw/ProtacioEtAIFW2020.pdf>

- Raja, R., & Nagasubramani, P. C. (2018). Impact of modern technology in education. *Journal of Applied and Advanced Research*, 3(1), 33–35.
<https://doi.org/10.21839/jaar.2018.v3iS1.165>
- Rattenborg, K., MacPhee, D., Walker, A. K., & Miller-Heyl, J. (2019). Pathways to parental engagement: Contributions of parents, teachers, and schools in cultural context. *Early Education and Development*, 30(3), 315–336.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2018.1526577>
- Reddy, L. A., Kettler, R. J., & Kurz, A. (2015). School-wide educator evaluation for improving school capacity and student achievement in high-poverty schools: Year 1 of the school system improvement project. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 25(2-3), 90–108. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1064803>
- Renz, S. M., Carrington, J. M., & Badger, T. A. (2018). Two strategies for qualitative content analysis: An intra-method approach to triangulation. *Qualitative Health Research*, 28(5), 824–831. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317753586>
- Restler, S., & Glant, L. (2020). All hands-on deck: Building a sustainable volunteer program. *Journal of Youth Development*, 15(4), 162–173.
<https://jyd.pitt.edu/ojs/jyd/article/view/20-15-4-SIA-09>
- Reynolds, A. D., Crea, T. M., Medina, J., Degnan, E., & McRoy, R. (2015). A mixed-methods case study of parent involvement in an urban high school serving minority students. *Urban Education*, 50(6), 750–775. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1071204>
- Reynolds, A. J., Hayakawa, M., Ou, S.-R., Mondì, C. F., Englund, M. M., Candee, A. J., & Smerillo, N. E. (2017). Scaling and sustaining effective early childhood programs

- through school–family–university collaboration. *Child Development*, 88(5), 1453–1465.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28768056/>
- Reynolds, A. J., Ou, S.-R., & Temple, J. A. (2018). A multicomponent, preschool to third grade preventive intervention and educational attainment at 35 years of age. *Journal of the American Medical Association Pediatrics*, 172(3), 247–256.
<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/fullarticle/2668645>
- Ribeiro, L. M., Cunha, R. S., Silva, M. C. A., Carvalho, M., & Vital, M. L. (2021). Parental involvement during pandemic times: Challenges and opportunities. *Education Sciences*, 11(Article 302), 1–17. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1300686>
- Ricard, N. C., & Pelletier, L. G. (2016). Dropping out of high school: The role of parent and teacher self-determination support, reciprocal friendships and academic motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 44–45, 32–40.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.12.003>
- Richards, H. (2017). *Success factors of women in leadership roles and breaking through the glass ceiling: A phenomenological qualitative study* [Doctoral Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University]. Abraham S. Fischler College of Education and School of Criminal Justice Nova Eastern University Theses and Dissertations.
https://nsuworks.nova.edu/fse_etd/257/
- Roberts, K. A. (2012). *Investigating differences of parental involvement in secondary education across child gender, ethnicity, and year level* [Master's thesis, University of Canterbury]. University of Canterbury Research Repository.
<https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/10369>
- Rodwell, M. K. (1998). *Social work constructivist research*. Garland Publishing.

- Ross, P. T., & Bibler Zaidi, N. L. (2019). Limited by our limitations. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 8(4), 261–264. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31347033/>
- Rowe, E., & Perry, L. B. (2020). Inequalities in the private funding of public schools: Parent financial contributions and school socioeconomic status. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 52(1), 42–59.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2019.1689234>
- San Antonio, D. M., Martel, J., & Weisbart, C. (2020). Perceptions of mentors and mentees in school-based cross-age peer mentoring in a low-income rural community. *Journal of Child and Youth Care Work*, 26, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jcyew.2020.12>
- Sanjari, M., Bahramnezhad, F., Fomani, F. K., Shoghi, M., & Cheraghi, M. A. (2014). Ethical challenges of researchers in qualitative studies: The necessity to develop a specific guideline. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, 7(14), 1–6.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4263394/pdf/jmehm-7-14.pdf>
- Santiago, R. T., Garbacz, S. A., Beattie, T., & Moore, C. L. (2016). Parent–teacher relationships in elementary school: An examination of parent–teacher trust. *Psychology in the Schools*, 53(10), 1003–1017. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1119646>
- Schueler, B. E., McIntyre, J. C., & Gehlbach, H. (2017). Measuring parent perceptions of family-school engagement: The development of new survey tools. *School Community Journal*, 27(2), 275–301. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1165635>
- Shao, M., He, W., Zhao, L., & Su, Y. S. (2021). The influence of parental involvement on parent satisfaction: The moderating effect of parental educational level and the number of children. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1–29.
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.752802/full>

- Sharp, L. A. (2016). ESEA reauthorization: An overview of Every Student Succeeds Act. *Texas Journal of Literacy Education*, 4(1), 9–13. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1110854.pdf>
- Sheridan, S. M., Witte, A. L., Kunz, G. M., Wheeler, L. A., Angell, S. R., & Lester, H. F. (2018). Rural teacher practices and partnerships to address behavioral challenges: The efficacy and mechanisms of conjoint behavioral consultation. *Elementary School Journal*, 119(1), 99–121. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2018-42875-006>
- Shim, J. M., & Shur, A. M. (2018). Learning from ELLs' perspectives: Mismatch between ELL and teacher perspectives on ELL learning experiences. *English Language Teaching*, 11(1), 21–32. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1162483>
- Siegel, A., Esqueda, M., Berkowitz, R., Sullivan, K., Astor, R. A., & Benbenishty, R. (2019). Welcoming parents to their child's school: Practices supporting students with diverse needs and backgrounds. *Education and Urban Society*, 51(6), 756–784. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124517747682>
- Siegel, R. L., Jakubowski, C. D., Fedewa, S. A., Davis, A., & Azad, N. S. (2020, April). Colorectal cancer in the young: Epidemiology, prevention, management. *American Society of Clinical Oncology Educational Book*, 40, e75–e88. https://ascopubs.org/doi/full/10.1200/edbk_279901
- Smith, T. E., & Sheridan, S. M. (2019). The effects of teacher training on teachers' family-engagement practices, attitudes, and knowledge: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 29(2), 128–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2018.1460725>
- Snyder, T. D., Dillow, S. A., & Hoffman, C. M. (2007). *Digest of education statistics 2006*. National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007017.pdf>

- Solis, B. D., & Lopez, E. R. (2015). Stress level and adversity quotient among single working mothers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(5), 72–79.
<http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/APJMR-2015-3.5.3.09.pdf>
- Stein, L. (2016). Schools need leaders—not managers: It’s time for a paradigm shift. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(2), 21–30. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1131961>
- Steiner, S., Wolf, J., Glatzel, S., Andreou, A., Granda, J. M., Keenan, G., Hinkley, T., Aragon-Camarasa, G., Kitson, P. J., Angelone, D., & Cronin, L. (2018, November). Organic synthesis in a modular robotic system driven by a chemical programming language. *Science*, 363(6423), eaav2211. <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aav2211>
- Stratton, S. J. (2021). Population research: Convenience sampling strategies. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 36(4), 373–374. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X21000649>
- Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative research: Data collection, analysis, and management. *Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*, 68(3), 226–231.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26157184/>
- Syed, E. (2018). There goes the PTA: Building parent identity, relationships, and power in gentrifying schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 51(3-4), 284–300.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1214495>
- Tarasawa, B., & Waggoner, J. (2015). Increasing parental involvement of English Language Learner families: What the research says. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, 21(2), 129–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10796126.2015.1058243>
- Tan, C. Y., Lyu, M., & Peng, B. (2020). Academic benefits from parental involvement are stratified by parental socioeconomic status: A meta-analysis. *Parenting*, 20(4), 241–287.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2019.1694836>

- Tekin, Ş. (2014, January). Self-insight in the time of mood disorders: After the diagnosis, beyond the treatment. *Philosophy, Psychiatry, & Psychology*, 21(2), 139–155.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/ppp.2014.0019>
- TenHouten, W. D. (2017, March). Site sampling and snowball sampling—methodology for accessing hard-to-reach populations. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 134(1), 58–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0759106317693790>
- Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. In C. Willig & W. S. Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (pp. 17–37). SAGE Publications.
- Texas Education Agency. (2012). *Public education information management system (PEIMS) data standards 2011–2012*. <https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/data-submission/peims/peims-data-standards/peims-data-standards-2011-2012>
- Theofanidis, D., & Fountouki, A. (2018). Limitations and delimitations in the research process. *Perioperative Nursing*, 7(3), 155–163.
https://www.spnj.gr/articlefiles/volume7_issue3/pn_sep_73_155_162b.pdf
- Thompson, A. M., Herman, K. C., Stormont, M. A., Reinke, W. M., & Webster-Stratton, C. (2017). A latent transition analysis of the impact of Incredible Years® on teacher perceptions of parental involvement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 62, 51–65.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28646975/>
- Tighe, L. A., & Davis-Kean, P. E. (2021). The influence of college education on parents and children in low-income families. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 67(3), 293–328.
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/813626>

- Tillmann, S., Tobin, D., Avison, W., & Gilliland, J. (2018). Mental health benefits of interactions with nature in children and teenagers: A systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiol Community Health*, 72(10), 958–966. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29950520/>
- Tobin, G. A., & Begley, C. M. (2004, November). Methodological rigour within a qualitative framework. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48(4), 388–396. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15500533/>
- Tobin, S. A. (2016). *Everyday piety*. Cornell University Press.
- Torres, S., & Serrat, R. (2019, June). Older migrants ‘civic participation: A topic in need of attention. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 50, 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2019.100790>
- Trieu, Q., & Jayakody, R. (2018). Ethnic minority educational success: Understanding accomplishments in challenging settings. *Social Indicators Research*, 145(2), 663–701. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-018-1900-9>
- Turner, E. M., Koskela-Staples, N., Voorhees, S., McQuaid, E. L., & Fedele, D. A. (2021, March). Health-related decision-making in early adolescents with poorly controlled asthma. *Clinical Practice in Pediatric Psychology*, 9(1), 24–34. <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/2020-38974-001>
- Uslu, F., & Gizir, S. (2017). School belonging of adolescents: The role of teacher–student relationships, peer relationships and family involvement. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 17(1), 63–82. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-17819-004>
- Valentine, K. D., Kopcha, T. J., & Vagle, M. D. (2018). Phenomenological methodologies in the field of educational communications and technology. *TechTrends*, 62(5), 462–472. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11528-018-0317-2>

- Van Lancker, W., & Parolin, Z. (2020). COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: A social crisis in the making. *Lancet Public Health*, 5(5), E243–E244.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30084-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30084-0)
- Vega, D., Moore, J., III, & Miranda, A. H. (2015). Who really cares? Urban youths' perceptions of parental and programmatic support. *School Community Journal*, 25(1), 53–72.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1066219>
- Wandasari, Y., Kristiawan, M., & Arafat, Y. (2019). Policy evaluation of school's literacy movement on improving the discipline of state high school students. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 8(4), 190–198. <https://www.ijstr.org/final-print/apr2019/Policy-Evaluation-Of-Schools-Literacy-Movement-On-Improving-Discipline-Of-State-High-School-Students.pdf>
- Wang, J., Hong, H., Ravitz, J., & Hejazi Moghadam, S. (2016, February). *Landscape of K–12 computer science education in the US: Perceptions, access, and barriers*. Proceedings of the 47th ACM Technical Symposium on Computing Science Education.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/2839509.2844628>
- Ware, J. K. (2019). Property value as a proxy of socioeconomic status in education. *Education and Urban Society*, 51(1), 99–119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124517714850>
- Wassell, B. A., Hawrylak, M. F., & Scantlebury, K. (2017). Barriers, resources, frustrations, and empathy: Teachers' expectations for family involvement for Latino/a ELL students in urban STEM classrooms. *Urban Education*, 52(10), 1233–1254.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915602539>

- Wentzel, K. R., Russell, S., & Baker, S. (2016). Emotional support and expectations from parents, teachers, and peers predict adolescent competence at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(2), 242–255. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1088639>
- White, G. W., Stepney, C. T., Hatchimonji, D. R., Mocerri, D. C., Linsky, A. V., Reyes-Portillo, J. A., & Elias, M. J. (2016). The increasing impact of socioeconomic and race on standardized academic test scores across elementary, middle, and high school. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 86(1), 10–23. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/ort0000122>
- Wieczorek, D., & Manard, C. (2018). Instructional leadership challenges and practices of novice principals in rural schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 34(2), 1–21. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1172786>
- Williams, M., & Moser, T. (2019). The art of coding and thematic exploration in qualitative research. *International Management Review*, 15(1), 45–55. <http://www.imrjournal.org/uploads/1/4/2/8/14286482/imr-v15n1art4.pdf>
- Wood, L. M., Sebar, B., & Vecchio, N. (2020, February). Application of rigour and credibility in qualitative document analysis: Lessons learnt from a case study. *Qualitative Report*, 25(2), 456–470. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss2/11/>
- Wright, K. B., Shields, S. M., Black, K., & Waxman, H. C. (2018). The effects of teacher home visits on student behavior, student academic achievement, and parent involvement. *School Community Journal*, 28(1), 67–90. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1184921>
- Wu, Z., Zhao, R., Zhang, X., & Liu, F. (2018). The impact of social capital on volunteering and giving: Evidence from urban China. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(6), 1201–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764018784761>

- Yang, Y., Liu, K., Li, M., & Li, S. (2022). Students' affective engagement, parental involvement, and teacher support in emergency remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from a cross-sectional survey in China. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 54(1), S148–S164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2021.1922104>
- Yin, R. K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Yu, C., & Prince, D. L. (2016). Aspiring school administrators' perceived ability to meet technology standards and technological needs for professional development. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 48(4), 239–257. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1113180>
- Yulianti, K., Denessen, E., Droop, M., & Veerman, G. J. (2022). School efforts to promote parental involvement: The contributions of school leaders and teachers. *Educational Studies*, 48(1), 98–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2020.1740978>
- Zenda, R. (2021). Implementing a parental involvement policy to enhance physical sciences learner's academic achievement in rural secondary schools. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 20(2), 125–143. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1303401>
- Zhang, D., Hsu, H.-Y., Kwok, O.-M., Benz, M., & Bowman-Perrott, L. (2016). The impact of basic-level parent engagements on student achievement: Patterns associated with race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status (SES). *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 22(1), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207310394447>
- Zhang, Y. (2020, June). Quality matters more than quantity: Parent–child communication and adolescents' academic performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(Article 1203), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01203>

Zilberstein, K. (2016). Parenting in families of low socioeconomic status: A review with implications for child welfare practice. *Family Court Review*, 54(2), 221–231.

<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/fcre.12222>

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Questions for Potential Participants
What challenges cause you to be absent from your child's high school educational experience?
Whose responsibility is it to initiate a partnership between parents and teachers, and why is it important?
In what ways do parents show that they are interested in their child's high school education?
Why should District X provide training for teachers regarding developing parental relationships?
What type of relationship do you have with non-English-speaking parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds?
What type of relationship do you have with your student's parents that are from low socioeconomic status?
What strategies and programs have you been a part of that increased parental involvement for parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds?
In what ways does parental involvement benefits high school students?
How would you describe the socioeconomic status of your family when you were a child?
How many years do you have in teaching, and how does that affect your parental relationships?

Appendix B: Email to Participants

Date:

Dear _____,

I have been working on a research study, and I need your help.

My goal in this study is to identify the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education.

If I can identify and remove the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education, then their children will potentially have higher attendance rates, test scores, and fewer discipline infractions.

Would you like to be a part of the solution? If so, I would like to request your participation in my research study about parental involvement in high school education. I want to conduct a semistructured interview and focus group and have you fill out a questionnaire as part of the data collection process. The semistructured interview and the focus group will both last 60 minutes. With complete confidence, I want you to know that your confidentiality is safe with this study. I will change your name to a pseudonym, and the audio or video recordings and interviews will be securely stored on campus with the faculty mentor for a period of 3 years following the completion of the study. Prior to any data collection, participants will give verbal and written consent. You have the right to withdraw from this study at any time without any repercussions. If you would like to participate in this study, please email me at xxxxx@acu.edu, stating your interest in participating in the study.

Sincerely

Jason Shepherd
Doctoral Candidate, Abilene Christian University

Appendix C: Informed Consent

Introduction: Barriers That Prevent Parents From Low Socioeconomic Backgrounds From Being Involved in High School Education at District X in Rural East Texas.

You may be able to take part in a research study. This form provides important information about that study, including the risks and benefits to you as a potential participant. Please read this form carefully and ask the researcher any questions that you may have about the study. You can ask about research activities and any risks or benefits you may experience. You may also wish to discuss your participation with other people, such as your family doctor or a family member.

Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or stop your participation at any time and for any reason without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

PURPOSE & DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this is to present information about the perceived barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from being involved in their child's education at District X in rural East Texas. The researcher hopes to learn various strategies that will improve parental involvement in schools.

If selected for participation, you will be asked to physically attend two visits with the study staff over the course of 2 weeks. Each visit is expected to take 60 minutes. During these visits, you will be asked to participate in the following procedures: As a participant in this study, you will fill out a Google form questionnaire, be involved in a one-on-one interview, and participate in a focus group. The interviews and the focus groups both will last approximately 60 minutes. Your participation will be audio or video recorded for the purposes of researcher accuracy.

RISKS & BENEFITS: There are risks to taking part in this research study. Below is a list of the foreseeable risks, including the seriousness of those risks and how likely they are to occur:

Breach of Confidentiality: Not serious in this study and not likely to occur based on the precautions described in the next section.

Emotional Stress: Could be serious but extremely unlikely to occur.

There are potential benefits to participating in this study. There are a couple of benefits that could relate to this study as well. For example, you may get a sense of self-awareness and knowledge going forward on the issue at hand. You may learn different strategies to take back to your campus and implement. The researcher cannot guarantee that you will experience any personal benefits from participating in this study.

INCLUSION OR EXCLUSION CRITERIA (PARTICIPANT QUALIFYING CRITERIA):

You may be ***eligible*** for this study if you:

- are heavily involved in your child's education
- grew up in a low socioeconomic status household
- teach at a Title I high school with parents that are reluctant to get involved with high school education

You will be ***ineligible and excluded from participation*** in this study if you are:

- a school administrator, parent, student, and/or community advocate

PRIVACY & CONFIDENTIALITY: Any information you provide will be confidential to the extent allowable by law. Some identifiable data may have to be shared with individuals outside of the study team, such as members of the ACU Institutional Review Board. Otherwise, your confidentiality will be protected by storing data on password-protected drives accessed through password-protected devices. The primary risk with this study is a breach of confidentiality. However, the researcher has taken steps to minimize this risk. The researcher will not be collecting any personal identification data during the survey. However, Survey Monkey may collect information from your computer. You may read their privacy statements here:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/policy/privacy-policy/>.

CONTACTS: If you have questions about the research study, the lead researcher is Jason Shepherd and may be contacted at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or xxxxx@acu.edu. If you are unable to reach the lead researcher or wish to speak to someone other than the lead researcher, you may contact Dr. xxx at xxx-xxx-xxxx or xxxxx@acu.edu. If you have concerns about this study, believe you may have been injured because of this study, or have general questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact ACU's Chair of the Institutional Review Board and Executive Director of Research, Dr. xxx, at xxxxx@acu.edu.

Additional Information

The researcher expects 10–15 participants to be enrolled in the study. There may be unexpected risks associated with your participation in this study, and some of those may be serious. The researcher will notify you if any such risks are identified throughout the course of the study, which may affect your willingness to participate. Your participation may be ended early by the researcher for certain reasons. For example, the researcher may end your participation if you no longer meet study requirements, the researcher believes it is no longer in your best interest to continue participating, you do not follow the instructions provided by the researcher, or the study is ended. You will be contacted by the researcher and given further instructions if you are removed from the study. Please let the researcher know if you are participating in any other research studies at this time.

Consent Signature Section

Please sign this form if you voluntarily agree to participate in this study. Sign up only after you have read all the information provided and your questions have been answered to your satisfaction. You should receive a copy of this signed consent form. You do not waive any legal rights by signing this form.

Printed Name of Participant

Signature of Participant

Date

Printed Name of Researcher

Signature of Researcher

Date

Appendix D: One-on-One Interview Protocol

1. Tell me about your experience growing up as a child and your role as a teacher or a parent.
2. What are teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from engaging in high school education at District X in rural East Texas?
3. In what ways does parent perception of teachers affect parental involvement?
4. What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parent volunteers and parental involvement in high school education in rural East Texas?
5. How would you describe the communication between parents and teachers at District X?
6. What is your perception regarding the effectiveness of teacher–parent relationships at District X and why?
7. How does mental health affect parental involvement in high school education?
8. In what ways does parental involvement benefit your classroom?
9. Who is responsible for removing barriers that prevent parents from being involved in high school education?
10. In what ways can teachers advocate and promote parental involvement at District X?

Appendix E: IRB Approval

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

Educating Students for Christian Service and Leadership Throughout the World

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
328 Hardin Administration Building, ACU Box 29145, Abilene, Texas 79699-9145
325-674-2885



September 2, 2022

Jason Shepherd
Department of Organizational Leadership
Abilene Christian University

Dear Jason,

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board, I am pleased to inform you that your project titled "Barriers that Prevent Parents from Low Socioeconomic Backgrounds from Being Involved in High School Education",

(IRB # 22-099) was approved by expedited review (Category 6&7) on 9/2/2022 . Upon completion of this study, please submit the Inactivation Request Form within 30 days of study completion.

If you wish to make any changes to this study, including but not limited to changes in study personnel, number of participants recruited, changes to the consent form or process, and/or changes in overall methodology, please complete the Study Amendment Request Form

If any problems develop with the study, including any unanticipated events that may change the risk profile of your study or if there were any unapproved changes in your protocol, please inform the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and the IRB promptly using the Unanticipated Events/Noncompliance Form.

I wish you well with your work!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Qi Hang'.

Qi Hang (Sep 2, 2022 14:31 CDT)

ACU Executive Director of Research

Additional Approvals/Instructions:

The following are all responsibilities of the Primary Investigator (PI). Violation of these responsibilities may result in suspension or termination of research by the Institutional Review Board. If the Primary Investigator is a student and fails to fulfil any of these responsibilities, the Faculty Advisor then becomes responsible for completing or upholding any and all of the following:

- If there are any changes in the research (including but not limited to change in location, members of the research team, research procedures, number of participants, target population of participants, compensation, or risk), these changes must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation.
- Report any protocol deviations or unanticipated problems to the IRB promptly according to IRB policy.
- Should the research continue past the expiration date, submit a Continuing Review Form, along with a copy of the current consent form and a new Signature Assurance Form approximately 30 days before the expiration date.
- When the research is completed, inform the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. If your study is Expedited or Full Board, submit an Inactivation Request Form and a new Signature Assurance Form. If your study is Exempt, Non-Research, or Non-Human Research, email orsp@acu.edu to indicate that the research has finished.
- According to ACU policy, research data must be stored on ACU campus (or electronically) for 3 years from inactivation of the study, in a manner that is secure but accessible should the IRB request access.
- It is the Investigator's responsibility to maintain a general environment of safety for all research participants and all members of the research team. All risks to physical, mental, and emotional well-being as well as any risks to confidentiality should be minimized.

For additional information on the policies and procedures above, please visit the IRB website <https://cdn01.acu.edu/community/offices/academic/orsp/human-research/overview.html> or email orsp@acu.edu with your questions.

Appendix F: Focus Group Questions

1. What are ways teachers can reach out to parents that are reluctant to get involved in high school education?
2. How do you think the implementation of technology affects low socioeconomic parents' communication with teachers?
3. What are some of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education?
4. What type of support do you think would be helpful to you regarding working with parents in teacher–parent partnerships?
5. Through your experiences, what is the state of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds regarding their commitment to their child's education?

Appendix G: Question Correlation

Semistructured Interview Questions	Focus Group Question	Questionnaire	Research Questions	Framework
<p>1) Tell me about your life background and your role as a teacher or a parent.</p> <p>2) What are teachers' perceptions of the barriers that prevent low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking parents from engaging in high school education at District X in rural East Texas?</p> <p>3) What are your perceptions of low-socioeconomic parents' commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?</p> <p>4) What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parent volunteers and parental involvement in 9–</p>	<p>1) What are teachers' responsibilities in increasing parental involvement at District X in rural East Texas?</p> <p>2) How do you think the implementation of technology affects low socioeconomic parents' communication with teachers?</p> <p>3) What are some of the barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in high school education?</p> <p>4) What type of support do you think would be helpful to you regarding working with parents in</p>	<p>1) What barriers prevent you from being involved in your child's education?</p> <p>2) What is the parent's responsibility to reach out to the teacher regarding parental involvement opportunities?</p> <p>3) In what ways do parents show their commitment to their child in high school education?</p> <p>4) Why should District X provide training for teachers regarding developing parental relationships?</p> <p>5) What type of relationship</p>	<p>RQ1: What are teachers' perceptions of barriers that prevent low socioeconomic parents from engaging in high school education at District X in rural East Texas?</p> <p>RQ2: What are teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?</p> <p>RQ3: What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?</p>	<p>Hornby and Lafaele (2011) created an explanatory framework describing factors inhibiting parental involvement in their child's education. Some parents and other family members only believe their responsibility involves taking their children to school. Apart from the parents' beliefs, parents' current life context can also affect how they are involved in the child's education (Hornby, 2011).</p>

<p>12 public schools in rural East Texas?</p> <p>5) How would you describe the communication between parents and teachers at District X?</p> <p>6) What is your perception regarding the effectiveness of teacher–parent relationships at District X and why?</p> <p>7) What do you believe are factors that prevent parents from being involved in their child’s education?</p> <p>8) What strategies or programs should District X put in place to create a welcoming culture and to remove barriers that prevent low socioeconomic and non-English-speaking parents from being involved in their child’s education?</p> <p>9) In what ways does parental involvement</p>	<p>teacher–parent partnerships?</p> <p>5) Through your experiences, what is the state of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child’s education?</p>	<p>do you have with non-English-speaking parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds?</p> <p>6) Why type of relationship do you have with your student’s parents that are from low socioeconomic status?</p> <p>7) Who should initiate the communication and partnership between teachers and parents and why?</p> <p>8) How would you describe your commitment to your child’s education?</p> <p>9) How would you describe the socioeconomic status of your family when you were a child?</p> <p>10) How many years do you have in</p>		
---	---	--	--	--

<p>benefit your classroom?</p> <p>10) Who is responsible for removing barriers that prevent parents from being involved in high school education and why?</p> <p>11) In what ways can teachers advocate and promote parental involvement at District X?</p>		<p>teaching, and how does that affect your parental relationships?</p>		
	<p>Through your experiences, what is the state of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education?</p>	<p>In what ways do parents show their commitment to their child's high school education?</p>	<p>RQ2: What are teachers' perceptions of parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds of their commitment to their child's education at District X in rural East Texas?</p>	
			<p>RQ3: What are teachers' perceptions of their role in removing barriers that prevent parents from low socioeconomic backgrounds from being involved in their children's high school education at District X in rural East Texas?</p>	