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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to; a) design an instrument that could be used to assess parent’s access to school social networks; b) to determine if relationships exist between parents’ beliefs and ability to access school networks and resources; and, c) to determine if there are significant differences in parents’ access to school networks and resources as it relates to social class. A total of 430 respondents replied to a 37-item survey consisting of 31-Likert scaled items and six demographic questions. All respondents were parents or guardians of middle grade students in one of two middle schools in a large suburban area in the Southeastern United States. Items on the survey were developed to align with social network theories, influences of social capital, and accessibility factors identified in previous research and aligned with Hatala’s (2009) research on social networks. An exploratory analysis using principal components factoring method with direct oblimin rotation was used to examine the factors and to investigate if the influences of social capital uncovered in the review of literature were indeed accessibility factors of school networks. Four factors (Management of Educational Experience, Network Information and Resources, Structural Barriers, and Parent Beliefs about Responsibilities) and two sub-factors (Negotiating the Context of School Structures and Accessing Information) were identified in the exploratory analysis. Furthermore, related samples t tests indicated there were significant relationships between parents’ beliefs, their actions, and their access to school networks. Also, independent samples t test of social class differences revealed that parents’ access and involvement within school networks is significantly impacted by certain structural barriers. The present findings suggest that the survey, School Network Accessibility for Parents Scale (SNAPS), is a useful tool for investigating parents’ social capital in school networks and highlights the importance of social capital research in educational settings. Further research is
needed to validate the scale across several school settings and contexts. Additionally, future research is needed to explore the impact of social class differences on family members’ access to school networks.
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Chapter One: Introduction and Rationale

Without a doubt, parents play a pivotal role in their child’s education. Research strongly suggests that parental involvement in a child’s schooling is an important influence that can have a positive impact on success (Brough & Irwin, 2001; Epstein, 1985; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1991). The federal, state, and local governments recognize the impact of parental involvement and continue to outline plans and guidelines to build partnerships between schools and families. As school districts implement plans that leverage parental involvement to improve academic achievement, it is important to understand the ways in which schools can build relations between home and school.

Almost all parents emphasize education for their children. Education is viewed as a path for social mobility, and the primary way that parents can aid their children in status attainment is to invest in their education (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996). Increasing parent participation in education has been a top priority in educational reform because research has shown that the actions, behaviors, and attitudes of parents can be a crucial determinant of educational performance. Theories and studies have identified the significant role of families, family-school relationships, and parental involvement in education. Studies have demonstrated the positive effects of parent involvement in children's schooling across a wide range of populations and ages (Epstein, 1985; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Lareau, 1987). Family-school relations and parental involvement in education have been identified as a way to close achievement gaps in education (Hill & Tyson, 2009). Yet, there are a multitude of reasons why education serves to reproduce inequities in the larger context of society, and much of the research has applied various lenses to approaching this problem.
Research has shown that parents and schools who are able to work together for a common cause can provide students with the support they need to be successful members of the community. But to approach the issues of parent involvement, educational research has been limited to measures and variables that do not fully capture the influence of home and community. Schools function as an organization with members. Each school setting can be viewed as a network of individuals. These school networks encompass the faculty members of the school, including teachers, administrators, counselors, graduation coaches, paraprofessionals, and other support staff, and the surrounding community, including the parents or guardians whose children attend the school or have attended the schools, community members who own businesses that partner or support the school, and other individuals that are in some way connected to schools through relationships or ties. Within this network, some individuals are more closely connected to the school due to their investment in their position within the school network. A closely connected community provides support to its members by providing access to potential resources, such as financial help or educational advice or professional knowledge, which can benefit members. At the center of this network is the school because information, knowledge, and potential stem from its resources. A school network connects parents and teachers through its established norms, it provides a flow of information through its communication, and it connect members of the community with its support. Through the discussion of school networks, it is important to understand that members are not equally connected and engagement. Some members have stronger connection or ties to the network than others, and this is due to a conscious investment in the network.

Up until the late 1960s and 1970s, schools and families were viewed as two separate contexts; researchers paid little attention to how these two overlapped and worked together. In
fact, most sociologists focused on one environment and not the other (Epstein & Sanders, 2000). When the federal government legislated the involvement of low-income parents as a component of programs such as Head Start and Title 1, research and practice suggested parental involvement would improve schools and students’ success (Epstein & Sanders, 2000). Soon after, researchers needed a new framework to understand how home and school environment impact student outcomes.

Sociologists such as Epstein sought to understand the relationship between home and school environments. Epstein’s research advanced the theory of overlapping spheres of influence to explain how home, school, and communities with common goals and interests work together to create effective environments for children’s learning and development. Thus, the field has progressed to include an understanding of how these environments need to work together to improve children’s development and learning.

To further understand the complex relationship between home and school, numerous studies explored the concept of parental involvement on various student outcomes. Research in the field has approached the issue of parental involvement using varying definitions and applying different ways to measure and assess the impact of involvement on student outcomes. Though typical quantitative measures of parent involvement include the number of times a parent visits the school or participates in school-related activities, this one-dimensional measurement proposes several limitations. Borrowing ideas from other fields, the concept of parent involvement becomes a multidimensional model that takes into account several types of involvement and resources that parents can provide.

Within these models of parental involvement is a concept exported from the field of sociology: social capital. As educational research focused on parental involvement, sociologists
began to refine theories about social capital. In simple form, social capital is the culmination of social resources an individual has acquired or has access to through his or her social connections with other individuals, groups, or institutions (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Lin, 2000; Mellin, Belknap, Brodie, Sholes, 2015). An institution like a school has the potential to build social capital within its network. School networks consist of teachers, faculty, students, parents, and other community members. Individuals who are connected to this network are able to use the resources embedded in its members. For example, parents are able to leverage the expertise of teachers and other professionals within their network to help their children be successful in school. Connected parents tend to be more informed and more able to navigate the context of schools because they utilize the resources within their networks. For example, parents swap advice about how to approach certain teachers or administrators to get information they need. Therefore, it is not enough to view school, home, and community as overlapping spheres of influence. There has to be a component to address the utility of these overlapping spheres – these social networks of individuals. Social capital is best understood within social networks, and parental involvement can be viewed through a social capital perspective.

**Rationale**

Epstein and Sanders (2000) explain, “It is essential to understand home, school, and community connections in order to understand the organization and improvement of schools, the influence of families and communities on children, and the academic and developmental progress or problems of students” (p. 298). Schools are incubators of social capital and contain many potential resources that can impact several outcomes. There are several initiatives in place to encourage schools to get parents involved. However, it is more complex than just having a
“parent night” which encourages parents to visit the school. Social capital measures need to take into account an individual’s ability to activate resources, not just possess them.

In his field, Hatala (2009) developed a network accessibility scale to measure an individual’s skills and abilities to access network resources. Hatala notes that his study is the first of many that needs to be conducted in order to develop such a scale to assess accessibility. He encourages future research with various populations in order to establish the stability of the Network Accessibility Scale (NAS). He notes, “By exposing an individual’s ability to access network resources, HRD practitioners stand to gain valuable insight into the potential connectivity within an organization” (p. 65). These ideas are needed in the field of educational research. The traditional measures of parent involvement in schools are not enough to capture the social capital. Likewise, it is not enough to just have a connection or a tie to a school network, parents also have to have the ability to leverage those ties.

Measures need to be developed to capture a parent’s ability to access school networks. This research will add the social network accessibility perspective to highlight one part of this larger issue and add to the body of knowledge by uncovering mechanisms that impact social capital within school, home, and community connections.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this research study is to design a scale that will capture a parent’s ability to access school networks and its resources. Parent’s beliefs, abilities, and action (mobilizing resources) all contribute to a parent’s capacity to build social capital by accessing school networks and the resources embedded in its members. Social capital theory notes that there are restrictions, structural barriers, in the form of access across race and gender and other groups to institutional resources. Lareau (1987), Horvat et al. (2003) and Lin (2000) also discuss the
differential access social groups have to network resources. As part of the research developing this scale, it will hopefully illuminate those restrictions and allow for deeper understanding as to how and why those barriers might exist. Research questions for the development of a School Network Accessibility for Parents (SNAP) Scale include:

1. What are the underlying factors that can be extracted from a parent survey about the beliefs, abilities, and involvement of parents that influence accessibility to school networks?
   a. Do these variables form meaningful constructs that further inform or confirm theory relating to a parent’s involvement in a school network?
2. Do relationships exist between a parent’s belief and ability and a parent’s access to school networks and resources?
3. Are there meaningful differences in a parent’s access to school network resources related to social class indicators?

The first two research questions will help identify variables that measure the construct of parents’ accessibility. The third question will allow an investigation of social class differences that contribute to measures of accessibility. An investigation of accessibility should take into account differential access to resources within school networks, as such the third question should determine the implications and use of this scale in future research.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Engaging parents in their child’s education has typically been a top priority of schools in the past decades. In an era of high accountability measures, it is more important that schools and parents work together to ensure the success of students. In trying to understand the strong connection between home, school, and community, research in the field of parent involvement and engagement has taken on multiple perspectives and approaches. It was not until the late 1970s and early 1980s did researchers pay attention to the impact of home environments on students’ success in school. Prior to this time period, school and home were considered separate environments that had little impact on one another. However, research has shown that these environments overlap and influence one another. In order to understand the relationship between home and school and subsequent impact on students, research in the field has developed frameworks aimed at understanding how these environments work together.

Concepts of parent involvement began as simple measures, such as frequency counts, that captured the involvement of parents. However, Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) argued for a multidimensional framework of parental involvement that takes into account several resources of a parent’s involvement in a child’s schooling. They propose three categories of involvement that allow for multiple facets and resources to be assessed. Similarly, Epstein (1985) also proposes six major types of involvement that are within the overlapping spheres of influence. Both models argue for the importance for schools to understand the level and types of parental involvement in order to create a strong, central community to positively impact student success.

Research conducted using the model of overlapping spheres of influence has generally found that teachers and schools often do not know much about parents’ interest and involvement with their children’s education (Epstein & Sanders, 2000). Most teachers and schools assume
that parents know how to get involved; however, research has shown that teachers know little about how parents are involved at home, how they would like to be involved at home and at school, and what information they need to have more effective interactions with their child about schoolwork (Epstein & Sanders, 2000). Most parents also lack information about the opportunities and programs available at their child’s school, course offerings, and teacher expectations (Epstein & Sanders, 2000; Useem 1992). Finally, schools and teachers assume that parents have the same abilities, resources, and beliefs about involvement.

Epstein’s theory of overlapping spheres of influence uncovered disconnects between the home and school environments. In order to bridge the gap between these two environments, there must be an investment in relationships and connections in order to bridge communication and information between these two environments. Epstein’s theory places the idea of parent involvement as a form of social capital in a broader context.

Social Capital

In the past decade, social capital, a concept exported from the field of sociology, has matured from its original conception into an entire field of research. Social capital has caught the attention of researchers in several different fields such as family and youth behavior, management and organizations, crime and violence, community life, public health, economic development, including educational research (Kwon & Adler, 2014). Bourdieu and Coleman are credited with conceptualizing the idea of social capital in the 1980s. Both note that social capital is a resource available to individuals through their connections with others and highlight the importance of social networks. Both also discuss its relevance in educational attainment and achievement.
Coleman (1988) notes that social capital is a resource available to an individual, it is defined by its function, and it facilitates action within a structure. Social capital is inherent in the structure of relations between and among member of a social group. Obligations among the members of a social group and effective norms and sanctions exert positive social control onto the members of the group. Coleman sees closure and density within the group as an advantage because those features maintain the group and allow for individuals to utilize the resources embedded in the network. A network of densely connected individuals reinforce trust and obligations within the group. For example, in his study comparing the drop-out rates of Catholic and public schools, Coleman notes that closure is an important component of social capital and that impacts students’ educational attainment (Coleman, 1988). Most often cited in educational research is Coleman’s definition of social capital in the family. Coleman (1988) notes that “The social capital of the family is the relations between children and parents…That is, if the human capital possessed by parents is not complemented by social capital embodied in family relations, it is irrelevant to the child’s educational growth that the parent has a great deal, or a small amount, of human capital” (p.110). Coleman discusses that children will not benefit from their parent’s human capital if there is no investment in the relationship between parent and child. Measures of social capital typically cling to this framework.

Around the same time, Bourdieu (1986) also discussed the concept of social capital. He notes that social capital is the result of strategic investment in establishing desirable relationships that can be used short term or long term to one’s benefit. Bourdieu’s notion of social capital places focus on the deliberate construction of relationships with people who have desirable status and resources. Social capital is about the connections an individual has to people who are worth knowing. Bourdieu discusses the importance of network size stating that, “The volume of social
capital possessed by a given agent thus depends on the size of the network of connections he can
effectively mobilize and on the volume of the capital (economic, cultural, or symbolic) possessed
in his own right by each of those to whom he is connected” (p. 51). These investments serve to
solidify networks and reinforce the group as worthy individuals. Thus, Bourdieu sees social
capital as an investment in the dominant social class to maintain the group’s solidarity (Dika &
Singh, 2002; Lin, 1999). Both Coleman and Bourdieu view social capital as a collective good as
a way to reinforce certain norms, trust, and sanctions of a group.

Thus, research about social structures emphasize the need to address social capital using a
social network perspective. Social capital is an investment in relationships and consists of the
resources embedded in social relations and social structure. Individuals are able to access or
borrow those resources from those relations. Social capital is a concept best understood in the
social network perspective that emphasizes the resources available in networks that individuals
can directly or indirectly access and one’s location in this network (Carolan, 2013). Networks
comprise of individuals with connections or ties with one another. These networks may resemble
several clusters with one more connection within the cluster or across several clusters. The
structure of this network is an important aspect in social network analysis.

Analyzing social networks, Burt (2000) discusses social capital noting that certain people
or groups of people receive a higher or better outcome due to their efforts of investing in
relationships. Burt sums up both Bourdieu and Coleman’s argument about social capital noting
that both see social capital as a metaphor for advantage, social structures can also act as a kind of
capital that creates an advantage for certain groups. The emphasis in research has shifted to
focusing on the more specific aspects of social capital the mechanisms through which social
capital is mobilized. When viewing a social network, individuals can have many connections or
ties with one another. Networks that are densely connected show that members have several ties with one another, but few ties across different networks. An individual who bridges or fills a structural hole between two networks is at a competitive advantage because that individual has access to new information from different groups of people and can control the flow of information from one network to another. Burt’s contribution to social capital theory is to explain how social capital is more of a function of brokerage, or ties, across structural holes than closure, this is also known as bridging capital (Kwon & Adler, 2014).

Granovetter (1973) also discusses the importance of “weak ties”. An individual with strong ties to close friends are embedded in a closely-knit network. Those individuals also have a weak ties to acquaintances who are not a part of that closely-knit group. The weak ties then serve as bridges between two closely-knit groups thus allowing new information and resources to flow from one group to another (Portes, 1998). Research about social networks has provided great insights into the dynamics social structure; Coleman’s social closure concepts, Bourdieu’s group solidarity, Burt’s structural holes, Granovetter’s weak tie theory, have all contributed to the understanding of social structure and the importance of understanding social capital in network structures.

Lin (1999) builds upon these theories and suggests that network location does not necessarily determine the access to better embedded resources. He also notes that network density or closure is not necessary or realistic, but rather his argument suggests that individuals will access the resources that they need to secure some outcome. Lin (1999) explains that the notion of social capital contains three parts: the resources embedded in the social network, the accessibility to said resources by individuals, and the use of resources for a particular purpose or action. He writes, “Thus conceived, social capital contains three elements intersecting structure
and actions: the structural (embeddedness), opportunity (accessibility), and action-oriented (use) aspects” (p.35). In his work in the field of human resources development, Hatala emphasizes the importance of accessibility to network resources. Hatala (2009) writes, “In order for individuals to benefit from the resources inherent in a network, they must possess the ability to access information from the network that is useful and relevant to meeting their objectives” (p.54). His research draws from Lin’s definition of social capital in order to uncover the underlying abilities that allow an individual to access information from a network.

Though the concept of social capital is not necessarily new to sociology as Portes (1998) notes, “That involvement and participation in groups can have positive consequences for the individual and community is a staple notion…” (p.2), it has been exported to multiple fields and interpreted multiple ways. Dika and Singh (2002) note that Bourdieu’s and Coleman’s theories have resulted in “…markedly different types of exportation to educational literature” (p. 34). Sociologists of education, such as Lareau, use Bourdieu’s theory to explain how school structures may reinforce the social and cultural capital of certain groups. Yet, most other educational research clings to Coleman’s indicators. Dika and Singh state that “The designation of social capital as a catch-all for the positive effects of sociability has clouded the intersection of race, class, and gender in the schools and society” (p. 44). Often overlooked is the accessibility to networks. Differential access to social capital within a network can serve to reproduce the social class standing within a society.

Many sociologists, notably Coleman, Burt, Granovetter, and Lin, explore the utility of social networks as a mechanism that builds social capital. As research about social capital has progressed, educational researchers borrowed the ideas from these sociologists to explain how social capital may work within a school network. However, most of the research conducted using
social capital as a component has clung to Coleman’s key element of defining social capital: closure. Closure explains the strength of ties of connected individuals within a group. Closure in educational research is measured by two factors: family structure and intergenerational closure. The first factor, family structure, is the total number of siblings a student has in his or her family. The second factor, intergenerational closure, is an indication if parents know and socialize with their children’s friend’s parents or other parents of students who attend the same school. These two measures of closure, family structure and intergenerational closure, are known as social capital indicators in educational research. Typically in educational research, social capital measures of closure include family structure: number of family members and intergenerational closure: parents knowing the parents of students who attend the same school. Coleman sees closure and density, defined by the strength of ties or amount of connections within the group as an advantage. His research exploring Catholic schools seems to suggest that closure is a necessary component of social capital and contributes to student success (Coleman, 1988). Though other research has shown that closure is not necessary (see Morgan & Sørensen, 1999), most often cited in educational research is Coleman’s definition of social capital in the family including intergenerational closure, the frequency of parent-child interactions, and parent’s educational attainment. Coleman argues that a parent’s human capital, a term borrowed from economists to describe an investment in an individual’s education, training, and skills, has to be complemented by social capital, which Coleman’s refers to as an investment in the relationship between parent and child, in order for the child to benefit educationally. In other words, parents need to interact with their children regarding the child’s education and school experience in order for the child to benefit from such relations. Thus, parent involvement at home and at school can be recast as social capital and viewed through Coleman’s measures.
Further exploring the ideas of social capital, Portes, a sociologist, notes that, “…the consensus is growing in the literature that social capital stands for the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures” (1999, p. 6). This conceptualization of social capital combines Bourdieu and Coleman’s notions with economist Loury’s work and sociologists Lin and Granovetter’s contributions. Research in the field of sociology note the importance of network structure on an individual’s ability to access social capital. Lin’s social resources theory is most applicable to educational research. His conceptualization of social capital will allow educational researchers to pursue a new framework and potentially push the field in a new direction. Lin (1999) explains how ones’ ability to access and mobilize resources embedded in one’s network will secure benefits or enhance outcomes. Focal points in his analysis of social capital include how individuals invest in social relations and how individuals are able to capture the embedded resources in the relations to gain a return. Social capital needs to be defined using variables other than the traditional notions developed by Coleman, such as family background and parent involvement. However, social capital in educational research continues to cling to Coleman’s framework.

Dika and Singh (2002) have also noted, “Educational researchers have shown little interest in departing from Coleman’s framework and exploring how social ties and social networks are explored in economic sociology” (p.45). Lin (1999) explains that the notion of social capital contains three parts: the resources embedded in the social network, the accessibility to said resources by individuals, and the use of resources for a particular purpose or action. Lin’s conceptualization of social capital and its application to the field of educational research is needed in order to fill in the gaps that Dika and Singh noted in their review. This study will focus on theories in the field of sociology since the research notes the importance of network structure
on an individual’s ability to access social capital. This research will also shed light on how parents are able to capture the embedded resources to their networks to promote their involvement in their children’s schooling.

As researchers attempt to understand how social capital impacts student achievements, they should continue to apply the ideas from other fields in order to broaden the concept of social capital. Hatala (2009) notes that in the field of human resources development individuals must possess the ability to access information from the network in order to benefit from resources embedded within. Kessels and Poell (2004) as cited by Hatala note that “Organizations themselves are incubators of social capital and as a result contain potential resources that can have a significant impact on performance” (p. 54). Hatala argues that assessing an individual’s ability to access network resources is the first step to improving the utility of networks. The same can be said about school organizations. Schools offer an important location for building social capital since this is where parents can connect with each other across social class lines. If schools have the ability to assess their parents’ ability to access school networks, then they may be able to develop ways to leverage and use the resources within the network to benefit all members, especially the students. These ideas are highly relevant in school settings and in educational research. Dika and Singh encouraged educational researchers to explore ideas about social ties and social networks from the field of economic sociology, and these ideas borrowed from human resources development allow for cross-fertilization of the concept of social capital.

**The Importance of Social Class Differences**

In the field of sociology, research has shown that there are class differences in regard to the acquisition and utilization of social capital. Social capital is embedded in the social networks. Lin (2000) notes that inequality of social capital occurs when certain groups of people cluster at
disadvantaged socioeconomic positions. This tendency for individuals to associate with similar groups of people is known as homophily. Members of disadvantaged groups interact with others who are in similar social standings, therefore, they are embedded in social networks with poorer resources (Lin, 2000). Social capital, measured by these resources and networks, have an effect on socioeconomic attainment.

Lin observes that these inequalities in different types of capital, such as human capital, the educational attainment of an individual, and social capital, the resources an individual is able to access and use through his or her social network connections, contribute to social inequality, achievements, and quality of life. When an individual has cross-group ties or is embedded in a network that has resource-heterogeneity, he or she benefits from better access to information and more influence from diverse socioeconomic positions (Lin, 2000). These cross-group ties, however, are the exception since homophily and other structural constraints serve to limit the development of those ties for many disadvantaged members. Because of their advantaged or disadvantaged positions and social networks, Lin (1999) concludes that social groups have different access to social capital. Inequities in social networks offer less opportunities to mobilize and utilize better social resources. Lin argues that differential access to social capital needs more research.

Social class largely determines the amount of social capital an individual is able to possess. Pichier and Wallace (2009) concluded in their analysis of European countries that social capital is socially stratified across each of the countries. They found that individuals within higher social classes are embedded in a broader range of networks consisting of people with different skills, resources, and connections through their activities in formal associations. Because they have more heterogeneity in their social networks, individuals in higher social
classes benefit from knowing different people that could help in different situations. Pichier and Wallace (2009) found that individuals within the working class tend to have a smaller circle of social connections and know similar people. This may limit the possibilities to move out of a social position.

According to research conducted by social scientists in the field of status attainment, parents’ socioeconomic status is the primary contributor to the educational and occupational advancement of their children (Dyk & Wilson, 1999). Because of social class differences, the educational experience of children vary across social groupings. Typically, social capital is measured by parental involvement in a child’s schooling. Therefore, the impact of social class on achievement is largely mediated by parental involvement in their child’s education. Ream and Palardy’s (2008) study assessed different types of parental social capital, such as PTA involvement and the frequency of contact parents had with the school, and found that parents in the highest social class grouping were well above the mean measures of social capital. Whereas, social capital among the lowest class groupings were well below the mean. Lareau and Horvat, as cited by Ream and Palardy (2008), have concluded that the availability and utility of parents’ social capital is delineated through social class categories so as to benefit those who materially and financially advantaged and socially well-connected. Ream and Palardy (2008) have also concluded that parental social capital differs significantly across social groupings, not only by advantage in resources, but also in terms of availability of the forms they used to measure parental social capital. It is clearly documented that social class determines an individual’s social capital.

Furthermore, social class also determines the social networks in which an individual is located. Devine (1998) states that social networks can act as channels of information and
influence, therefore, networks are able to the reproduce social standings of advantage. Ream and Palardy (2008) further note how research has shown that social interactions can facilitate for some or inhibit for others the exchange of useful resources. These studies indicate how social capital may function differently across groups. As a result, the researchers conclude that the link between school and a parent’s network is more available and educationally beneficial to parents in higher social classes than those in lower classes (Ream & Palardy, 2008). Social class differences have implications for family-school relationships.

Family-school relationships are socially constructed, and, over time, there has been a steady increase in parental involvement in schooling. During the rise of mass schooling, parents were involved in the political and economic support for selection and maintenance of school sites. As of late, parents became involved in the cognitive development of their children and increased efforts to reinforce curriculum. Epstein and Sanders (2000) explain how in education the most effective schools, families, and communities have shared goals and a common mission. This theory of overlapping spheres suggests how home, school, and community influence children and the relationships within those contexts. Epstein and Sanders state, “In this view, the results of interactions, family, school, and community members are accumulated and stored as social capital within the internal structure of the model of overlapping spheres of influence” (p. 287). Parents play a growing role in monitoring children's educational development. Parent's educational attainment, which is also stratified, is one factor that has an impact on the kind and degree of parental involvement.

Epstein and Sanders (2000) have found that families with more formal education and higher incomes are more likely to be partners with their children's schools. Families with less formal education and lower incomes are more likely to become involved if the schools is able to
successfully implement programs of partnerships. Useem (1991) further concluded that college-educated parents were more integrated into school affairs, through their activities as volunteers or PTA members, and informal parental information networks; therefore, these parents of eighth grade students understood how the math course tracking placements operated. More formally educated parents were more likely to act on the information they acquired through their activities and networks by either directly intervening at the school to improve child's learning experiences, including having them placed into higher math levels, or by exerting their influence over their children so that they would enroll in more demanding math courses. Parents who are college graduates have more financial, intellectual, and social resources needed to seek out crucial information about the school’s tracking process and are therefore better able to navigate the school process, exert influence over their child’s course selection, provide assistance with the demanding work, or seek outside help (Useem, 1991).

Devine (1998) states that instead of denying the importance of cultural differences between social classes, it would be better to explore the significance of the economic and cultural resources in the reproduction of advantage. It would be of value to examine the different types of resources associated with different classes or occupational groupings within classes and to explore in what situations those resources are mobilized. Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch (1995) have noted racial and ethnic differences in success at school that are connected to social class and network-based differences. They note that success in school also includes more class-based and network-oriented forms of support that, “For whites, may be enhanced due to their membership in resource-rich social networks in schools that correspond to the embeddedness in middle-class and privileged networks in their families and communities. For black and other minority groups, participation in such school networks may instead correspond to conformity
and accommodation” (p.118). Bourdieu (1986) has argued that social and cultural capital may be a mechanism in which inequality is reproduced in schools. The transmission of cultural capital, as defined by a symbolic wealth of elite knowledge, dispositions, and skills, is a way that individuals located at the top of the social structure are able to maintain their position of advantage. Cultural capital, in this sense, is similar to an inherited wealth. Privileged children are familiar with topics valued by elite that schools reward students for knowing. However, Lareau (1987) has argued that social class determines cultural capital because parents have different resources to approach the family-school relationship. Devine (1998) further notes that there needs to be a more clear analysis in order to understand which cultural attributes are linked to classes since this remains an underdeveloped point in Bourdieu’s theory of cultural capital in the reproduction of social classes. However, what can be concluded is that class differences can impact a child’s educational experience.

Dika and Singh’s (2002) review of applications of social capital in educational literature note that most of research conducted that links social capital to educational outcomes have consistently used Coleman’s original indicators of social capital, mainly family structure and parent-child interaction variables. Few research studies have strayed from those variables. The conceptualization of social capital is restricted by the variables that are available in the data sets, such as family structure, parent-school involvement, parent’s educational attainment, with outcomes measuring such quantitative items like grade-point average, high school completion, or achievement test score gains. Dika and Singh also discuss how “Nearly all these studies focus on the conceptualization of social capital as norms rather than access to institutional resources” (p.43). Dika and Singh highlight the conceptual, measurement, and analysis issues in the current body of research relating social capital and educational outcomes noting, “…the disentanglement
of the possession of social capital from its activation becomes difficult. It is unclear whether ability to activate this social capital (in the home or in the community) or the ability the activate this social capital in the institutional context (the school) is associated with desirable outcomes” (p. 44). Future research needs to explore the resources based in social capital and social ties as well as the differential access to social networks. Dika and Singh state that, “Problems in the conceptualization and measurement of social capital have resulted in a body of research that, except for a few studies, does not acknowledge differential access to social networks and social resources” (p. 46).

Social class largely determines the social networks of the parents. Within those networks, parents who have more resources are more inclined and more likely to navigate the context of school networks with confidence and ease. Within school networks, it would be best to examine how social class differences impact a parent’s social capital.

**Influences Impacting Social Capital**

There are several influences that can impact families’ social capital within social networks. Parents’ beliefs about their roles and responsibilities in a family-school relationship, the amount information and resources available within their informal networks, the effective management of the educational experience of the child, and the existence of structural barriers all can influence a parent’s social capital potential. Underlying these influences is the idea that social class differences are evident in a parents’ level and type of involvement in a school network. As earlier stated, seminal research informs that social class determines the social networks individuals are located within, and therefore, determine the amount of resources and social capital an individual is able to possess and mobilize. The following are influences have been identified as impacting families’ social capital within school networks.
**Parental beliefs about responsibilities.** Within the context of school networks, there are social class differences that influence a parent’s ideas about his or her role and responsibilities as a parent and the school’s role and responsibilities as the educational experts. These ideas about the roles and responsibilities of schools and parents can influence a parent’s ability and extent that they get involved in school matters. Regardless of social class and cultural groups, almost all parents value education and want their children to do well in school, and they see themselves as helping or supporting their children. However, the extent at which the responsibilities and roles overlap with the home and school differ with regards to social class.

Lareau (1987) found that there were important differences in how middle- and working-class parents responded to teachers’ requests for participation. In her interviews and observations with parents, she notes that a variety of factors, including the parent’s view of appropriate division of labor between teacher and parent, influenced parents’ participation in schooling. She states that, “These patterns suggest that the relationship between families and schools was independent in the working-class school, and interdependent in the middle-class school” (p. 79). Lareau concludes two major factors that influence a parents’ participation are their educational capabilities and their information about schooling. Epstein and Sanders (2000) summarize the results of other studies to also conclude that, “Presently, on average, families with more formal education and higher incomes are more likely to be partners with their children’s schools” (p. 289). Working-class parents, on the other hand, saw a separation of spheres between home and school. Lareau (1987) notes in her interview with working-class families that they depend on the teacher to educate their children since they had doubts in their own educational capabilities. Furthermore, they felt education took place on school grounds, and teachers, the professionals, are responsible for getting their children to learn. Parents who divide up responsibility believe
that their children’s academic progress does not necessarily depend on the activities at home. Educators perceive these parents as uncaring or unsupportive and are less likely to build a working relationship. Clearly, these differences in the nature of the building relationships between schools and families can influence the extent of parental involvement in schooling and a parent’s ability to gain social capital through a partnership with schools.

Parents who view family-school relationships as interdependent or as overlapping spheres understand that they have an important role to play in their children’s education. Parents who view their role and responsibilities overlaps with that of the teacher are able to connect with school network more comfortably and confidently. Parents who agree that a strong partnership with teachers is an essential element in their children’s schooling are able to initiate contact with the teachers, build a relationship that allows them to enter the school network, and exert influence. Families who want to be involved in their children's educational process in an important way describe the relationship between parents and teachers as that of equals. They view education as a shared enterprise between parent and teacher. Furthermore, these families who engaged in equal partnerships believe that they have similar or superior educational skills compared to those of their child’s teachers and can extend learning at home. Educators perceive these parents as more caring and supportive of their children’s education and are more likely to maintain a working relationship. Overall, families who agree with that education is a shared responsibility are more likely to monitor, scrutinize, and supplement education in both spheres: home and school.

Family and school interactions carry the imprint of interactions in a larger social context and thus acceptance of a particular type of relationship emerges as a result of these social practices. Lareau (1987) concludes that these aspects are typically neglected in discussions of
parental involvement. Therefore, these aspects, such as the nature of the relationship between schools and families, need to be explored. A parent’s view of what this relationship entails includes ideas about the roles and responsibilities of parents and teachers. Whether a parent believes that the nature of the relationship is interdependent or independent, overlapping or separate spheres, can hinder or facilitate parental involvement in school networks. Coleman (1988) argues that effective norms, such as the school’s idea about the appropriate relationship between family and school, and obligations, such as the school’s expectation about parental involvement, serve as a form of social capital within a social network. Parents who abide by these norms and obligations by initiating and building relationships are able to connect to school network and benefit from the social capital from the members.

**Network information and resources.** Lin’s social resources theory contends that individuals will mobilize resources embedded within their networks regardless of strength of ties. Lin’s theory is a comprehensive general theory of social capital and focuses on the resources that are transferred or pooled through social networks (Horvat, Weininger & Lareau, 2003). Lin assumes that a social structure is shaped like a pyramid; the degree of access to and control over resources are positively related to position (Perna & Titus, 2005). Networks embedded in layers of the social hierarchy try to monopolize resources within these pyramid-structures. Individuals whose networks span social layers are more likely to be socially mobile (Pichier & Wallace, 2009). Heterogeneity of social networks is seen as an advantage by Granovetter as well as Lin. Granovetter (1973) argues that weak ties have helped job-seeking individuals find employment. Putnam, as cited by Pichier and Wallace (2009) also argues that bridging capital is more advantageous than bonding capital. Overall, individuals will seek out relationships with people who have better social status in order to gain access to resources (Perna & Titus, 2005).
McNeal (1999) has stated that much of the research about social capital and social networks tend to focus on the structure of social capital and the benefits attributed to social relations, but little research has addressed forms of social capital and how it varies across domains. McNeal argues that more attention is needed to the address the resources in a network. Lin argues that social capital is embedded in social structures which determine the resources available to the network. The social capital a person may gain access to through social networks depends on the volume of resources within the network (Perna & Titus, 2005). Embeddedness in resource-rich social networks increases the likelihood of receiving useful information in the routine exchange (Lin, 2000). Pichier and Wallace (2009) have found that the size of the network is important as well as the frequency of interactions within the network. Hatala (2009) further states that the utilization of network resources results in inequity among people.

Interactions among school personnel, parents, teachers, and students are governed by the social structures in which they participate. Social networks within communities supply parents and students with valuable information they need to navigate the school context (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996). The structural characteristics of the school, for example, the extent at which the school encourages involvement, the resources available through school networks, or the extent at which interactions occur can influence a parent’s ability to become involved in school networks (Perna & Titus, 2005). Furthermore, the level of parental involvement is linked to the class position of the parents and the social and cultural resources of that social class. Educational status and material resources of parents increase with higher positions in the social hierarchy. Since social networks typically contain individuals with similar characteristics, parent networks tend to be more homogeneous with respect to class (Horvat et al., 2003).
In reviews of literature, research suggests that social networks accessed by working-class and poor families are less valuable than those of middle-class families for negotiating the school environment (Horvat et al., 2003). Furthermore, research on social networks shows that there is a greater flow of academic information to middle-class groups more than lower class groups (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996; Lareau, 1987). This flow of information is due to varying resources and ties across a parent’s network. Middle-class families have more professionals and more resources embedded in their networks due to their social class position. Furthermore, the culture of middle-class families encourages a particular type of family-school relationship that is congruent with the school's definition of appropriate behavior and interactions (Lareau, 1987).

Middle-class culture also encourages network ties among other middle-class families through involvement in their child’s schooling and after school activities. This type of involvement provides parents with more information about schooling and builds social networks among parents. For example, parents note that conversations with other parents are important since they swap stories about their educational experiences. Through informal conversations, parents learn about which teachers to avoid, develop strategies for teaching with teachers and administrators, or find out how to work the school system (Useem, 1992). In interviews with parents, Useem (1992) notes that parents relied on other parents, not necessarily the teacher or administrators, for school information. One parent states how she is very plugged into a community of friends and neighbors, but not into the school as an institution (Useem, 1992).

For middle-class families, social networks tend to be surrounded by their children's lives. These networks then encompass the organized activities in which the children participate, as well as parents’ informal contacts with educators and other professionals. Because the frequency that the children participate in organized out of school activities differ from working-class and
middle-class families, middle-class families have greater opportunity to forge stronger connections since their children participate in more activities (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996; Horvat et al., 2003). Therefore, children's organized activities, such as participation in sports, clubs, dance, music, and other extracurricular activities, can determine the structure of parents' networks, regardless of class (Horvat et al., 2003). Middle-class families exhibited closure that was in part due to their children's organized activities (Horvat et al., 2003). These informal information networks serve as an adequate substitute for involvement in school affairs (Useem, 1992).

Middle-class families are more connected to one another and to the school as a result of class culture differences and their participation in informal networks (Horvat et al., 2003). Though middle and upper class families socialized with other parents in the school community, working and poor families had closer ties with relatives in the area (Lareau, 1987). Social networks of working-class families are rooted in kinship groups and have few ties to other parents and professionals (Horvat et al., 2003). These families relied on their network ties generally to alleviate problems that stem from economic necessity. Their network ties, in contrast to middle-class network ties, had little to do with the enhancement of their children’s schooling (Horvat et al., 2003). Because working-class and poor families do not often socialize with other parents from the school, they lack the information needed to build a strong family-school connection (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996). Networking with parents of other schoolchildren provides information about school policies, teachers, and students' peers. For example, Useem (1992) found that parents who were most knowledgeable about the ability-grouping system in the school were also ones who were most integrated into a web of school activities or informal information networks of parents or both. Dornbusch and Glasgow (1996)
also confirm that middle-class parents often learn from their friends, rather than the school, about the track to which their child is assigned. Educational and career aspiration and outcomes are influenced by social and cultural resources embedded in adolescents' social networks and their social class (Smith-Maddox, 1999). Parents’ abilities to successfully socialize and gain access to network resources outside their kinship group can bring about higher levels of academic achievement and educational attainment for their children (Ream & Palardy, 2008). McNeal (1999) has noted that the same forms of social capital, such as parent-child discussions about school, involvement at school, homework help, may be less effective for minority and poor students because of the differential access to resources within and outside their social network. Most parents participate in similar ways in their child’s education. However, middle-class parents may be more successful since they have more information about educational skills and the schooling process. Epstein and Sanders (2000) state that if well-invested, social contacts and social skills may improve the experiences for children and families.

Middle-class families frequently make available resources to deal with situations regarding their children’s educational experience and thus are able to attain their desired outcome (Horvat et al., 2003). For example, Horvat et al. (2003) found that middle-class parents were more proactive about their child’s specific learning needs and were more inclined to mobilize network resources by talking with a friend or family member in the field of education about their child’s issues. Parents would this collect information through their network ties and use it to secure a desired outcome, such as requesting additional services, testing, or support materials or coordinate with the school’s programs (Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 1987). These network ties helped parents make decisions and helped them locate resources. In contrast, Horvat et al. (2003) found that working and poor families rarely used network ties to intervene in
decisions that impacted their child’s education, such as overriding placement assignments or disputing assessment outcomes. Furthermore, Lareau (1987) notes how working-class and poor families were not familiar with the school curriculum and with the specific educational problems of their children, nor were they aware of the efforts that the teachers made to try to improve their child's performance (Lareau, 1987). Upper and middle-class families, however, were more aware of their children’s learning problems and made efforts to help their children. Those efforts were often coordinated with the school program (Lareau, 1987). Horvat et al. (2003) explains that working-class parents were more wary of contact with professionals and did not mobilize networks to challenge the gate-keepers in schools. However, middle-class families were able to draw on their professional contacts in order to leverage information, expertise, and authority needed to challenge the school officials’ judgement or decisions (Horvat et al., 2003; Ream & Palardy, 2008; Useem, 1992). Ream and Palardy (2008) note how middle-class families tend to have a sense of entitlement and use strategies to influence school personnel on behalf of their children to facilitate their children’s growth. Since many of their network resources include professionals, middle-class families were more comfortable facing issues that affected their children’s school experiences. This differences in the utilization of network resources affect a parents’ ability to gain social capital within school networks.

Overall, working and poor families lack the channels that middle and upper class families frequently use to gain information due to their limited network resources. This is partially explained by the differences in how parents build family-school relationships. Parents who view the school as an independent sphere trust the teachers to make the educational decisions for their children. Parents who hold the idea that the educational decision making is the responsibility of the school are less likely to know about the process of tracking or the implications of course
placements on their children. Overall, families who view education as the responsibility of the school are more likely to depend on the teacher to make educational decisions and less likely to initiate contact when problems arise.

Networks that include varying social classes can allow a parent more access to resources that can be utilized in the contexts of schools. Parents are at an advantage when their networks include other parents, professionals, and educators. They are also at an advantage when their network ties stretch across social groupings. Social capital becomes contingent on a parents’ ability to build relationships with schools and other parents in order to gather information by accessing and utilizing their contacts across their network.

**Management of educational experience.** Parents who are connected to school networks are able to exert influence over the educational decisions that impact their children. These parents have the ability and know-how to manage their children’s educational experiences in order to maximize academic potential (Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1992). The more educated and the more affluent parents are able to pass on their social class status to their children by using their resources and intervening to improve their children’s educational opportunities (Useem, 1992). Because of these social, cultural, and financial resources, parents with more education or from higher social classes are more proficient in their abilities to navigate the context of school, in other words, know how to get at the insider knowledge that will allow them an advantage at customizing their child’s education.

One way in which parents would navigate the school context to customize their child’s education is to request that their child be put with a specific teacher or team (in the cases of middle school). Middle and upper class parents would often use their connections with other parents and professionals to know which teacher to request for their child. Furthermore, parents
understood that they had to be strategic about requesting a teacher since they knew that too many requests could get ignored (Horvat et al., 2003). These abilities allowed parents to customize their child’s education. Whereas, working-class and poor families tended to accept the luck of the draw in their children's teacher assignments. This attitude may be due to their lack of contacts in their networks to gather information that fueled teacher requests. However, even when they have the information, they did not act to make a request. It appeared that many of these parents lacked the capacity or the right to intervene in these matters (Horvat, et al., 2003).

Another way in which parents would manage their child’s education is to request access to certain resources or requesting testing for special programs. For example, middle and upper class families would request additional resources if there were problems at school. Parents asked for homework and extra materials to complete work at home with their children (Lareau, 1987). Furthermore, parents would also request testing or be enrolled in the gifted programs (Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1992). The link between parent's socioeconomic status and placement in more advanced tracks or course is partially explained by the tendency of well-educated parents to be more effective managers of their child's schooling (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996; Useem, 1992). Other interventions include requesting meetings with principals or counselors to ask for a change in a teacher's behavior, seeking to override a teacher's recommendation, or removing their child from a classroom or school. Useem (1992) concludes that a parent’s reluctance or know-how to intervene and influence their child’s program were factors that were highly associated with the educational background of parent. Educated parents understand the long-term implications of the decisions that their children are required to make early in their educational careers.

Social capital impacts a parents’ ability to be an effective manager. Parents understand that their partnership with schools directly impacts their child’s educational experience.
Furthermore, parents have to act in accordance with the school’s definition of appropriate involvement. Parents who strategically build relationships with teachers are more comfortable discussing academic issues. Brough and Irvin (2001) note that a close association between parents and their children’s teacher may influence the teacher’s perception of the parent. Parents who are effective managers of their children’s education will tend to assert their right to directly intervene to manage their child’s experience. They are more comfortable making decisions, asking for guidance, seeking outside help, or challenging the judgements of school officials.

**Structural barriers.** Parents who are highly involved typically have life contexts that allow them to easily navigate the school context which provides them with an advantage. Lee and Bowen (2006) found that parents who were more likely to be involved at school were parents whose culture and lifestyle were most likely congruent with the school’s culture. This is because structural barriers may exist for parents who are not part of the dominant group. Bourdieu discusses this inequality, suggesting that an individual’s habitus (lifestyle and culture) that is congruent with the school’s habitus will enjoy benefits. For example, there are several barriers due to a parent’s life contexts that hinder or prevent him or her from getting more involved in their child’s schooling and thus impeding social capital gained through building relationships with school personnel and other parents.

Some parents do not have the time to invest in building social capital with their children, school personnel, and other parents. This may be due to their working schedule; inflexible working hours prevent parents from attending school events, helping their children with homework, or interacting with other parents (Brough & Irvin, 2001; Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1992). Furthermore, economic needs may prevent parents from taking time off from work,
enrolling their children in after-school activities, or participating in school events that require some monetary fee. Single-parent households may even less time to invest due to working responsibilities or economic concerns. Poor health of parents also hinders the amount of time parents can invest their children’s schooling (Brough & Irvin, 2001; Useem 1992).

Language and cultural barriers can also prevent or hinder parental involvement. Parents whose English is a second language may be more discouraged or intimidating when trying to get involved in school matters (Useem, 1991, 1992). Furthermore, the bureaucratic processes in schools can be intentionally difficult to navigate (Perna & Titus, 2005). Thus, less educated parents and non-English speaking parents may not get involved in educational decisions that impact their children such as course-placement and the ability-grouping process (Useem, 1991).

Parents who frequently move from place to place disrupt their social capital potential (Perna & Titus, 2005). Parents who are new to a community may encounter difficulty building relationships, finding information, or understanding the social structures within the community and school. These various life contexts present difficulties for parents to get more involved with their children’s schooling or present barriers to navigating the resources within school networks. Parents whose life contexts are congruent with that of the school’s context do not have as many barriers to their involvement, and thus, have the ability to access school networks more easily.

**Application of Factors to Current Study**

The review of literature highlights several influences that impact a families’ social capital within a school network. It can be concluded that a parents’ beliefs about their roles and responsibilities in a family-school relationship, the amount information and resources available within their informal networks, the effective management of the educational experience of the child, and the presence of structural barriers either facilitate or hinder the development of
parental social capital within school networks. It can also be concluded that social class differences directly impact a person’s social capital potential. Because social capital is rooted in the networks of individuals, those networks are delineated across social class groupings. The influences that have been identified through the work of seminal researchers help explain the inequality of accessibility within social networks. The implications of this review note that future research needs to explore the resources based in social capital and social ties as well as the differential access to social networks in order to illuminate the differential access of school networks by examining a parent’s ability to connect with school networks.

All parents have a connection to a school network, yet some parents have certain beliefs and abilities that allow them to take a more direct action in their child’s education. It is important to understand that within the influences of social capital are certain abilities that allow parents to access and utilize a school network’s resources. These factors that impact a parents’ accessibility to a school network include the ability to initiate contact and build relationships, gather information, navigate the context of school structures, and the existence of structural barriers. Research has shown that differences in these factors may relate to differences in a parent’s accessibility to a school network and utilization of school network resources. As a result, these influences and accessibility factors may overlap in certain areas that impact a parent’s access to school networks. Table 1 details the findings from seminal research about the influences that impact social capital and the related accessibility factors. This information will provide the foundation for the development of the scale.

Traditional measures of parent involvement in schools, such as the number of times a parent visits or attends school-related function and participation in the parent-teacher association, prove to not be enough to capture a parent’s social capital potential; therefore, this research will
add the body of current knowledge about social capital and social networks and forge new paths within education to explore accessibility factors that impact a parents’ access and connection to school networks. In order to disentangle the possession of social capital and ones’ ability to activate it, this study proposes new measures of social capital, borrowed from the field of human resources development, that capture an individual’s capabilities to access the resources embedded in a social network. Through the review of research about social capital potential, parents who possess certain abilities are able to gain more out of their connections to the school network than those parents who do not show those same capabilities. Parent’s beliefs, abilities, and action all contribute to secure certain outcomes for their children.

Overall, the purposes of this study will fill in gaps and add to the current body knowledge since it bridges several fields of research together. The framework will be grounded in Lin’s social resources theory that links social capital theory and social network utility. The method will employ an instrument inspired by Hatala’s accessibility scale developed for use in the human resources development field. This research’s contribution to the field of education will also fill in the gaps of social capital application outlined by Dika and Singh since it will address in what ways parents have differential access to institutional resources. Furthermore, the research study will continue Lareau and Horvat’s work in investigating social class differences by utilizing several of the factors they uncovered impacting families’ access to social capital. Finally, the application of social capital will depart from traditional measures of parent involvement in order to capture a parent’s accessibility to the school network.
Table 1

Influences and Accessibility Factors Impacting Social Capital Derived from Review of Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences of Social Capital</th>
<th>Related Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coleman, 1988; Epstein &amp; Sanders, 2000; Lareau 1987</strong></td>
<td>Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dornbusch &amp; Glasgow, 1996; Granovetter, 1973; Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 1987; Lin, 2000; McNeal, 1999; Perna &amp; Titus, 2000; Pichier &amp; Wallace, 2009; Ream &amp; Palardy, 2008; Smith-Maddox, 1999; Useem, 1992</strong></td>
<td>Network Information and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brough &amp; Irvin, 2001; Dornbusch &amp; Glasgow, 1996; Lareau, 1987; Horvat, et al., 2003; Useem, 1992</strong></td>
<td>Management of Educational Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brough &amp; Irvin, 2001; Lareau, 1987; Lee and Bowen 2006; Perna &amp; Titus, 2005; Useem, 1991 &amp; 1992</strong></td>
<td>Structural Barriers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Three: Methodology

Research Questions and Design

Research questions for the development of the School Network Accessibility for Parents (SNAP) Scale include:

1. What are the underlying factors that can be extracted from a parent survey about the beliefs, abilities, and involvement of parents that influence accessibility to school networks?
   a. Do these variables form meaningful constructs that further inform or confirm theory relating to parents’ involvement in school networks?

2. Do relationships exist between parents’ beliefs and abilities and parents’ access to school networks and resources?

3. Are there meaningful differences in parents’ access to school network resources related to social class indicators?

In order to best answer the research questions, a quantitative research study using an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to investigate the variables that impact a parents’ accessibility to a school network. Because such an instrument does not exist at this time to capture this construct of school network accessibility, variables for the instrument were developed to align with the influences of social capital and accessibility factors discussed in the review of literature. The theoretical framework seeks to bridge several fields of research to fill in gaps regarding the application of social capital in educational research. Specifically, this study connects Hatala’s work in human resources development with educational research. Hatala argued that the first step in improving of the utility of networks must be to assess an individual's ability to access network resources. Because a school network functions like an organization, the purpose of this study was
to parallel Hatala’s work by developing such an instrument that would measure parents’ accessibility to school networks. An exploratory factor analysis was used to draw conclusions regarding the underlying beliefs and abilities that contribute to a parent’s potential access to school network resources known as accessibility factors. Furthermore, an exploratory factor analysis was used to determine if the variables formed meaningful constructs that further informed or confirmed theory relating to a parent’s involvement in a school network. This type of analysis answered the first two research questions. To answer the final research question, several independent-samples t tests were conducted in order to determine if there were meaningful differences in a parent’s access to school network resources along social class groupings.

**Development of Instrument**

Previously identified were the accessibility factors that impact families’ social capital within school networks. Those factors include: initiating and building family-school relationships, gathering information from formal and informal school networks, navigating the context of school structures, and the existence or nonexistence of structural barriers. These factors relate the influences identified in the review of literature as impacting social capital. Each item on the survey relates to an influence and one or more accessibility factors. The instrument measures the parents’ level of agreement to the item statements using a 6-point Likert-type scale: (1) strongly agree, (2) somewhat agree, (3) slightly agree, (4) slightly disagree, (5) somewhat disagree, and (6) strongly disagree. A neutral standing was omitted in order to encourage parents to choose a level of agreement or disagreement. The instrument had a total of 31 statements broken into three sections.
The last items of the survey included the demographic variables: gender, race, education level, household income, participation in free or reduced lunch program, and movement. Race/ethnicity options matched the school’s identifiers: African-American, Asian, Hispanic, Multiracial, Native American, White, and Other. Educational level included a drop-down menu with options about formal schooling: did not attend or complete high school, received high school diploma or equivalent, received some college or vocational training, completed a two-year college degree, completed a four-year college degree, and completed a graduate degree. Typically, educational research uses participation in free or reduced lunch program as an indicator of socioeconomic status, so that demographic variable remains, but also included was a drop-down menu for parents to select the yearly household income. Finally, a measure of movement, or number of schools that their child has attended in the past two years, was included.

The following sections describe how survey was designed. Chapter four details the results of the factor analysis and outlines the specific accessibility measures that were uncovered, and chapter five further discusses the final instrument.

Four main influences and four accessibility factors were previously identified in the review of literature. The influences from the review of literature include: parental beliefs about responsibilities, network information and resources, management of educational experience, and structural barriers. The factors include: initiate contact and build relationships, gather information, navigate the context of school structures, and the existence of structural barriers. The survey was designed to capture both influences of social capital and possible related accessibility factors. Each survey item was also related to a defining category; statements were categorized by either a belief, ability, or involvement item in order to see if these variables formed meaningful patterns. The conceptual framework for the survey design in Figure 1 details
the development of item statements being derivative of the overarching influences identified in the review of literature. The factors were identified from trends in parents’ accessibility to school networks. Item statements were developed to represent three categories of accessibility: beliefs, ability, and involvement that relate to each factor.

Figure 1

*Conceptual Framework of the Development of Item Statements*

The survey began with a total of 76 items that were narrowed down to a final total of 31 items. To best organize the development of the item statements, codes were developed to ensure that a minimum of five items were created for each accessibility factor. The 31 items were organized into three sections to ease the cognitive load of participants. The first section consists of seven item statements which describe parental beliefs about responsibilities within a school network; each statement begins with the item stem “It is my responsibility…”. The second section consists of eight item statements which describe parent abilities; each statement begins with the item stem
“I know how to…” The third section consists of 16 item statements that are categorized as parent abilities, involvement, and barriers to involvement and begin with varying item stems.

Parental beliefs and responsibilities serve to clarify the relationship of the school network. Therefore, the items categorized as belief statements were all presented in the first section. The purpose of these survey items was to identify a parent’s beliefs about the roles of parents and teachers within a school network. From the review of literature, it is apparent that parents who view education as a joint-responsibility between school and home are more likely to build a relationship with the child’s teacher and school, gather information from their networks, and navigate the school context. Parents who view themselves as equals in educational skills or professional status feel comfortable helping their child with their school work or supplementing education. Additionally, they are perceived by teachers as more caring and supportive than parents who do not abide by the expected roles. Parents who feel that it is primarily the school’s responsibility to ensure that their child is learning are less likely to build strong relationships with their children’s teachers or the school as an institution, and as such, do not see a need to gather information or navigate the school context. The items establish some of the family-school relationship norms.

Initiating contact and building a relationship with the school network is an important accessibility factor that can facilitate or hinder social capital. Parents are expected to abide by certain norms in order to build relationships within a school network. Those norms or expectations are evident in the previous section detailing parents’ beliefs. However, parents who build a relationship with the school are also able to manage their children’s educational experience. Table 2 includes the survey items that assess a parent’s involvement in initiating contact and build relationships. These survey items were designed to correspond and
complement one another regarding a parent’s responsibility to build a family-school relationship. All of the survey items were designed to be related to the influence of management of educational experience from the review of literature. Items were also categorized as belief, ability or involvement statements.

Table 2

*Initiating Contact and Building Relationships Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to keep track of my child’s progress at school.</td>
<td>ICBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to support school learning at home.</td>
<td>ICBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to communicate regularly with my child’s teacher.</td>
<td>ICBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to ask for the things I need to help my child’s learning.</td>
<td>ICBR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to talk with my child’s teachers about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>ICBR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to make sure my child is in the appropriate class.</td>
<td>ICBR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contact my child’s teacher about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>ICBR</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gathering information includes a parent’s ability to access and use resources within their social networks. It also includes a parent’s ability to connect with others within that network to gain important information. Social networks that include professionals, educators, and other parents with school-age children benefit members since those resources allow for more access to school networks. This factor is multi-faceted since the informal network resources of the parents can determine how well they can integrate into school networks. The ability to access information, use resources, seek out or connect with others should be assessed through two network structures: formal networks consisting of direct connections to the school (e.g. PTA membership) and informal networks consisting of indirect connections to the school.

Typical measures of parental involvement include a parent’s direct connection with the school itself. This direct involvement allows parents to gain access to the school networks and
gain social capital. In social capital research in education, items that assess a parent’s relation to the school almost always include whether or not they attend parent-teacher conferences, school-related events, PTA meetings, and other structured activities set up by the school.

Informal information networks typically include a parent’s involvement in their children’s after-school activities or their relationship with other parents who have school-age children or children who have already attended the school. However, parents whose informal networks involve their family members or do not include other parents from the school are not as likely to have as many connections to the school network. Parents connected to these informal information networks gain access to valuable information about school that they would not be able to get from the school itself. For example, parents discuss which teachers are the “good” ones and which ones to avoid, or they discuss strategies on how to approach administrators, or they collectively act to deal with problems and make changes. Through informal information channels, parents are able to obtain a wide range of information regarding school and parenting advice. Parents who know who to seek out for information to help them have more resources in their network than those who do not know who to contact.

Overall, the items addressed the parents’ ability to gather information and resources from these networks. Table 3 includes the survey items that were developed to assess a parent’s ability to gather information. All of the survey items were related to the influence of network information and resources from the review of literature. Items were also categorized as belief, ability or involvement statements.
Table 3

**Gathering Information Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to seek out information about school from people I know.</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to ask questions about my child’s education.</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to participate in school-related activities.</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to find out about what school-related activities are occurring each month.</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to get the information I need about school from other parents.</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to access the school or district websites to get information.</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend school-related activities when I can at my child’s school.</td>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Navigating the context of school structures includes a parents’ ability to utilize the information they gained through their relationships and networks to manage their child’s educational experience. Parents who are effective managers of their child’s education will do their best to ensure that their child is in an appropriate class. Parents may request that their child be tested for special services, or request a specific teacher for their child. They may even challenge a teacher’s recommendation of course placement. Regardless, parents who are effective managers of their child’s education know that they have those options. Navigating the context of schools structures is a complex factor since it requires that parents have built relationships with the school and other parents as well as gathered information from their formal and informal networks. Parents who demonstrate an ability to navigate the inner workings of school probably hold strong parental beliefs about their responsibilities. Table 4 includes the survey items that were designed to assess a parent’s ability to navigate the school context. All of the survey items were related to the influence of management of educational experience from the review of literature. Items were also categorized as ability or involvement statements.
It is important to understand the structural barriers that exist for some parents due to their current life contexts. These barriers hinder parents from getting more involved in their child’s education and school network. The structure of school can make it difficult for people to access the network or get involved. For example, some parents’ working schedules prevent them from visiting the school, attending parent-teacher conferences or open-house nights, or getting in touch with the teacher. Furthermore, economic strains or transportation issues may prevent parents from allowing their children to attend after-school activities. All of these barriers have the potential to impact the previously identified factors. Parents whose native language is not the same as the teacher’s language may find it difficult to initiate contact and build a relationship as an example. Furthermore, if the school does not provide information in the parent’s native language, then the parent may not be able to gather information from the formal school network. Table 5 details the survey items that were developed to assess if these barriers exist for some parents. Parents who do not encounter these barriers have more potential involvement in school networks than those who have to find ways around these barriers. All of the survey items were related to the influence of structural barriers. All items were categorized as involvement since
structural barriers can hinder action and involvement in a school network or in a child’s education.

Table 5

*Structural Barriers Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to spend time at school because I can’t get to school due to transportation or other reasons.</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to spend time working with my child at home because my jobs takes up too much time.</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t always afford to let my child attend school-related activities.</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t always find transportation to let my child attend after-school activities.</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several items that were developed that did not easily identify with a single influence or factor because these items may include multiple factors or influences that impact a parent’s social capital potential within a school network. Regardless, these items were developed to give insight into school network accessibility. The factors were labeled to be analyzed (TBA). Table 6 includes the items that do not necessarily align with a specific factor and can span multiple categories. These items were related to different influences from the review of literature. These items were related to different categories of item statements.
Table 6

*Multiple Factors Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m more connected to the parents at my child’s school than the school itself.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain useful information about my child’s school through my connections with other parents.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain valuable information by attending school-related activities.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain valuable information by visiting the school or district website.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to ask questions about my child’s education.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m more connected to the parents at my child’s school than the school itself.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Instrument**

Chapter four explains the results of the exploratory factor analysis. Four accessibility factors and two sub-factors were extracted that confirmed the influences named in the review of literature as impacting parents' social capital potential. These four accessibility factors include: *Management of Educational Experience, Negotiating the Context of School Structures, Accessing Information, Network Information and Resources, Structural Barriers,* and *Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities*. The two sub-factors were derived from the *Management of Educational Experience* factor since this factor had the most amount of item statements and was analyzed further to result in the extraction of the sub-factors *Negotiating the Context of School Structures* and *Accessing Information*. Factor loadings and internal reliability consistency tests confirm the patterns of these items with its factors as detailed in the following chapter. The item statements aligned with its factors are detailed in Table 7. The final instrument was entered in Qualtrics to create an online version of the survey and was translated into Spanish (see Appendix A for English and Spanish versions of instrument). A link was generated in Qualtrics, and a
shorter URL address was created from that link using the website, Tiny URL, to make the link easier to read. The online consent was a required response (Appendix B). The paper copy of the survey reflected similar formatting as the online version and included two copies of the signed consent form (Appendix C).

Table 7

Item Statements Aligned with Accessibility Factors in Final Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Factor / Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know how to communicate my support or disagreement with teacher decisions.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to request my child be placed in a different class.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to ask for the things I need to help my child’s learning.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to make sure my child is in the appropriate class.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to talk with my child’s teachers about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to ask questions about my child’s education.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would contact the teacher if I had questions about his or her educational decisions.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If needed, I would request my child be placed in a different class.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I request parent-teacher conferences when I feel it is needed.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contact my child’s teacher about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contact the school to find out ways I can help my child.</td>
<td>MEE/ NCSS</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to find out about what school-related activities are occurring each month.</td>
<td>MEE/ AI</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain valuable information by visiting the school or district website.</td>
<td>MEE/ AI</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to access the school or district websites to get information.</td>
<td>MEE/ AI</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to seek out information about school from people I know.</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain useful information about my child’s school through my connections</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my family members to give me educational advice.</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to get the information I need about school from other parents.</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain valuable information by attending school-related activities.</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m more connected to the parents at my child’s school than the school</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend school-related activities when I can at my child’s school.</td>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t find transportation to let my child attend after-school activities.</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t afford to let my child attend school-related activities.</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to spend time at school because I can’t get to</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school due to transportation or other reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to spend time working with my child at home</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because my jobs takes up too much time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to support school learning at home.</td>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to keep track of my child’s progress at school.</td>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to ask questions about my child’s education.</td>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to communicate regularly with my child’s teacher.</td>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to participate in school-related activities.</td>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to support the teacher’s educational decisions.</td>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>Belief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Management of Educational Experience (MEE), Negotiating the Context of School Structures (NCSS), Accessing Information (AI), Network Information and Resources (NIR), Structural Barriers (SB), and Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities (PBR)

**Setting**

For the purposes of this study, the sample population of parents were from two middle schools located in a county that is northeast of a major metropolitan city. Middle school parents
were targeted because middle students are in transition and influenced by the changing conditions between elementary and middle school. Middle school students begin to push their boundaries and seek more independence. Most parents and teachers encourage more autonomy during this time; therefore, parents tend to not visit the school, volunteer in the classroom, or attend school-related events as frequently as they were during their child’s elementary school years.

As the school setting becomes more complex and complicated decisions must be made, collaborative relations between parents and schools weaken (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996). Consequently, parents’ direct involvement in school is waning while their children withdraw information about school. Middle school is typically a time where children have more choices about their education careers and more challenging coursework. Some parents do not have the ability to help their children through the process of choosing courses or helping with homework. They also may be unaware of how the choices they make during this time influence the child’s high school and even college trajectory. Thus, most parents have to rely on information from their informal networks about nuanced information that they cannot access directly through the school or do not know how to procure from school personnel.

Much of the research discussing the link between parental involvement and achievement target elementary school and high school students and parents (Hill & Tyson, 2009); therefore, a middle school setting was chosen in order fill in some of the gaps since there is not enough research at the middle and high school levels regarding parents’ involvement in school networks.

**Participants**

The research study was conducted at two middle school sites within a school district. These two middle schools, Oak Middle School and Horizon Middle School, (both pseudonyms)
are part of a school district that experienced sustainable growth within the past fifteen years. Originally a rural area dotted with tiny towns surrounded by farmlands, it experienced a growth spurt when a major highway bisected the area. During the construction boom, the area was built up to include middle and upper class master-planned communities. Large subdivisions were built on land that previously housed cows, horses, chickens, and crops. Within ten years, the county population doubled in size. In order to accommodate the growing population, a number of new schools were built, including the one for the sample population.

Built during the peak of growth in the community, Oak Middle School draws its student population, sixth through eighth grades, from the surrounding upper and middle-class neighborhoods. As a result, this middle school has earned a reputation of having a high level of parental involvement and strong ties to the surrounding community. The next school site, Horizon Middle School, was built in the 1980s to alleviate the growing population in the school district. Recently in 2014, a brand new state-of-the-art school was built to accommodate students in grades six through eighth as well. Horizon Middle School is considered a Title 1 school. It is also the only school site in the district to offer one-to-one laptops for its students. Students are issued a laptop instead of textbooks and use digital tools to complete assignments.

Approximately, 2553 students attend these two school sites. The demographic breakdown of the school sites’ student population in comparison the school district are presented below in Table 8. This information is from the state website’s latest information from the March 2015 enrollment data.
Table 8

Demographics of Student Population Percentage within School Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>OMS</th>
<th>HMS</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since an exploratory factor analysis of the data was conducted, best practices for this type of analysis were consulted. According to Costello and Osbourne (2005), the rules regarding sample size for factor analysis have disappeared. However, they note that exploratory factor analysis is a large sample procedure (Costello & Osbourne, 2005, p.4). In their review of studies using exploratory factor analysis as a method, they note that in order to generalize beyond a particular sample population, researchers should use a large sample size, thus using two school sites would allow for a greater sample size to be collected.

A total of 338 paper copies of the survey including signed consent forms were sent home with students whose parents did not have an email address in the system. A total of 17 were returned: five surveys were completed but could not be used because there was no signed consent, one survey was signed but no responses were recorded, and 11 surveys were completed and had signed consent forms. Those 11 surveys responses were recorded in Qualtrics. According to Qualtrics, the survey had 486 responses that responded “Yes” to participate in the survey; however, because the online survey was designed so that the respondents did not have to answer every question, response numbers vary for each item. As a result, responses for item statements and demographic information range from 416-430. Responses to the 31 item
statements average 428 responses. Reviewing the six demographic items the following number of responses were recorded: 427 responses indicated gender, 429 indicated ethnicity, 427 indicated educational level, 417 indicated income, 423 indicated free/reduced lunch qualifying, and 416 indicated movement. Table 9 details the demographic information of the parent responses.

The demographic information provided by the respondents show that 80% are female and 19% are male. Furthermore, 85% of the respondents are White, 17% African-American, and 5% Hispanic. Most of the respondents indicated that they completed a two-year college or higher level of degree. A total of 50% of the respondents indicated that they have an annual household income of $100,000 or higher. Additionally, 85% of the respondents indicated that his or her child does not qualify for the free or reduced lunch program. Finally, 86% of the respondents indicated that his or her child has not changed schools in the past two years.

To explore social class differences, lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents were determined by the free or reduced lunch program demographic variable: 359 were identified middle/upper class and 48 were identified as lower/working class. Those parents whose children qualify for that program have to meet federal income requirements. The U.S. Department of Agriculture publishes Income Eligibility Guidelines (IEG) for each school year that are used to determine financial eligibility for the free and reduced lunch program. The IEGs are based on the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines. Families who are eligible for the free or reduced lunch program have met these IEGs. For the purposes of this study, nominal coding was used to represent the two groups of parents. Parents who indicted that their children are eligible for participation in the free or reduced lunch program were coded
as lower/ working class. Parents who indicated that their children are not eligible for the free or reduced lunch program were coded as upper/ middle class.

Table 9

*Detailed Demographics of Parent Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (N=427)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (N=429)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level (N=427)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not attend or complete high school</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received high school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received some college or vocational training</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a two-year college degree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a four-year college degree</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a graduate degree</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income (N=417)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $69,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 to $89,999</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/ Reduced Lunch (N=423)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child qualifies</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child does not qualify</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools Attended Past 2 years (N=416)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedure**

First, university approval through the IRB process was submitted with appropriate documents, instruments, and consent form. After receiving approval from the university, meetings with both principals of Oak and Horizon Middle Schools were conducted. After presenting the information regarding the purpose of the research study, instruments and data collection methods used, and procedures, both principals gave permission for their school sites and parent population to be a part of the research study. District requests to collect data were completed and appropriate instruments were attached via email.

After receiving approval from the district to collect data, principals were given an outline of the procedure and asked to review emails that would be sent out to parents through the email distribution system. This student information system allows principals to send an email to every parent who has an email address as part of their contact information. This system makes it easy for the schools to communicate directly with their students, parents, and teachers. Students whose parents did not have an email address in the school’s system were identified by the registrar who was able to run a report detailing the students’ names, grade levels, and homeroom teachers on an Excel spreadsheet. A total of 338 students from both school sites did not have a parent email address in the school’s system.
Paper copies of the email, consent, and survey were printed for those students who did not have a parent email address in the school system. Paper copies were organized and placed in homeroom teachers’ mailbox with a note attached explaining that these particular students needed the paper copy of the survey to be sent home inside their report card envelope. The survey was sent home the same time as report cards to ensure that parents would receive a copy. During the afternoon, the principals of both schools sent out the first email to all parents which explained the purpose of the research study and provided the link to the online survey (see Appendix D for initial email). Parents were also informed that paper copies of the survey were available, upon request, at the front office of the schools.

After the first initial email about the online survey, a reminder email was sent again to parents from the principals of both schools through the email distribution system (see Appendix E). The reminder email was sent one week after the initial email. The online survey remained open for 12 days. Paper surveys were collected by the researcher at both school sites.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

After collecting the data from the surveys, principal components factoring method with direct oblimin rotation was used to examine draw conclusions regarding the accessibility factors. Because the survey instrument has not been utilized before to measure the construct of accessibility, an exploratory factor analysis was more appropriate at this time than confirmatory factor analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis can be conducted in future research to confirm the findings of the exploratory analysis.

Nominal coding was applied to the demographic variables: gender, race, educational level, occupation, and free or reduced lunch program participation. Reverse coding was applied to all of the responses except the four item statements that related to the structural barriers.
Reverse coding was applied to those statements to indicate strongly agree as higher measures of accessibility and strongly disagree as lower measures of accessibility. High levels of agreement to these items indicated less accessibility, thus the scale coding remained.

SPSS Version 22.0 was used run the analytics of the data. Assumption tests were conducted to determine the normality of the data, and the descriptive statistics was analyzed for skewness. Then, principal components factoring method with direct oblimin rotation was used to examine the factors. The factor loadings of the variables were reviewed using Kaiser’s criteria and the scree test. Eigenvalues of the factor loadings in the pattern matrix that were close to 1 or -1 were retained. The initial factor analysis extracted six factors was resulted in 21 items loading significantly onto the first factor. After reviewing the factor loadings, it was noted that few items were loaded onto the remaining five factors. This analysis was not supported by the review of literature. The number of factors to retain was then manually set to four, which was supported by the number of accessibility factors uncovered in the review of literature. Fourteen items loaded significantly on the first factor; another factor analysis was conducted to break the main factor into sub-factors. This resulted in two sub-factors extracted and a renaming of the sub-factors.

Internal reliability tests were run to confirm that the items in each factor were related. A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.7 or greater was used as the guideline to determine reliability and internal consistency. Composite scores were then created for each of the main four factors and two sub-factors. Related samples t tests were run using the composite scores of the four main factors. Correlation coefficients were examined to determine the strength of relations between Parent Beliefs about Responsibilities and the three factors: Management of Educational Experience, Network Information and Resources, and Structural Barriers. Strength of relations was determined to be moderate, modest, and weak.
Independent samples \( t \) tests were conducted using the demographic variable of free or reduced lunch participation to delineate two groups of social classes to determine if there were significant differences in a parent’s access to school network resources along these social class lines. Independent-samples \( t \) test were conducted for each factor and sub-factor to compare the mean composite scores for the two social class groupings: lower/working, and middle/upper. The lower/working and upper/middle class grouping was identified by the demographic variable of participation in free or reduced lunch program. By comparing the results of the mean composite scores on the factors identified, the independent-samples \( t \) test determined that there was a significant difference in the \textit{Structural Barriers} factor.

\textbf{Limitations}

In order to reach as many parents as possible, the survey was conducted online. Each school has its own student information system that the school’s administrators used to distribute important information. Throughout the school year, several email notifications are sent to the school’s parent population. The survey was distributed through the mass email notifications in order to get the information to the parents quickly and efficiently and to make the online survey easy to access. The email provided information regarding the study and the direct link to the online survey. Since both schools have a Hispanic population and Spanish-speaking parents, all information was translated into Spanish to reach that population of parents. To encourage participation, parents were reminded that their responses are anonymous and that no identifying information was collected. The number of responses per item varied because parents were not required to answer each item. A shortened version of the web address was made using a website that creates tiny URLs so that parents could easily type the web address to access the online survey if the direct link was not working.
Because not all parents have access to the internet or have an email address, students who did not have a parent email address in the school’s system were given a paper copy of the email and survey. Both schools were able to run a report of those students without a parent email address, and 338 were identified. The paper copies of the survey were sent home with those students’ report cards. A total of 17 paper copies were returned, but only 11 were completed and had signed consent, so those were included in the data analysis.

The results of the survey were skewed. The majority of the responses, 14 out of the 31 item statements, were skewed. All items were retained in the analysis because this was anticipated. The parents who responded to the survey were more than likely already involved and connected parents, so the data analysis showed homogeneity in the results. Overall, it was important to reach as many parents as possible in order to get a large sample size that represents the diversity of the school population.
Chapter Four: Findings

The purpose of this study sought to understand three main research questions regarding parents’ accessibility to a school network:

1. What are the underlying factors that can be extracted from a parent survey about the beliefs, abilities, and involvement of parents that influence accessibility to school networks?
   a. Do these variables form meaningful constructs that further inform or confirm theory relating to a parent’s involvement in a school network?

2. Do relationships exist between a parent’s belief and ability and a parent’s access to school networks and resources?

3. Are there meaningful differences in a parent’s access to school network resources related to social class indicators?

Data Descriptives

After collecting the data from the surveys, the results were exported from Qualtrics and saved as an SPSS file. First, scale coding was used for the responses: strongly agree = 1, somewhat agree = 2, slightly agree = 3, slightly disagree = 4, somewhat disagree = 5, and strongly disagree = 6. Reverse coding was applied to the first 27 item statements so that strongly agree = 6, somewhat agree = 5, slightly agree = 4, slightly disagree = 3, somewhat disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. Higher number represented higher levels of accessibility. The remaining four item statements regarding the structural barriers were not recoded because strongly agree responses indicated a lower level of accessibility, therefore, the coding was not reversed. Nominal coding was used for the demographic variables: gender, race, educational level, income, and free or reduced lunch program participation.
After properly coding the responses and demographic information, descriptive statistics were run for the data. The descriptive statistics showed 14 items with a skewness and kurtosis $> |2|$. This was to be expected since the parents who responded to the survey were more than likely involved parents. All items were retained in order to run the analyses.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

A principal components factoring method with direct oblimin rotation was used to examine the factors. The rotation method was used since the factors were more than likely related as it was discovered in the literature review. On the initial run of the data, six factors were extracted. A total of 21 items loaded significantly onto the first factor; therefore another factor analysis was conducted, and the extraction method was set to extract a total of four factors which was supported by the theoretical framework of the study. Principal components factoring method with direct oblimin rotation was again used to examine the factors. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .89, above the recommended .6 value, and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($p<.05$). The sample size was large enough to conduct a factor analysis. A total of four factors were extracted. The initial eigenvalues showed that the first factor had a total eigenvalue of 9.1, the second factor had a total eigenvalue of 2.8, the third factor had a total eigenvalue of 2.1, and the fourth factor had a total eigenvalue of 2.0. The first factor explained 29.34% of the variance, the second factor 9.11% of the variance, the third factor 6.91% of the variance, and the fourth factor 6.5% of the variance. All four factors explained 51.89% of the variance, and these four factors were supported by the previously identified influences of social capital. The four factors are: *Management of Educational Experience, Network Information and Resources, Structural Barriers, and Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities.*
The pattern matrix in Table 10 shows the factor loadings for each item. Two item statements loaded onto two separate factors. The item “It is my responsibility to participate in school-related activities” loaded onto the *Network Information and Resources* and *Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities* factors. For the purposes of this study, this item was retained only in the *Network Information and Resources* factor since the items that loaded on this factor had to do specifically with the network. The pattern of these items was supported by the theoretical framework, and overlapping of items was anticipated. Also, the item “It is my responsibility to seek out information about school from people I know” loaded onto both the *Network Information and Resources* and *Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities* factors. For the purposes of this study, this item was also retained in the *Network Information and Resources* factor since it related with the other network items. Again, this cross-loading was to be expected given that the accessibility factors overlap and influence one another.

Table 10

*Factor Loadings and Communalities Based on a Principal Components Factoring with Direct Oblimin Rotation for 31 items of the SNAP Scale (N=430)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>MEE</th>
<th>NIR</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>PBR</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know how to communicate my support or disagreement with teacher decisions.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to request my child be placed in a different class.</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to ask for the things I need to help my child’s learning.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Eta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to make sure my child is in the appropriate class.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to talk with my child’s teachers about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would contact the teacher if I had questions about his or her educational decisions.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If needed, I would request my child be placed in a different class.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I request parent-teacher conferences when I feel it is needed.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to ask questions about my child’s education.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contact my child’s teacher about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contact the school to find out ways I can help my child.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to find out about what school-related activities are occurring each month.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain valuable information by visiting the school or district website.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to access the school or district websites to get information.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain useful information about my child’s school through my connections with other parents.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m more connected to the parents at my child’s school than the school itself.</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my family members to give me educational advice.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to get the information I need about school from other parents.</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to seek out information about school from people I know.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain valuable information by attending school-related activities.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL NETWORK ACCESSIBILITY FOR PARENTS SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I attend school-related activities when I can at my child’s school.</td>
<td>.28 .33 .10 -.20 .36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t find transportation to let my child attend after-school activities.</td>
<td>-.06 -.06 .79 -.13 .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t afford to let my child attend school-related activities.</td>
<td>.00 .10 .75 .00 .58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to spend time at school because I can’t get to school due to transportation or other reasons.</td>
<td>-.04 .11 .67 .01 .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to spend time working with my child at home because my jobs takes up too much time.</td>
<td>.16 -.06 .63 .03 .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to support school learning at home.</td>
<td>-.18 -.10 .13 -.87 .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to keep track of my child’s progress at school.</td>
<td>-.08 -.12 .06 -.86 .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to ask questions about my child’s education.</td>
<td>.12 -.00 .05 -.71 .59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to communicate regularly with my child’s teacher.</td>
<td>.09 .07 -.23 -.67 .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to participate in school-related activities.</td>
<td>.08 .36 .09 -.45 .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to support the teacher’s educational decisions.</td>
<td>.24 .03 -.03 -.41 .31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Factor loadings >.30 are in boldface.

In order to further break-down the four factors, an additional factor analysis of the first factor, *Management of Educational Experience*, was conducted to examine sub-factors. A principal components factoring analysis was used on the 14 items. A direct oblimin rotation was used to examine the sub-factors. A total of two sub-factors were extracted from the *Management of Educational Experience* factor. These two sub-factors were supported by the previously identified related factors: Initiating Contact and Building Relationships, Navigating the Context
of School Structures, and Gathering Information. The first sub-factor explained 48.03% of the variance, and the second sub-factor 9.33% of the variance. The two sub-factors explained 57.36% of the variance. Because the items that had loaded significantly onto these two sub-factors overlapped, the two sub-factors were renamed from the ones previously identified in the literature review to Negotiating the Context of School Structures and Accessing Information in order to capture the best description of the two sub-factors.

The pattern matrix for the two sub-factors shows the factor loadings. The item “I find it easy to ask questions about my child’s education” loaded significantly onto both sub-factors. However, it was retained in the Negotiating the Context of School Structures factor since it connected with the other item statements in this factors. Again, this cross-loading was to be expected given that the accessibility factors overlap and influence one another.

Table 11

Sub-factor Loadings and Communalities Based on a Principal Components Factoring Analysis with Direct Oblimin rotation for 14 items of Management of Educational Experience Factor (N=430)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Negotiating the Context of School Structures (NCSS)</th>
<th>Accessing Information (AI)</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I contact my child’s teacher about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contact the school to find out ways I can help my child.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I request parent-teacher conferences when I feel it is needed.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to communicate my support or disagreement with teacher decisions.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to make sure my child is in the appropriate class.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know how to request my child be placed in a different class.  
If needed, I would request my child be placed in a different class.  
I know how to talk with my child’s teachers about my child’s progress.  
I know how to ask for the things I need to help my child’s learning.  
I would contact the teacher if I had questions about his or her educational decisions.  
I find it easy to ask questions about my child’s education.  
I know how to access the school or district websites to get information.  
I gain valuable information by visiting the school or district website.  
I know how to find out about what school-related activities are occurring each month.

Note. Factor loadings >.30 are in boldface.

To further test the reliability of these factors, internal consistency reliability tests were run for the first four factors and then the two sub-factors. All tests showed that the items within each factor were highly correlated. The first factor, Management of Educational Experience (14 items) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .91. The sub-factor, Negotiating the Context of School Structures (11 items) had an alpha of .88, and the second sub-factor, Accessing Information, (3 items) had an alpha of .72. The second main factor, Network Information and Resources (7 items), had an alpha of .78, the third, Structural Barriers (4 items), had an alpha of .73, and the fourth, Parental Beliefs (6 items), had an alpha of .75. Composite scores were created for each of the four factors and the two sub-factors. The descriptive statistics for the four main factors and two sub-factors are included in Table 12.
Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics for the Accessibility Factors (N=430)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Educational Experience</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.35 (.67)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating the Context of School Structures</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.35 (.71)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing Information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.32 (.79)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Information and Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.44 (.83)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Barriers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.92 (1.16)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.59 (.52)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Item statements are categorized as B= belief, AB= ability, IN= involvement

**Examining the Relationships Between Parent Beliefs and Access**

The null hypothesis that the correlation would be zero was rejected at the .05 level of significance. The results of the correlations showed that relationships exist between a parent’s belief and ability and a parent’s access to school networks and resources. The correlation between *Parent Beliefs about Responsibilities* and *Management of Educational Experience* is moderately correlated ($r=.49$, $p=.000$). The correlation between *Parent Beliefs about Responsibilities* and *Network Information and Resources* is modestly correlated ($r=.37$, $p=.000$). Finally, the correlation between *Parent Beliefs about Responsibilities* and *Structural Barriers* is weakly correlated ($r=.15$, $p<.001$). Table 13 summarizes the findings including the correlation coefficients, p-values, means, and standard deviations for the four accessibility factors.
Table 13

Summary of Correlation Coefficients of the Accessibility Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MEE</th>
<th>NIR</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>PBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBR</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDs</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Management of Educational Experience = MEE, Network Information and Resources = NIR, Structural Barriers = SB, and Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities = PBR. Significance of the correlations is noted as *p<.001, **p=.000

Examining the Differences Between Social Classes

In order to determine if social class differences exist, several independent-sample t tests were conducted to compare the mean composite scores for each factor of two social class groupings: lower/working, and middle/upper. Lower/working class grouping was determined by the demographic variable indicating “yes” participation in free or reduced lunch program. Middle/upper class grouping demographic variable indicating “no” participation in free or reduced lunch program. Nominal coding was used to identify the two social class groupings of parents.

Management of educational experience. Based on the sample of parents, 359 were identified middle/upper class and 48 were identified as lower/working class using the participation in the free/reduced lunch program as the categorical variable. The mean score of middle/upper class parents was 5.4 with a standard deviation of .89. The mean score of lower/working class parents was 5.3 with a standard deviation of .63. The independent-sample t-
test indicated the difference was not statistically significant \(t=.74, df=405, p=.46\). The null hypothesis was accepted. There is no difference between lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents in regards to the factor of *Management of Educational Experience*. The effect size was small (.11).

*Negotiating the context of school structures.* Based on the sample of parents, the mean score of lower/working class parents was 5.46 and the standard deviation was .93. The mean score of the middle/upper class parents was 5.34 and the standard deviation was .68. The independent-sample t-test indicated the difference was not statistically significant \(t=1.06, df=405, p=.29\). The null hypothesis was accepted. There is no difference between lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents in regards to the sub-factor of *Negotiating the Context of School Structures*. The effect size was small (.16).

*Accessing information.* Based on the sample of parents, the mean score of lower/working class parents was 5.38 and the standard deviation was .91. The mean score of the middle/upper class parents was 5.33 and the standard deviation was .74. The independent-sample t-test indicated the difference was not statistically significant \(t=.405, df=405, p=.69\). Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no difference between lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents in regards to the sub-factor of *Accessing Information*. The effect size was small (.06).

*Network information and resources.* The mean score of lower/working class parents was 4.3 and the standard deviation was .94. The mean score of middle/upper class parents was 4.46 and the standard deviation was .80. When compared, the difference between the two mean scores was not statistically significant \(t=-1.30, df=405, p=.19\). The null hypothesis was accepted. There is no difference between lower/working class parents and middle/upper class
parents in regards to the factor of *Network Information and Resources*. The effect size was small (-.12).

**Structural barriers.** The mean score of lower/working class parents was 4.05 with a standard deviation of 1.49. The mean score of middle/upper class parents was 5.05 with a standard deviation of 1.03. The independent-sample *t*-test indicated the difference was statistically significant (*t*=-4.478, *df*=405, *p*=.00). The null hypothesis was rejected. There is a difference between the lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents in regards to the factor of *Structural Barriers*. The effect size was large (-.86).

**Parental beliefs about responsibilities.** The mean score of lower/working class parents was 5.5 with a standard deviation of .93. The mean score of middle/upper class parents was 5.6 with a standard deviation of .37. When compared, the difference between the two means was not statistically significant (*t*=-1.41, *df*=405, *p*=.16). The null hypothesis was accepted. There is no difference between lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents in regards to the factor of *Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities*. The effect size was small (-.12).
Chapter Five: Discussion, Limitations, and Future Research

The purpose of the research study was to understand the underlying factors that can be extracted from a parent survey about the beliefs, abilities, and involvement of parents that influence accessibility to school networks, and if these variables form meaningful constructs that further inform or confirm theory relating to parents’ involvement in a school network. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to extract accessibility factors.

The four factors extracted, *Management of Educational Experience* (Brough & Irvin, 2001; Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996; Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1992), *Network Information and Resources* (Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996; Granovetter, 1973; Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau, 1987; Lin, 2000; McNeal, 1999; Perna & Titus, 200; Pichier & Wallace, 2009; Ream & Palardy, 2008; Smith-Maddox, 1999; Useem, 1992), *Structural Barriers* (Brough & Irvin, 2001; Lareau, 1987; Lee and Bowen 2006; Perna & Titus, 2005; Useem, 1991 & 1992), and *Parental Beliefs about Responsibilities* (Coleman, 1988; Epstein & Sanders, 2000; Lareau 1987) were initially identified in the review of literature as influences of parents’ potential social capital. However, the analysis confirms that these influences are indeed the accessibility factors. The anticipated accessibility factors from the review of literature: Initiating Contact and Building Relationships, Gathering Information, Navigating the Context of School Structures, and Existence of Structural Barriers, were not extracted as accessibility factors (Brough & Irvin, 2001; Coleman, 1988; Dornbusch & Glasgow, 1996; Epstein & Sanders, 2000; Granovetter, 1973; Horvat et al., 2003; Lareau 1987; Lee and Bowen 2006; Lin, 2000; McNeal, 1999; Perna & Titus, 200; Pichier & Wallace, 2009; Ream & Palardy, 2008; Smith-Maddox, 1999; Useem, 1991 & 1992). Instead, two sub-factors were extracted from the main factor, *Management of Educational Experience*. These two renamed sub-factors, *Negotiating the Context of School*
Structures and Accessing Information, were a result of a combination of item statements that captured a parent’s ability to build relationships, gather information, and navigate the context of school structures. Internal reliability tests confirm that the item statements relate to one another. Though the identification of accessibility factors were beneficial to the development of the survey items, the anticipated alignment of items onto the factors was not the actual outcome. The final instrument shows that the items were realigned with their corresponding influences. Although overlapping of item statements was anticipated, only two of the 31 items loaded significantly onto two factors. The two item statements were both categorized as belief statements, but were retained with items relating to parents’ network information and resources statements. Overall, these analyses support the four factors previously identified in the literature review and confirms the theory that the influences of social capital impact a parent’s involvement and accessibility to school networks.

This research also sought to understand if relationships exist between a parents’ beliefs and abilities and a parent’s access to school networks and resources. Parental beliefs function as a factor of accessibility. Items that were related to parental beliefs loaded significantly as a separate factor. The results from the related samples t tests confirm that parental beliefs are moderately correlated with two accessibility factors, Management of Educational Experience, and Network Information and Resources. Parental beliefs were weakly correlated with Structural Barriers. Though those barriers may exist for parents, it does not predict differences in parent beliefs.

Finally, this research sought to explore if there were meaningful differences in parents’ access to school network resources along social class groupings. The literature suggests the importance of social class differences. Epstein and Sanders (2000), Dornbusch and Glasgow
(1996), Horvat et al. (2003), Lareau (1987), Lee and Bowen (2006) McNeal (1999), Ream and Palardy (2008) have examined and discussed the impact that parents’ socioeconomic status can have on involvement in their child’s educational experiences. Lee and Bowen (2006) found that parents whose lifestyles were most congruent with the school’s culture were more than likely to be involved. Parents who had financial limitations, transportation restrictions, or language barriers were hindered from becoming more involved due to these obstacles. The results of the independent-samples t tests, which compared lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents as indicated by their child’s eligibility for the free or reduced lunch program, showed that there was a difference regarding accessibility. Lower/working class parents indicated that structural barriers exist that may impede their ability to become more involved within a school network. These barriers to involvement included financial limitations and time restraints. Parents in this social class groupings indicated higher levels of agreement to item statements regarding difficulty or inability to accessing school networks. These results are consistent with Lee and Bowen’s conclusions regarding barriers to parent involvement. However, this was the only difference noted in comparing the two social class groupings. Specifically, lower/working parents and middle/upper class parents indicated similar levels of agreement regarding their ability and involvement in the other main factors. The results of the independent-samples t tests showed that both groups of parents have similar beliefs, abilities, and involvement in their children’s education. Though Ream and Palardy (2008) found differences among social class groupings in regards to measures of social capital, this study can only confirm that differences in mean scores exist among parents in the lower/working class grouping. Lareau (1987) and Epstein and Sanders (2000) also emphasized the differences in parent beliefs among middle and working class parents in their research. However, the current study did not find
significant differences in regards to parents’ beliefs about their roles and responsibilities. Furthermore, when analyzing the sub-factors of *Negotiating the Context of School Structures* and *Accessing Information*, the results continued to support the argument that there was no difference along social class groupings.

Hatala (2009) notes that in the field of human resources development, “Providing employees with the skills necessary to use their network resources will likely increase the opportunities for those who have the ability to perform the job (human capital) but cannot gain access (social capital) to those who are in a position to influence change” (p. 54). Similarly, providing parents with the opportunities to develop the abilities necessary to access school networks may likely increase their opportunities or accessibility to resources and information. Those abilities include communicating, managing, networking, accessing, and negotiating.

For practical purposes, the SNAP scale can provide a SNAP shot of parents’ accessibility measures. This SNAP shot can be conducted at the start of the school year during open house. Schools can use the data collected from the SNAP shot to assess their parents’ accessibility and provide interventions to improve these measures. For example, the parental beliefs items can be tailored to the school’s belief or mission statements. Schools can use the results from SNAP shot to confirm that the school’s belief or mission statement is aligned with the beliefs of parents. If the SNAP shot shows a difference between parents’ beliefs and the school’s beliefs about the responsibilities of the parents, then this becomes a point of discussion for the stakeholders. It also allows schools and parents to come together to form beliefs that represent the school network as a whole.

Furthermore, the SNAP shot will show the abilities or possible skills such as asking questions or accessing information that parents indicate they lack in order to connect to a school
network. Schools can then provide opportunities to develop parents’ abilities. For example, most schools have a curriculum night or an open house for parents. These opportunities can be used to help parents develop the negotiating skills needed in order to effectively manage their children’s educational experience. Schools can provide parent training on how to read test scores or interpret reports send home by teachers, or how to contact the school counselor to request conferences, class changes, or how to access information through school and district websites.

To improve parents’ network information and resources, the school can create more opportunities within the community for parents to come together. For example, opportunities may be parent education nights where schools can put together information to educate parents on adolescent development or strategies on how to help with homework. These opportunities can also be events that showcase student projects in order to inform parents about the curriculum. Furthermore, these opportunities may even provide support groups for parents. Schools can partner with the local community, non-profit or faith-based organizations, which can bring together people from the community to help support the parents. These opportunities may even provide transportation so that parents who have difficulty attending due to these limitations can attend. Schools may even put together after-school activities that do not have a financial requirement so that students can participate and parents can connect with one another.

The results of the SNAP shot may also inform schools if there are social class differences impacting particular accessibility measures. For example, the present study showed a difference between lower/working class parents and middle/upper class parents in regards to the structural barriers due to transportation, financial, or time limitations. In order to improve parents’ accessibility to school networks, the schools in the study may consider providing flexible hours
for open house or curriculum nights, car-pooling sign-ups or schedules, activities on weekends, or even going out into the community to provide information.

The SNAP shot can help school set goals in their school improvement plans. The interventions provided can help target specific areas of improvement. Furthermore, the SNAP shot can measure growth in a particular accessibility factor. SNAP shots can be analyzed before and after interventions and goal setting to measure improvements. Overall, the SNAP shot will allow schools to be more informed about their parent population and give schools measurable and useful data.

**Limitations**

When discussing structural barriers, it is important to note that they exist for the school as well. A main barrier that was encountered during this study was the amount of the parents that were unreachable via email. A total of 338 students did not have a parent email address as part of their contact information. Because both schools use email notifications to pass along information, this barrier to communication is significant. Because this barrier was anticipated, some additional steps in the procedure were taken to help ensure that all parents were informed of the study. First, the timing of the survey was planned to align with important school dates, specifically the distribution of report cards because both schools sites require a parent signature confirming that they received the report card. The paper copy was sent home and the mass email notification was sent out to parents the same day. Second, all the survey information, including the email, consent forms, and instrument was translated into Spanish since both schools had a Hispanic population. Finally, to encourage participation, a short URL address was created to so that parents could easily type the link of the survey into a smartphone or other electronic device.
with internet access in case the direct link in the email was not working properly or if the parent received a paper copy and wanted to complete it online.

Because the research indicates the importance of social class differences, the present study was conducted using two school sites that were demographically diverse to provide some variety of parent populations. Oak Middle School was selected because it draws most of its population from the surrounding neighborhoods of middle and upper class families. Theoretically, this population of parents would have the most accessibility to school networks which was also evident when it was reported that only 20 students did not have a parent email address in the school’s system. Targeting this population of parents may have resulted in the highly skewed responses because the majority of parents received the email notification with the survey’s link. Horizon Middle School is a Title 1 school. It has a more diverse population compared to Oak Middle School, but it also has a significant amount of students who qualify for the free or reduced lunch program. Theoretically, this school’s population of parents may have more barriers to their involvement which was evident when it was reported that 318 students in this school did not have a parent email address in the school’s system. Furthermore, students at Horizon Middle School are issued their own school laptop to carry to and from school, so this may have influenced the amount of online responses if parents had internet access to use the laptops at home.

Overall, 338 students did not have a parent email in the school’s system: 318 students from Horizon Middle School, and 20 from Oak Middle School. Oak Middle School received one completed survey. Horizon Middle School received 16 surveys, but not all of them were used to the data analyses due to lack of signed consent or completed survey responses. Nine of the 11 analyzed surveys were completed in Spanish. It is important to note the significant difference
between the two populations in the amount of parent email addresses. It would be interesting to understand the two schools’ procedures in obtaining parent email addresses. Much of the communication between home and school is electronic. If 338 students from these two sites are lacking this channel of information, then this serves as a structural barrier. Furthermore, the schools have their own barriers to overcome. For example, approval was needed to send paper copies of the survey home with report cards. Communication between home and school is not always as simple as it can be because of district protocol and procedures. This is important to note since the barriers exist for both parents and schools.

Even though the responses were highly skewed, targeting these two populations of parents clarified the variables that are strongly correlated with accessibility. Parents who participated indicated high levels of agreement for many of the item statements. This was to be expected since the parents who responded were more than likely already connected or involved in the school network. This may appear to be a limitation, but it resulted in data that captured the factors of the scale. Furthermore, some parents even responded to the principal’s email notification informing that they completed the survey. Some parents reached out the researcher and asked for the link again in order to complete the survey. Not all parents exhibited enthusiasm completing the survey; one parent requested the principal to stop sending these email notifications. The range of responses to the email notification showed some connected parents were more willing to participate than others.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to uncover the accessibility factors. Confirmatory factor analysis should be conducted to test the reliability and validity of the scale with different groups of parents. This implies that future research is needed across multiple
groups and school contexts. Continued research needs to further investigate the differential access of parents to school networks. Although the review of literature suggests the importance of social class differences, the results of this study can only confirm that social class differences impact the existence of structural barriers to accessibility of school networks. Additional research is needed to confirm that this is the only factor that results in a meaningful differences. Furthermore, additional data analyses can be conducted using other demographic variables related to social class. Much of educational research uses participation in the free or reduced lunch program as the socioeconomic status indicator representing social class. Continued analyses could be used to investigate if parental access to school networks is influenced by income levels or educational attainment.

To encourage parents to complete the survey, it was designed to take only 5-10 minutes of the parents’ time. As a result, the final survey consists of 31 items. While more items were developed, those did not make it into the final instrument. Some of those items would be better addressed as part of a mixed-methods or qualitative research study to further understand the differences in network resources and information. For example, future research may utilize a focus group of parents from different social class groupings, and questions could be asked to understand the importance of informal and formal networks such as the value of information or type of information that is gained from being a part of the networks. Further analysis of the value and type of information gained by parents may uncover differential access. In addition to questions regarding network information and resources, questions can also be asked to uncover other structural barriers that may be in place for some parents. The survey items focused on transportation, financial, and time limitations; however, there may be more structural barriers that impact a parents’ access to a school network, for example a lack of an email address or
direct line of communication to the school. Focus groups and interviews may shed light on other barriers that may impact accessibility.

In final consideration, the development of a School Network Accessibility for Parents (SNAP) scale yields four accessibility factors and two sub-factors that impact a parent’s social capital potential. The four main factors derived seek to further explore the influences of accessibility to school network resources. The information gathered from this scale uncovers the importance of parent beliefs, management of educational experience, network information and resources, and structural barriers. Furthermore, parents’ abilities to negotiate the context of school structures and access information are important factors that can impact accessibility. This scale departs from traditional measures of social capital developed by Coleman and presents new variables to fill in gaps outlined by Dika and Singh’s (2002) analysis of social capital and its applications to educational research. The practical application of this survey on school population may give school administrators and faculty further insight on how to bridge the networks of school and home.
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Appendix A

**Parent Involvement Survey**

Thank you for participating in this brief survey regarding your involvement in your middle school child’s schooling. The survey contains 31 questions and should take about 5-10 minutes of your time. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the statements below. Please read each item carefully and respond to each item indicating your level of agreement or disagreement by marking the appropriate corresponding circle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is my responsibility to…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. keep track of my child’s progress at school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. support school learning at home.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. communicate regularly with my child’s teacher.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. support the teacher’s educational decisions.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. participate in school-related activities.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. seek out information about school from people I know.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ask questions about my child’s education.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know how to…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. ask for the things I need to help my child’s learning.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. talk with my child’s teachers about my child’s progress.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. make sure my child is in the appropriate class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. communicate my support or disagreement with teacher decisions.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. request my child be placed in a different class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. find out about what school-related activities are occurring each month.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. get the information I need about school from other parents.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. access the school or district websites to get information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I find it easy to ask questions about my child's education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I contact my child's teacher about my child's progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I contact the school to find out ways I can help my child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I request parent-teacher conferences when I feel it is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I would contact the teacher if I had questions about his or her educational decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. If needed, I would request my child be placed in a different class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I attend school-related activities when I can at my child’s school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I gain valuable information by attending school-related activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I gain valuable information by visiting the school or district website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I'm more connected to the parents at my child’s school than the school itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I gain useful information about my child’s school through my connections with other parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I rely on my family members to give me educational advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It is difficult for me to spend time at school because I can’t get to school due to transportation or other reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. It is difficult for me to spend time working with my child at home because my jobs takes up too much time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I can’t afford to let my child attend school-related activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I can’t find transportation to let my child attend after-school activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete the following information.

Please indicate your gender by placing a check in the appropriate box:

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to answer

Please indicate your race/ethnicity by placing a check in the appropriate box:

- African-American
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Multiracial
- Native American
- White
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Please indicate the highest level of education received by either parent/guardian in the household:

- Did not attend or complete high school
- Received high school diploma or equivalent
- Received some college or vocational training
- Completed a two-year college degree
- Completed a four-year college degree
- Completed a graduate degree
- Prefer not to answer

Please indicate if your child qualifies for the free or reduced lunch program:

- Yes, my child qualifies for free or reduced lunch
- No, my child does not qualify for free or reduced lunch
- Prefer not to answer

Please indicate the household’s total income in a year:

- Less than $10,000
- $10,000 to $19,999
- $20,000 to $29,999
- $30,000 to $39,999
- $40,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $59,999
- $60,000 to $69,999
- $70,000 to $79,999
- $80,000 to $89,999
- $90,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $149,999
- $150,000 or more
- Prefer not to answer

Please indicate the number of times your child has changed schools in the last two years. Do not count the regular transition from elementary to middle school.

- 0
- 1
- 2
THANK YOU! I appreciate you taking the time to complete this survey!

Cuestionario de Participación de los Padres

Gracias por su participación en esta breve encuesta respeto a su involucramiento en la educación de su hijo. La encuesta contiene 31 preguntas y debería tomarle 5-10 minutos de su tiempo. No hay respuestas correctas ni incorrectas a las declaraciones que siguen. Favor de leer cada oración cuidadosamente y responder a cada una.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Es mi responsabilidad…</th>
<th>Muy en Acuerdo</th>
<th>Algo en Acuerdo</th>
<th>Ligeramente en Acuerdo</th>
<th>Ligeramente en Desacuerdo</th>
<th>Algo en Desacuerdo</th>
<th>Muy en Desacuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. supervisar el desarrollo escolar de mi hijo.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. apoyar el aprendizaje escolar en casa.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. estar en contacto regularmente con el maestro de mi hijo.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. apoyar las decisiones escolares del maestro.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. participar en actividades escolares.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. buscar información escolar de gente que conozco.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. preguntar sobre la educación de mi hijo.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yo sé cómo…</th>
<th>Muy en Acuerdo</th>
<th>Algo en Acuerdo</th>
<th>Ligeramente en Acuerdo</th>
<th>Ligeramente en Desacuerdo</th>
<th>Algo en Desacuerdo</th>
<th>Muy en Desacuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. pedir por las cosas que necesito para ayudar el aprendizaje de mi hijo.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. hablar con las maestras de mi hijo sobre su desarrollo escolar.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. asegurar que mi hijo esté en la clase apropiada.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. comunicar mi apoyo o desacuerdo con las decisiones de los maestros.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. pedir que mi hijo sea puesto en una clase diferente.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. averiguar cuales actividades escolares ocurren cada mes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
<td>Muy en Acuerdo</td>
<td>Algo en Acuerdo</td>
<td>Ligeramente en Acuerdo</td>
<td>Ligeramente en Desacuerdo</td>
<td>Algo en Desacuerdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>como buscar la información escolar que necesito de otros padres.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>acceder el website escolar y del distritillo para información.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Yo lo encuentro fácil preguntar sobre la educación de mi hijo.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Yo me comunico con la maestra de mi hijo sobre su desarrollo escolar.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Yo me comunico con la escuela para encontrar maneras de ayudar a mi hijo.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Yo pido juntas con la maestra cuando siento que es necesario.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Yo me comunicaría con la maestra si tuviera preguntas sobre sus decisiones escolares.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Si fuera necesario, yo pediría que mi hijo sea puesto en una clase diferente</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Yo asisto a las actividades escolares de mi hijo cuando pueda.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Yo obtengo información valiosa cuando asisto actividades escolares.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Obtengo información valiosa cuando visito el website escolar o del distrito.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Estoy más conectado(a) a los padres de la escuela de mi hijo que a la escuela si misma.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Obtengo información útil de la escuela atrás de mis conexiones a los otros padres.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Dependo en mi familia para darme consejos educativos.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Es difícil para mí pasar tiempo en la escuela porque no tengo transporte o tengo otras razones por no poder ir.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Es difícil para mí pasar tiempo trabajando con mi hijo en casa porque tengo que trabajar y no me sobra mucho tiempo.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>No tengo el dinero para mi hijo para asistir a actividades escolares.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Por favor complete la siguiente información.

Por favor indique su género mediante la colocación de una marca en la casilla correspondiente:

- [ ] Hombre
- [ ] Mujer
- [ ] Prefiero no responder

Por favor indique su raza / origen étnico mediante la colocación de una marca en la casilla correspondiente:

- [ ] Afroamericano
- [ ] Asiático
- [ ] Hispano
- [ ] Multirracial
- [ ] Nativo
- [ ] Americano
- [ ] Otro
- [ ] Prefiero no responder

Por favor, indique el nivel más alto de la educación recibida por cualquiera de los padres / tutores en el hogar:

- [ ] No asistí o terminé la escuela secundaria
- [ ] Recibí diploma de escuela secundaria o su equivalente
- [ ] Recibí alguna educación superior o de formación profesional
- [ ] Recibió el título universitario de dos años
- [ ] Recibió el título universitario de cuatro años
- [ ] Recibió el título de graduado
- [ ] Prefiero no responder

Por favor indique si su hijo califica para el programa de almuerzo gratis o a precio reducido:

- [ ] Sí, mi hijo califica para el almuerzo gratis o reducido
- [ ] No, mi hijo no califica para el almuerzo gratis o reducido
- [ ] Prefiero no responder

Por favor, indique el ingreso total del hogar en un año:

- [ ] menos de $10,000
- [ ] $10,000 a $19,999
- [ ] $20,000 a $29,999
- [ ] $30,000 a $39,999
- [ ] $40,000 a $49,999
- [ ] $50,000 a $59,999
- [ ] $60,000 a $69,999
- [ ] $70,000 a $79,999
- [ ] $80,000 a $89,999
- [ ] $90,000 a $99,999
- [ ] $100,000 a $149,999
Por favor, indique el número de veces que su hijo ha cambiado de escuela en los últimos dos años. No cuente la transición normal de la primaria a la secundaria.

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 o más

¡GRACIAS! Yo aprecio que ha tomado el tiempo para completar esta encuesta!
Appendix B

ONLINE SURVEY CONSENT FORM

**Title of Research Study:** Development of a School Network Accessibility for Parents (SNAP) Scale: An Exploratory Factor Analysis

**Researcher’s Contact Information:** Lea Campos, (770-345-4100), Lea.Campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us
Dr. Nita Paris, (470-578-2882), nparis@kennesaw.edu

**Introduction**
You are being invited to take part in a research study conducted by Lea Campos of Kennesaw State University. Before you decide to participate in this study, you should read this form and ask questions about anything that you do not understand.

**Description of Project**
The purpose of the study is to understand parents’ involvement in their child’s school. This study will explore parents’ beliefs about getting involved in their child’s education and school and their abilities to do so. This study will explore if there are differences in a parent’s belief and a parent’s ability to get involved.

**Explanation of Procedures**
This study requires that you, the parent or legal guardian, complete a survey that will take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time. You can complete the survey online using the direct link or you can request a paper copy to complete the survey.

**Time Required**
The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

**Risks or Discomforts**
Participation in the survey has no known risks; however, you may feel slightly uncomfortable sharing your beliefs about parent involvement.

**Benefits**
By participating in this study, you may have a better understanding of your own beliefs about parental involvement and your abilities to get involved.

**Compensation**
Compensation is not applicable.

**Confidentiality**
The results of this participation will be anonymous. There will be no identifying information on the survey because only demographic information will be collected.
Inclusion Criteria for Participation
You must be a parent or guardian of a student who attends middle school in grades 6, 7, or 8.

Use of Online Survey
IP addresses will not be collected for this survey.

Research at Kennesaw State University that involves human participants is carried out under the oversight of an Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to the Institutional Review Board, Kennesaw State University, 585 Cobb Avenue, KH3403, Kennesaw, GA 30144-5591, (470) 578-2268.

PLEASE PRINT A COPY OF THIS CONSENT DOCUMENT FOR YOUR RECORDS, OR IF YOU DO NOT HAVE PRINT CAPABILITIES, YOU MAY CONTACT THE RESEARCHER TO OBTAIN A COPY

☐ I agree and give my consent to participate in this research project. I understand that participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw my consent at any time without penalty.

☐ I do not agree to participate and will be excluded from the remainder of the questions.

Formulario de consentimiento en línea
Título del Estudio de Investigación: Desarrollo de una red Accesibilidad Escuela para Padres Escala (SNAP): un análisis factorial exploratorio

Investigador de Información de Contacto: Lea Campos, (770-345-4100), Lea.Campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us; Dr. Nita París, (470-578-2882), nparis@kennesaw.edu

Introducción
Se le invita a participar en un estudio de investigación realizado por Lea Campos de la Universidad Estatal de Kennesaw. Antes de decidirse a participar en este estudio, debe leer esta forma y hacer preguntas sobre cualquier cosa que usted no entiende.

Descripción del Proyecto
El objetivo del estudio es entender la implicación de los padres en la escuela de sus hijos. Este estudio explorará las creencias de los padres acerca de cómo involucrarse en la educación y la escuela de sus hijos y sus capacidades para hacerlo. Este estudio permitirá explorar si existen diferencias en las creencias de los padres y la capacidad de los padres para participar.

Explicación de los Procedimientos
Este estudio requiere que usted, el padre o tutor, complete una encuesta que se llevará a aproximadamente 5-10 minutos de su tiempo. Puede completar la encuesta en línea utilizando el enlace directo o puede solicitar una copia impresa para completar la encuesta.

Tiempo requerido
La encuesta debe tomar aproximadamente 5 a 10 minutos para completar.
**Riesgos o molestias**
La participación en la encuesta no tiene riesgos conocidos; Sin embargo, se puede sentir un poco incómodo para compartir sus creencias sobre la participación de los padres.

**Beneficios**
Al participar en este estudio, es posible que tenga una mejor comprensión de sus propias creencias sobre la participación de los padres y sus habilidades para participar.

**Compensación**
La compensación no es aplicable.

**Confidencialidad**
Los resultados de esta participación será anónima. No habrá ninguna información de identificación en la encuesta porque sólo información demográfica será recogido.

**Los criterios de inclusión para la participación**
Usted debe ser un padre o tutor de un estudiante que asiste a la escuela secundaria en los grados 6, 7, u 8.

**El uso de la encuesta en línea**
Las direcciones IP no serán recogidos para esta encuesta.

La investigación en la Universidad Estatal de Kennesaw que involucra a participantes humanos se lleva a cabo bajo la supervisión de una Junta de Revisión Institucional. Las preguntas o los problemas relacionados con estas actividades deberán dirigirse a la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad Estatal de Kennesaw, 585 Cobb Avenue, KH3403, Kennesaw, GA 30144 hasta 5591, (470) 578-2268.

POR FAVOR imprimir una copia de este documento de consentimiento para sus registros, O SI NO TIENE LA CAPACIDAD imprimir, es posible contacto con el investigador para obtener una copia.
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SIGN DENT CONSENT FORM

Title of Research Study: Development of a School Network Accessibility for Parents (SNAP) Scale: An Exploratory Factor Analysis

Researcher's Contact Information: Lea Campos, (770-345-4100), Lea.Campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us
Dr. Nita Paris, (470-578-2882), nparis@kennesaw.edu

Introduction
You are being invited to take part in a research study conducted by Lea Campos of Kennesaw State University. Before you decide to participate in this study, you should read this form and ask questions about anything that you do not understand.

Description of Project
The purpose of the study is to understand parents' involvement in their child's school. This study will explore parents' beliefs about getting involved in their child's education and school and their abilities to do so. This study will explore if there are differences in a parent's belief and a parent's ability to get involved.

Explanation of Procedures
This study requires that you, the parent or guardian, complete a survey that will take approximately 5-10 minutes of your time. You can complete the survey online using the direct link or you can request a paper copy to complete the survey.

Time Required
The survey should take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete.

Risks or Discomforts
Participation in the survey has no known risks; however, you may feel slightly uncomfortable sharing your beliefs about parent involvement.

Benefits
By participating in this study, you may have a better understanding of your own beliefs about parent involvement and your abilities to get involved.

Compensation
Compensation is not applicable.

Confidentiality
The results of this participation will be anonymous. There will be no identifying information on the survey because only demographic information will be collected.

Inclusion Criteria for Participation
You must be a parent or guardian of a student who attends middle school in grades 6, 7, or 8.

Signed Consent
I agree and give my consent to participate in this research project. I understand that participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw my consent at any time without penalty.

__________________________________________________
Signature of Participant or Authorized Representative, Date
Research at Kennesaw State University that involves human participants is carried out under the oversight of an Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to the Institutional Review Board, Kennesaw State University, 585 Cobb Avenue, KH3403, Kennesaw, GA 30144-5591, (470) 578-2268.

Formulario de consentimiento firmado

Título del Estudio de Investigación: Desarrollo de una red Accesibilidad Escuela para Padres Escala (SNAP): un análisis factorial exploratorio

Investigador de Información de Contacto: Lea Campos, (770-345-4100), Lea.Campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us; Dr. Nita Paris, (470-578-2882), nparis@kennesaw.edu

Introducción
Se le invita a participar en un estudio de investigación realizado por Lea Campos de la Universidad Estatal de Kennesaw. Antes de decidirse a participar en este estudio, debe leer esta forma y hacer preguntas sobre cualquier cosa que usted no entiende.

Descripción del Proyecto
El objetivo del estudio es entender la implicación de los padres en la escuela de sus hijos. Este estudio explorará las creencias de los padres acerca de cómo involucrarse en la educación y la escuela de sus hijos y sus capacidades para hacerlo. Este estudio permitirá explorar si existen diferencias en las creencias de los padres y la capacidad de los padres para participar.

Explicación de los Procedimientos
Este estudio requiere que usted, el padre o tutor, complete una encuesta que se llevará a aproximadamente 5-10 minutos de su tiempo. Puede completar la encuesta en línea utilizar el enlace directo o puede solicitar una copia impresa para completar la encuesta.

Tiempo requerido
La encuesta debe tomar aproximadamente 5-10 minutos para completar.

Riesgos o molestias
La participación en la encuesta no tiene riesgos conocidos; Sin embargo, se puede sentir un poco incómodo para compartir sus creencias sobre la participación de los padres.

Beneficios
Al participar en este estudio, es posible que tenga una mejor comprensión de sus propias creencias sobre la participación de los padres y sus habilidades para participar.

Compensación
La compensación no es aplicable.

Confidencialidad
Los resultados de esta participación será anónima. No habrá ninguna información de identificación en la encuesta porque sólo información demográfica será recogido.

Los criterios de inclusión para la participación
Usted debe ser un padre o tutor de un estudiante que asiste a la escuela secundaria en los grados 6, 7, u 8.

El consentimiento firmado
Estoy de acuerdo y doy mi consentimiento para participar en este proyecto de investigación. Entiendo que la participación es voluntaria y que puedo retirar mi consentimiento en cualquier momento sin penalización.
POR FAVOR FIRME AMBAS COPIAS DE ESTE FORMULARIO, TENGA UNO Y VUELVE LA OTRA PARA EL INVESTIGADOR.

La investigación en la Universidad Estatal de Kennesaw que involucra a participantes humanos se lleva a cabo bajo la supervisión de una Junta de Revisión Institucional. Las preguntas o los problemas relacionados con estas actividades deberán dirigirse a la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad Estatal de Kennesaw, 585 Cobb Avenue, KH3403, Kennesaw, GA 30144 hasta 5591, (470) 578-2268.
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Hello Parents!

My name is Lea Campos and I am a teacher at Freedom Middle School. I have been a teacher in Cherokee County for eight years. I am currently pursuing my doctorate degree for Secondary English Education at Kennesaw State University. As part of my dissertation, I am conducting a research study to understand parent involvement in middle school. I have the school principal and the school district's approval to conduct this study.

Here is where I need your assistance! Because I am interested in understanding parental involvement, I created a survey that will ask you some questions about your beliefs and abilities regarding involvement in your children’s school and education. If you could spare a few minutes of your time to complete a survey about parental involvement, I would greatly appreciate it. Participation is optional, and the survey is anonymous.

This 32 question survey should only take a 5-10 minutes of your time.


More details about the survey are provided when you click on the link. You can use your computer or mobile device to take the online survey.

Please complete the survey by Sunday, April 3\textsuperscript{rd}.

If you need a paper copy of the survey, the front office can provide you or your student with one. Please return completed paper surveys to the school’s front office by Friday, April 1\textsuperscript{st}. Please do not hesitate to ask me any questions! Thank you in advance for your participation!

Sincerely,

Lea Campos, Ed. S
7\textsuperscript{th} grade Language Arts and Social Studies
Freedom Middle School
lea.campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us

Hola Padres!

Me llamo Lea Campos y soy maestra en la escuela, Freedom Middle. He sido maestra por 8 años en el condado de Cherokee. Actualmente estoy persiguiendo mi doctorado en Secondary English Education en la Universidad de Kennesaw State. Como parte de mi disertación, estoy conduciendo un estudio para mejor entender el involucramiento de los padres en el middle school. Tengo el permiso de la directora de la escuela y de la Junta de Educación del Condado para conducir esta encuesta.

Aquí es donde necesito su asistencia! Porque estoy interesada en el involucramiento de padres, he creado una encuesta que les preguntará sobre sus creencias y habilidades según el involucramiento en la escuela y la educación de sus hijos. Si Usted pudiera darme algunos minutos de su tiempo para completar la encuesta sobre el involucramiento de padres, se lo agradecería mucho. Esto es totalmente opcional y la encuesta es anónimo. Esta encuesta de 32 preguntas debe tomárse 5 a 10 minutos de su tiempo.

Se proporcionan más detalles acerca de la encuesta cuando se hace clic en el enlace. Usted puede utilizar el ordenador o dispositivo móvil para tomar la encuesta en línea. **Favor de entregar sus respuestas para domingo, el 3 abril.**

Si necesita una copia en papel de la encuesta, la oficina puede proporcionar usted o su niño con. Por favor, devuelva las encuestas completadas a la oficina principal de la escuela para el viernes, el 1 abril. Por favor, siéntase libre de hacer cualquier pregunta. Gracias de antemano por su participación!

Sinceramente,

Lea Campos, Ed. S  
7th grade Language Arts and Social Studies  
Freedom Middle School  
lea.campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us
Appendix E

Reminder to Complete Parent Involvement Survey

Hello Parents!

This is just a reminder that the deadline to complete the parent involvement survey is this **Sunday, April 3**. If you could spare a few minutes of your time to complete a survey about parental involvement, I would greatly appreciate it. Participation is optional, and the survey is anonymous.

This 32 question survey should only take a 5-10 minutes of your time.


If you need a paper copy of the survey, the front office can provide you or your student with one. Please return completed paper surveys to the school’s front office by Friday, April 1. Please do not hesitate to ask me any questions! Thank you in advance for your participation!

Sincerely,

Lea Campos, Ed. S
7th grade Language Arts and Social Studies
Freedom Middle School
lea.campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us

Hola Padres!

 Esto es sólo un recordatorio de que la fecha límite para completar la encuesta de participación de los padres es la siguiente **domingo, el 3 abril**. Si Usted pudiera darme algunos minutos de su tiempo para completar la encuesta sobre el involucramiento de padres, se lo agradecería mucho. Esto es totalmente opcional y la encuesta es anónimo. Esta encuesta de 32 preguntas debe tomarle 5 a 10 minutos de su tiempo.


Si necesita una copia en papel de la encuesta , la oficina puede proporcionar usted o su niño con. Por favor, devuelva las encuestas completadas a la oficina principal de la escuela para el viernes, el 1 abril. Por favor, siéntase libre de hacer cualquier pregunta. Gracias de antemano por su participación!

Sinceramente,

Lea Campos, Ed. S
7th grade Language Arts and Social Studies
Freedom Middle School
lea.campos@cherokee.k12.ga.us