ISSN: 2148-9955

International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)

www.ijres.net

Parents' Perceptions of Their Involvement in Schooling*

Mehmet Akif Erdener[1], Robert C. Knoeppel[2]
[1]Balıkesir University
[2]Clemson University

To cite this article:

Erdener, M.A., & Knoeppel, R.C. (2018). Parents' perceptions of their involvement in schooling. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 4*(1), 1-13. DOI:10.21890/ijres.369197

IJRES International Journal of Research in Education and Science
Volume 4, Issue 1, Winter 2018 DOI:10.21890/ijres.369197

Parents' Perceptions of Their Involvement in Schooling

Mehmet Akif Erdener, Robert C. Knoeppel

Article Info

Article History

Received:
5 November 2017

Accepted:
20 December 2017

Keywords

Parent involvement
Family studies
Schooling
Family income
Parent education level

Abstract

Parent involvement has an influence on children's educational engagement during the elementary years. The objective of this study was to examine the perceptions of rural Turkish parents about their involvement in schooling with elementary school students based on Epstein's (1995) six types of parental involvement (parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community). This study also investigated the differences among parent demographic characteristics (education level, income, marital status, and age) and parent involvement at the elementary grade level in rural areas of Turkey. 742 parents of elementary schools in three rural settings in the city of Konya, Turkey completed questionnaires and assessments. A quantitative analyze method is used to analyze verified data. Findings indicated that family income had a statistically significant impact on combined factors of parent involvement. Education level by Age interaction, Income by Age interaction, and Education level by Income by Age interaction had a statistically significant impact on combined factors of parent involvement. No significant differences were found in parent involvement among parents who are from different education levels, marital status, and age groups in Turkey. This study showed that family income is the most significant factor on parental involvement in schooling for Turkish parents in all regions.

Introduction

In the last two decades, educational researchers have been interested in the positive effects parental involvement can have on students' academic achievements and successes. Parent involvement increases students' academic achievement and self-esteem (Erdoğan & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010; Desimone, 1999) while decreasing absenteeism and behavioral problems (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002a; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002b; Michael, Dittus, & Epstein, 2007; Sezer & İşgör, 2010; Sezer, 2016). Epstein (2005b) emphasized "parental involvement as an essential component of school improvement, linked to the curriculum, instruction, assessments, and other aspects of school management" (p. 179).

Parent involvement is defined as requires asking about their children's homework, contacting a teacher, and also, watching every single move a student makes (Knisely, 2011). In addition, parent involvement includes parent-student communication, family rules with consequences, parental support of academics, parent-school communication initiated at a school level versus the teacher level as well as parents checking on homework (Knisely, 2011). The level of parental involvement in education is a significant concern among educators, because there is a strong relationship established between parental involvement and student success (Knisely, 2011). So, countless research studies have shown a consistent relationship between parental involvement overall and academic achievement (Jeynes, 2005a).

Furthermore, parental involvement is an important ingredient for the remedy for many problems in education and it has positive influences on students' academic achievements (Fan & Chen, 2001). On the other hand, Fan and Chen (2001) said that parental supervision had a weak relationship with students' academic achievement; though parental aspiration or expectation for children's educational achievement had a considerably stronger relationship with students' academic achievement. Additionally, Coleman and McNeese (2009) claimed that "the relationships between parental involvement and student motivation and parental involvement and academic achievement both showed a negative correlation, which was unexpected" (p. 468).

On the contrary, parental involvement is an important factor in promoting the successful transition of youth with disabilities (Geenen & Powers, 2001), and influences not only student's motivation but also teacher's

willingness to increase their performance (Jeynes, 2005a). Parent involvement is an efficient social investment with a payoff far greater than its costs and it provides students equity and equal opportunity in education (Currie, 1997; Desimone, 1999). Moreover, parent involvement promotes a strong belief about children's well-being (Desimone, 1999; Heclo, 1997; Sezer, 2013). Michael et al. (2007) explained that family, school, and the community partnerships increase resources for student learning, strengthen families, and sustain healthier communities.

Education policies support parent involvement, and the partnerships of home, school, and the community. The Turkish Ministry of Education was supporting the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNICEF) started a project that is called "Haydi Kızlar Okula." The purpose of the project was to provide girls, between the ages of 6 and 14 years, who did not go to school, had chronic absenteeism, and high drop-out rates, the opportunity to go school with the goal closing the gender gap (Haydi Kızlar Okula, 2009; Tezci, 2005). The second purpose of the campaign was to inform parents about the importance of education, and to provide them the opportunity to be involved in the education process. To achieve this goal, teams were created by the Ministry of Education that visited families door to door. The campaign was started in 2003 and in four years, it successfully enrolled 222,800 of the 273,447 girls in elementary and middle schools among who were not previously enrolled in any school (The Ministry of Education, 2011). The project required collaboration among parents, schools, and the community including local governors, religious leaders, journalists, and intellectuals.

Families influence their children's educational engagement, and occupational aspirations (Rosenberg & Lopez, 2010), and they are their children's first teachers (Erdoğan & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010). Epstein (2001) explained that children learn from their families, teachers, peers, relatives, part-time employers, and other adults in the community, so bridges among home, school, and community are certainly important. Additionally, family and community involvement in schools might increase the academic achievement of students, ensure better school attendance, and improve school programs and quality (Michael et al., 2007). Research by Epstein (2001) stressed the following points: 1) families care about their children's success; nevertheless, most parents need more information from schools to be productively involved in their children's education; 2) students learn more than academic skills at home, at school, and in the community; 3) peers, families, and the organization of activities in schools and classrooms positively or negatively influence students; and 4) community-based programs supporting school and families might effectively increase students' chances of success. Additionally, Epstein (2005a) suggested that educators, parents, and community partners might work collaboratively to design and conduct activities, so these activities improve student achievement, promote school goals for student attendance and behavior, and create a positive climate of partnership. She also described how these activities might be designed by teams including the principal, teachers, school council and parents who are accountable for their plans and work. Such activities are also influential in the acquisition of self-regulatory learning skills that also contribute to the lifelong learning of students (Aktan & Tezci, 2013).

Epstein conducted research over several decades using a model of parent involvement that she based on Bronfenbrenner's (1977) social ecological model (Epstein, 1985; 1987). She categorized parent involvement into six major types: (1) parenting, (2) communicating, (3) volunteering, (4) learning at home, (5) decision making, and (6) collaborating with the community. These types are parenting involvement are defined below.

Parenting activities demonstrate how schools increase the understanding of families about student needs and interests, as well as assist families to meet their parenting responsibilities at each grade level to influence child growth and development (Epstein et al., 2009).

Communicating activities increase two way communications from home to school and from school to home in order to develop understanding and cooperation between school and home. It is important for school personnel to establish clear communication with families who speak languages other than English at home (Epstein et al., 2009).

Volunteering activities encourage parents and community members to share their time and talents to help schools, teachers, and students. These parents and community members might assist schools in the library, computer room, playground, and cafeteria for after school activities, celebrations, sport activities and other events (Epstein et al., 2009).

Learning at home activities guide parents to help their children with homework; to increase reading skills; to select courses and school programs; to plan postsecondary education, and to benefit from other learning opportunities (Epstein et al., 2009).

Decision Making activities encourage parents to become involved in the decision making process about school programs, activities, and their children's future academic plan. It informs all parents about school policies and provides opportunities for parents to support their school and students (Epstein et al., 2009).

Collaborating with the community activities help to increase the cooperation among schools, families, organizations, community groups, and agencies. Community resources include human, economic, material, and social resources. Such resources assist schools to improve student success and create a safe learning environment (Epstein et al., 2009).

In the light of this model, Epstein (Epstein, 2005a; Epstein et al., 2002; Epstein et al., 2009) gave recommendations about how schools should work with families and communities. Schools need to establish action teams that focus on reading, writing, math, behavior, a positive school climate and other school improvement goals. Each action team has a one year action plan (Epstein, 2005a), and these plans must emphasize all six types of family and community involvement to create productive involvement at school, at home, and in the community (Epstein et al., 2002). Also, Epstein's (2005a) study showed that the action teams for school improvement developed curriculum content and instructional approaches in classrooms as well as increased the number of families and community partners from diverse cultural groups who were involved in their students' education. Epstein and Sanders (1998) studied home-school and community partnership organizations to ensure all students have equal opportunities and to make families aware of children's development and the schooling process.

Moreover, Epstein (2005a) explained that home-school and community partnership programs help teachers and families focus on helping students learn positive character traits such as honesty, listening, respecting others, and being a friend. Well-designed programs build bridges among home, school, and the community and create a sustained school culture and positive school climate to increase students' achievement (Epstein, 2001; Tezci, 2011). Also important are home, school, and community advocacy efforts that encourage school health programs in states, districts, schools, and classrooms nationwide (Michael et al., 2007).

Parents' demographic characteristics (e.g., parents' education level, socioeconomic status, and marital status) have been found significantly related to parent involvement in education. Parents with post-secondary education have a positive effect on children's interest in literacy activities (Baroody & Dobbs-Oates, 2009). In addition, these parents encourage their young children's self-concept development (Ayhan, 2008). There is a correlation between parent's education level and student academic achievement (Hortacsu, 1995) and students with educated parents have less behavioral problems in the school (Hill et al., 2004). In addition, Cooper (2010) noted that families' socio-economic status during kindergarten may have an impact on their children's transition through the early years of schooling. Poverty negatively affects parent involvement because, these families lack the time, and money (Erdoğan & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010), which means that they may not provide cognitively stimulating materials for their children (Cooper, Crosnoe, Suizzo & Pituch, 2010).

Additionally, Epstein and Sanders (1998) reported that parents of elementary students are more involved than parents of children in secondary schools; mothers are more involved than fathers; and more educated parents are more involved than less educated parents. In addition, marital status is influential on student achievement (Jeynes, 2005b), and intact families have a positive impact on their children's academic achievement (Cooper, 2010). Epstein and Sanders (1998) said researchers in many nations are working to understand the relationship between school, home and community by using many different research methods to build knowledge in their field. While parent education level and parent income affect parental involvement, one of the important factors is to increase parental involvement is teachers' willingness and smiling faces during meetings with parents (Erdener, 2014). Parents everywhere care about their children and want them to be successful (Epstein & Sanders, 1998, p. 392). Snyder et al. (2009) said that all teachers and staff in the school, parents and the community developed to specifically target the positive development of student behavior and character. So, the interaction of family, teacher and the community assists students to gain not only the knowledge, attitudes, norms, and skills but also improves values, self-concept, family bonding, communication, and appreciation of school.

Statement of the Problem

Families support children's learning and growth from cradle to career, so they impact child development across all grades (Rosenberg & Lopez, 2010). Parents' demographics (e.g., parents' education level, socioeconomic status, and marital status) may be influential on parent involvement. There is a relationship between parents'

demographic characteristics and parent involvement (Baroody & Dobbs-Oates, 2009; Cooper, 2010; Cooper et al., 2010; Crosnoe, 2001; Englund et al., 2004; Epstein & Sanders, 2002; Erdoğan & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010; Hill et al., 2004; Hortacsu, 1995; Suizzo & Soon, 2006). Many studies have investigated the relationship between parental involvement and student achievement or success, and parent's demographics and parental involvement. Epstein and her colleagues have studied the effects of parent involvement which they categorized into six major types: (1) parenting, (2) communicating, (3) volunteering, (4) learning at home, (5) decision making, and (6) collaborating with the community on student academic achievement and behaviors.

In contrast, investigations into the relationship between parent's demographic characteristics and parent involvement in Turkey are minimal. The extant knowledge about cultural influences on parents' perceptions of their involvement in schooling is limited. Therefore, this study analyzed Turkish parents' perceptions of their involvement in schooling at elementary schools in Turkey. The research also analyzed the differences between Turkish parent's demographic characteristics (e.g., parents' education level, socioeconomic status, and marital status) and Epstein's six types of parental involvement.

Purpose of the Study

Studies have shown that parent involvement in schooling positively affect students' academic achievement (Epstein, 2001; Erdoğan & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010). Determining the effective level of parent involvement may be associated with parents' demographics. The primary purpose of this study was to investigate Turkish parents' perceptions of their involvement in schooling at elementary grades in rural areas of Turkey. The second purpose of this study was to explore the cultural influences on Turkish parents with their involvement in schooling. Thirdly, this study examined the differences among parent demographic characteristics (education level, income, marital status, and age) and parent involvement at the elementary grade level in rural areas of Turkey. The assessment of parent involvement was developed by Epstein using her model of parent involvement as six types: (1) parenting, (2) communicating, (3) volunteering, (4) learning at home, (5) decision making, and (6) collaborating with the community. Finally, this study explored the potential differences among Epstein's six aspects of parent involvement and rural parenting practices in Turkey. Understanding parents' perceptions about parent involvement may help educators understand the weaknesses and strengths of the relationship among home, school, and the community. So that school administrators and teachers may more effectively promote parent involvement in schooling.

This research explored following question: What is the difference among parents' perceptions when grouped parent education level, income, marital status, and age on Epstein's six factors of parent involvement as described (parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community) in Turkey?

First of all, parent involvement in education is a key component for students' academic success. Many studies showed a positive correlation between parental involvement and student achievement (Epstein, 2001; Erdoğan & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010; Jeynes, 2005a; Shaw, 2008). The significance of this study was to examine the perceptions of rural Turkish parents regarding effective parental involvement with elementary school students based on Epstein's (1995) six types of parental involvement. Therefore, this study's results may indicate more effective means of parental involvement. The findings of this study provided significant information that will extend knowledge about the phenomenon of parent involvement.

Theoretical Framework

Human development is a process that is affected by interaction with changing environments (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). The theoretical framework used in this study is Bronfenbrenner's Bioecoloogical theory that focused on the interactions between the environment and the individual. Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Theory (1977; 1986) included five systems: 1) Microsystems, 2) Mesosystem, 3) Exosystem, 4) Macrosystem, and 5) Chronosystem. Bronfenbrenner (1977) explained that the ecological theory is a lifespan theory and the mutual accommodation progressive happens between the individual and changing environment. There are reciprocal interactions between these systems and the child (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). The child is at the center of the systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1977); the relationship existing between the family and the school is a powerful factor affecting the capacity of a child to learn in the classroom (Bronfenbrenner, 1986).

According to Bronfenbrenner's theory, the microsystem includes the interactions between the developing person and environment (e.g., home, school, workplace, etc.). There is a direct interaction between the child and school, the child and family, and the child and peers. The mesosystem includes the interrelations among major settings containing the developing person (e.g., home, school, neighborhood, peers, religious affiliation, etc.). The exosystem includes the major institutions of the society such as the neighborhood, the mass media, agencies of government (local, state, and national), policies in education, communication and transportation facilities, and informal social networks (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). The exosystem is an extension of the mesosystem and it directly and indirectly affects the child. Finally, the macrosystem includes institutional patterns of the culture or subculture, such as the economic, social, educational, legal, and political systems, and also social interchanges (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Bronfenbrenner (1977; 1986) explained that children are affected by parents and school independently and interactively. Each interaction between the child and the systems influences child development and characteristics (Bronfenbrenner, 1986).

Parent involvement is a process of child development in social and educational environments. Furthermore, Epstein's (2010) overlapping spheres of influence model demonstrates the relationships of the school, family, and community for a child's success in school. Epstein (2010) recognized the child at the center as the focus within the family, school, and community. Children have interactions with their families, their schools, and their communities (Epstein, 1995). Families, their schools, and communities influence a child's academic achievement and success (Epstein, 1995). Epstein (2010) stated that each component of the external structure of the overlapping spheres might act and interact with others and these actions influence student learning and development.

Method

Research Design

Instrument

This research study used a survey designed to identify the Turkish parents' perceptions of their involvement in schooling. The researcher adapted a survey by Epstein et al. (2009, p. 324-329). The survey included Epstein's six categories of parental involvement with an additional category of parental expectations. The survey contained 29 parent involvement statements distributed among six categories of parental involvement. The survey questions were based on 5-point Likert scale for perceptions ranging from a low score of 1 (*never*) to a high score of 5 (*frequently*). Additionally, the instrument included a section on parent demographic information. This section helped the researcher investigate the differences between parents' demographic characteristics and their school involvement as measured by Epstein's survey and model of parent involvement.

Participants

The targeted populations in this study were parents of elementary schools students (grades 1-5) currently enrolled in a public school system in rural areas of the city of Konya, Turkey. Participants were selected from these parents by a cluster sampling technique (Huck, 2011). The researcher delivered the survey to schools and schools sent the survey home with students to give to their parents. Both electronic as well as paper copies of surveys were made available. The parents received the survey and a request letter that explained the intent of the study and asked for their participation in the study. Parents were asked to complete the survey and return it to schools. Parents were not required to provide any identifying information. The anonymity of the subjects strengthens the validity of the instrument and the study. The means and standard deviations of participants' demographic characteristics in this study are represented in Table 1.

Three hundred sixty-eight (49.6%) participants did not have a high school diploma, 199 (26.8%) graduated from high school, 76 (10.2%) had some college coursework, 93 (12.5%) had bachelor's degrees, and 6 (0.8%) had graduate degrees. Moreover, three hundred ninety-one (52.7%) families were low income families, and had 1,000 Turkish liras (TL) or less monthly; 245 (33%) families had between 1,000 and 2,500 TL; 83 (11.2%) families have gotten between 2,500 and 5,000 TL; 15 (2%) families had between 5,000 and 10,000 TL; and 8 (1.1%) families had 10,000 or more TL monthly. The last two groups were high-income families.

Table 1. Parent demographics

	N	Min	Max	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
ED_LEVEL	742	1	5	1396	1.88	.040	1.077
INCOME	742	1	5	1230	1.66	.031	.837
AGE	742	1	5	2394	3.23	.024	.651
MARITAL	742	1	5	832	1.12	.020	.536
Valid N	742						

Additionally, four (.5%) participants were 18 or 19 years old. These participants were probably the brother or sister of the students. Sixty (8.1%) participants were between 20 and 29 years of age; four hundred sixty two (62.3%) participants were between 30 and 39 years of age and this group had highest number of children who enrolled the elementary school in Turkey. One hundred ninety-six (26.4%) participants were between 40 and 49 years old, and 20 (2.7%) parents of guardians were in 50 years and older. Furthermore, six hundred ninety-six (93.8%) participants had been married once, and 20 (2.7%) participants were remarried. The cumulative number of married families was seven hundred sixteen (96.5%), which reflects the intact family structure is high in Turkey. Thirteen (1.8%) participants were separated, 8 (1.1%) participants were widowed, and 5 (0.7%) participants were never married.

Analysis Overview

Once all surveys were returned, data analysis followed. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (version 21.0). The researcher interpreted data using Exploratory Factor analysis and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). Factor analysis provided the researcher with the ability to reduce and cluster the complexity of the variables, so it was easier for the researcher to investigate the problem (Huck, 2011; Mertler & Vannaatta, 2010). Davidov and Beuckelaer (2010) explained that some questions might have different meanings and content for individuals from different cultures or who speak languages. The survey's original language was English, and the researcher translated it into Turkish. As such, Davidov and Beuckelaer (2010) suggested that the researcher needed to evaluate the reliability of the survey instrument. Factor analysis was used in this study to test for equivalence of the survey questions across cultural groups. Field (2009) stated that MANOVA included many dependent variables in the same analysis and considered the relationship between outcome variables. In addition, Mertler and Vannaatta (2010) explained that MANOVA incorporated two or more dependent variables in the same analysis with nominal and ordinal independent variables. MANOVA is designed to test the significance of group differences, and dependent variables that share a common conceptual meaning should have some degree of linearity (Mertler & Vannaatta, 2010).

Results and Discussion

The data were collected from 742 elementary school students' parents in Turkey. A factor analysis was performed using the Principal Component extraction method and revealed the presence of 5 factors with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining a total of 57.897 percent of variance. The Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) was 0.959 for sampling adequacy. Cronbach's alpha was used to check the reliability of the study; the reliability was 0.945 of 29 items. Despite these results indicating a strong model, one of the five factors was very weak, according to the Pattern Matrix. Questions 6, 11, 12, 27, 28, and 29 were removed and the factor analysis was rerun with Principal Component Analysis. An inspection of the scree plot displayed a clear break after the fourth factor. KMO was 0.948 with very good communalities, and the reliability was 0.934 of 23 items by using Cronbach's alpha. Direct Oblimin was used as a rotation method to interpret these four factors.

After the factor analysis was conducted, the factors were determined according to related questions and Epstein's typology labels. Factor 1 was labeled Parenting, and contained six items. The reliability of the Parenting factor was 0.836 of 6 items by using Cronbach's alpha. Factor 2 was labeled the Decision-Making, and contained six items. The reliability of Decision-Making factor was 0.828 of 6 items by using Cronbach's alpha. Factor 3 was a mix of three questions relating to Communicating and four questions relating to the Volunteering, and overall contained seven items. The researcher labeled this factor as School Interaction. The reliability of the School Interaction factor was 0.852 of 7 items by using Cronbach's alpha. The last factor was

labeled Learning at Home and contained four items. The reliability of the Learning at Home factor was 0.848 of 4 items by using Cronbach's alpha.

These four new factors were the dependent variables of this study. Then, the full Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The output of MANOVA includes the test for homogeneity of variance (Box's test), so the interpretations begins with the results of Box's test (Mertler & Vannaatta, 2010). The results of the Box's test of equality of variance, F (360, 13082.290) = 1.228, p = 0.002. The Box's test was significant and the groups were unequal, so the Pillai's Trace was chosen. "The multivariate normality implies that the sampling distribution of the means of each dependent variable in each cell is normally distributed" (Mertler & Vannaatta, 2010, p. 122), because of the possible violation of normality might be assessed by interpreting the results of Box's test. Nonetheless, Mertler and Vannaatta (2010) explained that a violation of this assumption of homoscedasticity will not prove fatal to analysis; despite this, a more robust multivariate test statistics, Pillai's Trace, was used to interpret the multivariate results.

The results of the multivariate test of parent involvement indicated that family income [Pillai's Trace = 0.047, F (16, 2424) = 1.814, p = 0.024, partial η2 = 0.012] is significantly affecting the combined dependent variables of Parenting, Decision-Making, School Interactions and Learning at Home. Education level by Age interaction [Pillai's Trace = 0.08, F (28, 2424) = 1.765, p = 0.008, partial η2 = 0.020] is significantly affecting the combined dependent variables of Parenting, Decision-Making, School Interactions and Learning at Home. Income by Age interaction [Pillai's Trace = 0.079, F (28, 2424) = 1.738, p = 0.01, partial η2 = 0.020] is significantly affecting the combined dependent variables of Parenting, Decision-Making, School Interactions and Learning at Home. Education level by Income by Age interaction [Pillai's Trace = 0.064, F (24, 2424) = 1.652, p = 0.024, partial η2 = 0.016] significantly affect the combined dependent variables of Parenting, Decision-Making, School Interactions and Learning at Home. Education level, Marital status, and Age do not statistically affect the combined dependent variables of Parenting, Decision-Making, School Interactions and Learning at Home. The results of multivariate test of parent involvement are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Multivariate test of parent involvement

Multivariate Tests[a] Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter
Intercept	.008	1.146[b]	4.000	603.00	.334	.008	4.585
ED_LEVEL	.036	1.377	16.000	2424.000	.143	.009	22.028
INCOME	.047	1.814	16.000	2424.000	.024	.012	29.021
AGE	.015	.585	16.000	2424.000	.898	.004	9.356
MARITAL	.037	1.402	16.000	2424.000	.131	.009	22.428
ED_LEVEL * AGE	.080	1.765	28.000	2424.000	.008	.020	49.411
INCOME * AGE	.079	1.738	28.000	2424.000	.010	.020	48.656
ED_LEVEL * INCOME * AGE	.064	1.652	24.000	2424.000	.024	.016	39.646

Note. Computed using alpha = .05

A Univariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted as a follow-up test. Income [F (4, 606) = 3.131, p = 0.015, partial η2 = 0.020] significantly affects the Parenting, and also [F (4, 606) = 2.62, p = 0.034, partial η2 = 0.017] significantly affects the School Interactions. Education by Income interaction [F (9, 606) = 2.45, p = 0.01, partial η2 = 0.035], and Education by Marital status interaction [F (3, 606) = 2.833, p = 0.038, partial η2 = 0.014] significantly affects the Learning at home. In addition, Education by Age interaction [F (7, 606) = 3.23, p = 0.002, partial η2 = 0.036] significantly affects the Decision-Making. The results of Univariate ANOVA are presenting on Table 3.

Four factors of parent involvement were found to exist after conducting the factor analysis. They were named: (1) parenting, (2) decision making, (3) school interactions, and (4) learning at home. Three of the factors contained almost the same questions that Epstein's factors had; as such, similar names were used for these factors. The collaborating with the community factor was not found to exist in this study. The cultural differences in the Turkish education system or decreased number of questions in the instrument might have been the cause of the change in the number of factors. The new factors are described as the following: First, parenting is an awareness of every step of child growth and development. Parents might be supported with more information from teachers about parenting. Second, Decision-Making is defined as being a part of Parent and Teacher Organizations at school so that parents are involved in the decision-making process for school

programs, and events. Involvement in Decision-Making may also be defined as parents discussing post-secondary and career plans with their children. Third, school-interactions are defined as communicating with schools and the community and volunteering for school activities and events. School-Interactions improve parents' and teachers' awareness about their child's talents, skills, and abilities. This helps teachers apply useful teaching methods and it helps parents to understand their children's capability so that they can better support them in their schooling. Last, learning at home is defined as parents monitoring and discussing the schooling process at home with their children. This can help parents to create better home conditions while sharing real life experience with their children.

Table 3. Parent demographics' effects on parent involvement

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter
Corrected Model	Parenting	180.133[a]	135	1.334	1.442	.002	.243	194.628
	Decision Making	172.679[b]	135	1.279	1.364	.008	.233	184.128
	School Interaction	207.104[c]	135	1.534	1.741	.000	.279	235.074
	Learning at Home	197.298[d]	135	1.461	1.629	.000	.266	219.905
Intercept	Parenting	.255	1	.255	.276	.600	.000	.276
	Decision Making	.319	1	.319	.341	.560	.001	.341
	School Interactions	.056	1	.056	.064	.801	.000	.064
	Learning at Home	2.070	1	2.070	2.307	.129	.004	2.307
INCOME	Parenting	11.591	4	2.898	3.131	.015	.020	12.523
	Decision Making	5.491	4	1.373	1.464	.212	.010	5.855
	School Interactions	9.231	4	2.308	2.620	.034	.017	10.478
	Learning at Home	3.733	4	.933	1.040	.386	.007	4.161
ED_LEVEL * AGE	Parenting	11.287	7	1.612	1.742	.097	.020	12.195
	Decision Making	21.203	7	3.029	3.230	.002	.036	22.609
	School Interactions	5.851	7	.836	.949	.468	.011	6.641
	Learning at Home	3.628	7	.518	.578	.774	.007	4.044
INCOME * AGE	Parenting	11.914	7	1.702	1.839	.077	.021	12.873
	Decision Making	11.001	7	1.572	1.676	.112	.019	11.730
	School Interactions	9.762	7	1.395	1.583	.138	.018	11.080
	Learning at Home	9.531	7	1.362	1.518	.158	.017	10.623
ED_LEVEL * INCOME * AGE	Parenting	5.356	6	.893	.964	.448	.009	5.787
	Decision Making	9.514	6	1.586	1.691	.121	.016	10.144
	School Interactions	8.850	6	1.475	1.674	.125	.016	10.046
	Learning at Home	9.940	6	1.657	1.846	.088	.018	11.079
Error	Parenting	560.867	606	.926				
	Decision Making	568.321	606	.938				
	School Interactions	533.896	606	.881				
	Learning at Home	543.702	606	.897				
Total	Parenting	741.000	742					
	Decision Making	741.000	742					
	School Interactions	741.000	742					
	Learning at Home	741.000	742					
Corrected Total	Parenting	741.000	741					
	Decision Making	741.000	741					
	School Interactions	741.000	741					
	Learning at Home	741.000	741					

Note. a. R Squared = .243 (Adjusted R Squared = .074)
b. R Squared = .233 (Adjusted R Squared = .062)
c. R Squared = .279 (Adjusted R Squared = .119)
d. R Squared = .266 (Adjusted R Squared = .103)
e. Computed using alpha = .05

The four factors were used as dependent variables to conduct the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). The findings indicated that family income level significantly affected the combined parent involvement factors of Parenting, Decision-Making, School Interactions and Learning at Home. On the other

hand, parent education level, marital status, and age did not significantly affect the combined dependent variables of Parenting, Decision-Making, School Interactions and Learning at Home. As earlier research indicated, educated parents have a positive effect on children's interest in literacy activities and motivation in early ages (Ayhan, 2008). In addition, in a study in of parents of fourth grade students in Ankara, Turkey, Hortacsu (1995) found that educated parents also affected children's cognitions, development, and their academic achievement. Nevertheless, this study was conducted in rural areas, and the number of parents who had bachelors and graduate degrees were low. More than 96% of participants had intact families, so the sample did not include a large enough number of participants who were separated, widowed, and never married.

Although, education level, marital status, and age did not significantly affect the combined parent involvement, there were some interactions among the independent variables that showed significant differences on parent involvement factors. The interaction between education level and age significantly affected the combined dependent variables of parent involvement. Also, the interaction between family income and age significantly affected the combined dependent variables of parent involvement. The finding is consistent with previous studies (Cooper, 2010; Erdoğan & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010; Hill et al., 2004; Reynolds, 1991) that indicated that parents who work in minimum wage jobs might not be involved in many school activities because they lack the time. Furthermore, poverty might limit these parents ability to obtain resources for their children's education. Finally, the interaction among education level, family income, and age, as well as the interaction among family income, and age significantly affected the combined dependent variables of parent involvement.

Moreover, the results of the follow-up test, the Univariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), indicated that some interactions of independent variables, and income separately affected the Parenting, the Decision-Making, the School Interactions and the Learning at Home factors. Income statistically affected the Parenting, and the School Interactions factors. The interaction between education and income, and also education and marital status statistically affected the Learning at Home factor. More than half of families earned the minimum wage, and almost 80% of families had low income in rural areas of the city of Konya. There are not private schools, so all parents send their children to public schools. Nevertheless, high income and middle income families might send their children to private learning centers and might also be able to afford tutoring expenses, and transportation. In addition, the government provides free textbooks for all children; however, there were many other schooling materials such as technology, the internet, new books etc. In the last decade, teachers have promoted the use of technology by students for their homework and projects. Although, high income and middle-income families might offer these materials to their children, low-income families cannot afford the internet, computers, and touchpad for their children.

Also, high income parents and one of the middle income levels were involved in school interactions for all three districts. These families had good communication with teachers. They were attending school activities and events. These parents also joined the school activities as volunteers. They were informed about how to monitor their children's schooling process.

In addition, the interaction between education and age statistically affected the Decision-Making factor. Educated parents in the Çumra district were involved in school interactions for all age groups except parents who had bachelor's degrees between the ages of 20-29 and 40-49. None of the parents in Akşehir had graduate degrees. The most involved parents in Cihanbeyli were in the age groups of 20-29 years and 40-49 years. All parents in this region were significantly involved in school interactions except those who had less than a high school degree. The most involved parents in this region had bachelor's degree and they were from the middle age groups. Therefore, highly educated parents from the middle and young age groups were involved in school activities and regularly communicated with teachers. The importance of education has increased among the Turkish people during the last two decades. Thus, educated parents paid attention to the significance of education for their children and they take the time to become involved in their children's schooling. In Çumra district, low income parents for all age groups were more likely to be involved in both the decision-making and the learning at home process more than high income families. High income and middle income parents who are in the 30-39 years of age were only involved in the decision-making process in Çumra. In addition, high income and middle income parents for different age groups were most likely to be involved in the decision-making and the learning at home process in Cihanbeyli and Akşehir districts. These parents joined the Parent and Teacher Organizations to make decision about school programs and activities. Also these parents discussed and monitored the schooling processes at home with their children. In the Çumra district, many people work at farming and breading livestock, so there are many low income families. This is an important finding because it was contrary to existing literature that low income parents are less involved in the decision making process at school than higher income families. Although this only happened in one region, the finding was noteworthy.

The study had several limitations. Survey research is a design that permits the collection of data from large numbers of participants, but depends on the participants' willingness to respond to a written data collection instrument (Pinsonneault & Kraemer, 1993). Surveys are useful in collecting participants' perceptions about behavior, but are limited by the participants' honesty, willingness to answer questions, and their recall of situations or events. All these limitations of the research design of surveys pertain to this study (Green, Camilli, & Elmore, 2006).

Conclusion

The findings of this study extended the work of previous research on parent involvement in the schooling process. This investigation revealed how the partnership between home and school is necessary in Turkey. Significant differences were found between family income levels on combined parent involvement factors. Also, there were significant differences between the parent demographic characteristics on combined or separate parent involvement factors.

Many parents agreed that educated parents and society affect student achievement because these groups of people have better communication with teachers and principals (Erdener, 2014). Parent involvement has an influence on children's educational engagement for all school levels (Erdener, 2016). Educated parents are involved in the decision making process about their children's post-secondary education plans, career plans, and parents think that students from high income families are more successful. In addition, parents claimed that family problems prevented their involvement in the schooling process. For the most part, poverty was the cause of these problems. The parent's comments suggested that parents agreed that parent involvement is definitely significant for students' academic achievement and behaviors problems, but they still believed that schools are responsible for schooling.

Therefore, the education system might require professional development for the school administrators and teachers about increasing parent involvement in their children's schooling. A school administrators' fairness and working in harmony can make it easier for teachers to increase their job motivation levels (Deniz & Erdener, 2016b). Principal might increase their instructional supervision about teachers' classroom activities and lead them to communicate with parents (Deniz & Erdener, 2016a). Also, teacher candidates might be informed about why parent involvement is necessary and how they can provide the partnership between home, school and the community in bachelor's degree. Some courses might be offered for educators by the school of education.

Recommendations

The significance of parent involvement in schooling has been occurred in Turkey. Next studies and researches will solve the problems which are the barrier of parent involvement. Future researches might be about teacher attitudes about parent involvement in different regions.

Acknowledgements

This study is a part of a doctoral dissertation. The research was supported by a grant from the Turkish Ministry of National Education. We sincerely thank Dr. Curtis Brewer, Dr. Bonnie Holaday, Dr. Jane Clark Lindle, and Dr. Russ Marion for their guidance.

References

Aktan, S., & Tezci, E. (2013). Matematikte öz düzenleyici öğrenme stratejileri ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalişmasi [The study of validity and reliability of self regulated learning strategies scale in mathematics]. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, (8),1, 46-62.

Ayhan, A. (2008). Altı yaş grubundaki çocukların kavram gelişimlerinin cinsiyete, anne-baba ögrenim düzeyine ve ana okuluna devam süresine göre incelenmesi [An examination of six-year-old children's concept development with respect to gender, parents' education level and time spent in preschool]. *Cagdas Egitim Dergisi*, (350), 33-38.

Baroody, A., & Dobbs-Oates, J. (2009). Child and parent characteristics, parental expectations, and child behaviors related to preschool children's interest in literacy. *Early Child Development and Care, 181*(3), 345–359.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*, 513 - 531.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology, 22*(6), 723 - 742.

Coleman, B & McNeese, M.N. (2009). From home to school: The relationship among parental involvement, student motivations, and academic achievement. International Journal of Learning, 16 (7), 459-470.

Cooper, C. E. (2010). Family poverty, school-based parental involvement, and policy-focused protective factors in kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *25*(4), 480-492.

Cooper, C. E., Crosnoe, R., Suizzo, M. A., & Pituch, K. A. (2010). Poverty, race, and parental involvement during the transition to elementary school. *Journal of Family Issues*, *31*(7), 859-883. doi: 10.1177/0192513X09351515

Crosnoe, R. (2001). Academic orientation and parental involvement in education during high school. *Sociology of Education, 74*, 210-230.

Currie, J. M. (1997). Choosing among alternative programs for poor children. *The Future of Children, 7*, 113-131.

Davidov, E., & Beuckelaer, A. D. (2010). How harmful are survey translations? A test with Schwartz's human values instrument. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 22*(4), 487-510.

Deniz, Ü. ve Erdener, M. A. (2016a). Okul müdürlerinin sergilediği öğretimsel denetim davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. Tüfekçi, Ö. K. (Ed.). *Sosyal bilimlerde stratejik araştırmalar* (ss. 69-81). Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Deniz, Ü. ve Erdener, M. A. (2016). Öğretmenlerin iş motivasyonlarını etkileyen etmenler. Tüfekçi, Ö. K. (Ed.). *Sosyal bilimlerde stratejik araştırmalar* (ss. 29-41). Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Desimone, L. (1999). Linking parent involvement with student achievement: Do race and income matter? *The Journal of Educational Research, 93*(1), 11-30.

Englund, M. M., Luckner, A. E., Whaley, G. J. L., & Egeland, B. (2004). Children's achievement in early elementary school: Longitudinal effects of parental involvement, expectations, and quality of assistance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*, 723-730.

Epstein, J.L. (1985). Home and school connections in schools of the future: Implications of research on parent involvement, *Peabody Journal of Education, 62* (2), 18-41. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01619568509538471

Epstein, J. L. (1987). Toward a theory of family-school connections: Teacher practices and parent involvement. In K. Hurrelmann, F. Kaufmann, and F. Lösel (Eds.). *Social intervention: Potential and constraints*, (pp. 121-136). New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(9), 701-712.

Epstein, J. L. (2001). Building bridges of home, school, and community: The importance of design. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 6*(1/2), 161-168.

Epstein, J. L. (2005a). A case study of the partnership schools comprehensive school reform (CSR) model. *Elementary School Journal*, *106*(2), 151-170.

Epstein, J. L. (2005b). Attainable goals? The spirit and letter of the No Child Left Behind Act on parental involvement. *Sociology of Education*, *78*(2), 179-182.

Epstein, J. L. (2010). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Epstein, J., & Sanders, M. G. (1998). What we learn from international studies of school-family-community partnerships. *Childhood Education*, *74*(6), 392-94.

Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2002). Family, school, and community partnerships. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 5. Practical issues in parenting* (pp. 407-437). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). *School, family, and community partnerships. Your handbook for action* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K., Jansorn, N., Van Voorhis, F. L., Martin, C. S., & Williams, K. J. (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2002a). Improving student behavior and school discipline with family and community involvement**.** *Education and Urban Society*, *35*(4), 4-26.

Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2002b). Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. *Journal of Educational Research, 95*(5), 308-318.

Erdener, M. A. (2014). The Factors Which Contribute or Limit Parent Involvement in Schooling. *NWSA-Education Sciences, 9*(1), 36-47.

Erdener, M. A. (2016). Principals and Teachers Practices about Parent Involvement in Schooling. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4*(12A), 151-159., doi: 10.13189/ujer.2016.041319 (Yayın No: 2981226)

Erdoğan, Ç., & Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2010). Ailelerin eğitim sürecine katılımına ilişkin öğretmen ve yönetici görüşleri [Teachers' and school administrators' views of parent involvement in education process]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice], 16*(3), 399-431.

Fan, X. & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 13 (1), 1-22.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Geenen, S., & Powers, L. E. (2001). Multicultural aspects of parent involvement in transition planning. *Exceptional Children*, 67(2), 265-282.

Green, J. L., Camilli, G., & Elmore, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research.* Philadelphia: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Haydi Kızlar Okula. (2009). *The purpose of the girls' education campaign.* Retrieved from http://haydikizlarokula.meb.gov.tr/index.php

Heclo, H. H. (1997). Values underpinning poverty programs for children. *The Future of Children, 7*, 141-148.

Hill, N. E., Castellino, D. R., Lansford, J. E., Nowlin, P., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E. (2004). Parent academic involvement as related to school behavior, achievement, and aspirations: Demographic variations across adolescence. *Child Development, 75*(5), 1491-1509.

Hortacsu, N. (1995). Parents' education levels, parents' beliefs, and child outcomes. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 156*(3), 373-383.

Huck, S. W. (2011). *Reading statistics and research* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Jeynes, W. H. (2005a). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, *40*(3), 237-269. doi:10.1177/0042085905274540

Jeynes, W. H. (2005b). Effects of parental involvement and family structure on the academic achievement of adolescents. *Marriage & Family Review, 37*(3), 99-116. doi: 10.1300/J002v37n03_06

Knisely, K. (2011). *Literature Review: How much does parental involvement really affect the student's success?* Retrieved from http://kniselymtt.pbworks.com/f/EDCI6300_kknisely_LiteratureReview.pdf

Mertler, C. A., & Vannaatta, R. A. (2010). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Michael, S., Dittus, P., & Epstein, J. (2007). Family and community involvement in schools: Results from the school health policies and programs study 2006. *Journal of School Health*, *77*(8), 567-587. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2007.00236.x

Pinsonneault, A., & Kraemer, K. L. (1993). Survey research methodology in management information systems: An assessment. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 10*(2), 75-105.

Reynolds, A. J. (1991). Comparing measures of parental involvement and their effects on academic achievement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *7*(3), 441-462.

Rosenberg, H., & Lopez, M. E. (2010, April). Family engagement from cradle to career. *Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE) Newsletter, 2*(1). Retrieved from http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/family-engagement-from-cradle-to-career

Sezer, F., & İşgör, İ. Y. (2010). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki öğrencilerin problem alanlarının tespiti (Erzurum ili örneği). *Millî Eğitim Dergisi*, *39*(186), 235-247.

Sezer, F. (2013). Factors that affect psychological wellbeing. *Education Sciences*, *8*(4), 489-504

Sezer, F. (2016). Causes of failure from students' point of view Öğrenci gözüyle başarısızlığının nedenleri. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *13*(3), 4818-4830.

Shaw, C. A. (2008). *A study of the relationship of parental involvement to student achievement in a Pennsylvania career and technology center*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University. State College, PA.

Snyder, F., Flay, B., Vuchinich, S., Acock, A., Washburn, I., Beets, M., & Li, K.K., (2009). Impact of a social-emotional and character development program on school-level indicators of academic achievement, absenteeism, and disciplinary outcomes: A matched-pair, cluster-randomized, controlled trial, *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *3*(1), 26-55, DOI: 10.1080/19345740903353436

SPSS Inc. (2011). SPSS Base 20.0 for Windows. IBM inc., Chicago, IL.

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

Tezci, E. (2011). Turkish primary school teachers' perceptions of school culture regarding ICT integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *59*(3), 429-443.

Tezci, E. (2015). Türkiye'de ilköğretim politikaları. (Ed.: Gümüş, Arife) Türkiye'de Eğitim Politikaları (s.237-272). Ankara: Nobel Yay.

The Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Turkey. (2011). *Haydi Kizlar Okula*. Retrieved from http://www.meb.gov.tr/

Turkish Statistical Institute. (2011). *Education statistics*. Retrieved from http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?tb_id=14&ust_id=5

Author Information

Mehmet Akif Erdener
Balıkesir University
Necatibey School of Education
Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership
Altıeylül, Balıkesir / Turkey
Contact e-mail: *erdener@balikesir.edu.tr*

Robert C. Knoeppel
Clemson University
Professor & Chair of Educational & Organizational Leadership Development
Clemson, SC / USA 29634