

# An Evaluation On Determinants Of Parental Participation In Implementation Of Academic Projects In Kenya. A Case Of Public Secondary Schools Kisumu County.

Moses Aol Jabuya, Fredrick Ochieng Owuor, Clare Onsarigo

**Abstract:** The study was descriptive survey design and ex post facto design that evaluated the determinants of parental participation in implementation of school projects in public secondary schools in Kisumu County. The study was guided by the following objectives: To investigate the determinants of parental participation in the implementation of academic improvement projects in Muhoroni secondary school Kisumu County; to determine whether there is a relationship between determinants of parental participation in the school academic improvement projects and achievement of children. Sourcing for information, existing materials and primary data collection was done using structured questionnaires, Focused Group Discussion, and Key informants. Respondents were Parent Teachers Association members, Teachers and students of Muhoroni Secondary school. Data was analyzed using statistical package for Social Sciences. Analysis of data revealed that family characteristics, Social background, parental valuation of education, students characteristics and school perception were core determinants of parental participation in implementation of school improvement projects. Study recommended schools to maintain effective partnership with parents; schools to check students behavior as it pulls parents to school; Schools to outsource funds from other donors; Education Ministry to come up with clear policy on school project development assist schools improve performance.

**Key words:** Evaluation, Parental involvement

## 1.0 Background of the Study

Parental participation in school programs have been crucial in education life of children in the world and has been defined in practice as parental aspirations for their children's academic achievement and conveyance of such aspirations to their children (Bakken, 2009). Parents participate in school activities through attendance, volunteering, governance, contributions (Baech, 2005); and parental rules imposed at home for behavior changes that are considered education-related (Keith *et al.*, 1993). For this study, Baech (2005) definitions have been adopted. Studies by Lee (2004) and (Epstein, 2001) in china on parental participation had recognized perspective that considers family, school, and community as overlapping spheres of influence. They identified six types of determinants of parental involvement that is: parents' basic obligations for establishing learning environment at home; parent-school communications about student progress; participation and volunteering at school activities; parent and school communications regarding learning activities at home; parent involvement in school decision making and governance and parent collaboration with community organizations that increase students' learning opportunities (Laureau, 2000). Parental involvement varies by factors such as students' grade level, socioeconomic and race/ethnic background, family relationships and experiences, and school policies (Lee, 2006). Similarly, Fulcher (2007) found that parents involvement as volunteers had a more direct impact on instruction than all other forms of involvement. However, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandier (2005) and Sanda (2004) found that parental involvement in teaching activities at school would influence students' achievement because of parents' ability to offer modeling, reinforcement, and instruction that supports the development of attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors associated with successful school performance. In Canada, England, Wales, Ireland, and the United States initiatives demonstrated that teachers and students can benefit if parents support the teacher in the classroom. However, this would not succeed in

France, Germany, and Japan (OECD, 2009) that are homogeneous societies with a strong consensus as to the purpose and processes of education. In developing school's project plan, the principal, staff, school council, parents, and other community members work and focus on three areas of priority: curriculum delivery, school environment, and parental participation (Lee, 2006). In USA, Epstein (2005) noted that student performance improves when teachers use curriculum-delivery strategies that specifically address the needs of students. This increases achievement level by 30%. Nevertheless Dweck (2007) found that highly effective schools in projects implementation share the following characteristics: a clear and focused vision; a safe and orderly environment; a climate of high expectations for student success; a principal who provides instructional leadership; frequent monitoring of student progress and strong home-school relationship. In Netherlands, Epstein (2005) noted that 71% of principals and fifty nine percent (59%) of teachers called parental participation a priority. When school and parents work together towards implementation of projects different in student achievement go up from 17% to 29% (Brown, 2009). In USA, Lee & Bowen (2006); kyriakides (2002); Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005); In Malaysia, Maynard (2005) and in Bosnia, Yin (2003) and Brown (2009) found that parental aspirations, parent's self-efficacy, family size, perception of school on parents and socioeconomic status of family are very important factors determining participation of parents in project implementation. Parent's aspiration has had effects on student achievement and goals in that Parents who hold high aspirations for their children's future are likely to be more willing to exert efforts to ensure that those aspirations are realized. Indeed, study conducted in the United States by Lee & Bowen (2006) suggested that educational and occupational aspirations are associated with the ways in which parents shape children's activities, time, and learning environment (Christensal, 2004). Parents' self-efficacy is a vital determinant of parental participation in school improvement projects (kyriakides, 2002)). Studies

conducted in a number of countries found that individuals with high self-efficacy in a particular area exert effort in that area (Yin, 2003). Brown (2009) in Bosnia found that parents with high self-efficacy contributed more to school improvement projects than those whose self-efficacy was low. In Japan, lack of parenting self-efficacy is a contributing factor to scarcity of parenting counseling opportunities at home (Laereau, 2000). Perceptions of school towards parents had been found by researchers to determine Parents' degree of involvement (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005). Epstein (2005) found that schools affect parent involvement levels and evidence shows that parents want to become involved but are not allowed to have open communication with the school. In China, Britain, South Africa evaluation studies showed that Socio-economic status (SES) is a factor affecting parental involvement in many countries (Hopper, 2007). In California study by Lee and Bowen (2006) found that college-educated, relatively affluent parents were more involved in educational projects at the school than are lower SES parents, parents working in high paying jobs readily support projects in schools for their child's high achievement, although some research suggests that lower SES parents engage in certain aspects of parental involvement as frequently as their middle-class counterparts (Weiss et al., 2009). Study found that wealthier mothers were likely to invest in supplementary schooling. Mothers who were more highly educated involved in children's activities in the school context, although not necessarily at home. In Malaysia evaluation studies noted that size of the family is a major factor determining parental participation in implementation of school improvement projects. In such families, children are major expense because of cost of supplementary schooling and that of college tuition (Maynard, 2005). This was confirmed by Lee (2005) in china. One factor is the disinclination of Chinese men to take on much responsibility for childrearing or housework (Reay, 2004). However, this was a contradiction to the study in Singapore by Bowen (2006) who noted that parents were ready to supplement their children's education by paying for their tuition and upkeep in schools during (Ryttonen, 2007). In Norway Epstein (2004) found that employment is reducing the amount of time and energy mothers have for interacting with their children and becoming involved in their schooling projects as compared with men. Nevertheless, Lee (2006) noted that employment may boost women's support for children's schooling by making financial resources available for lessons and materials. In terms of Sex of Child, study findings by Chrispeels (2001) in Australia noted that mother's aspirations for their children and their willingness to support their schooling for effective achievement for boys and girls were the same. To them both boys and girls are 'God' given and should be treated equally (Lee, 2001). However study by Lee (2005) in Japan noted that parental aspirations for girls may be particularly low because Japanese women tend to have lower educational attainment than men therefore parental investment in girls' education is less likely to pay off in terms of future earnings (McNeal, 2001). In South Africa, MKuperminc (2008) found that schools are now more democratically run, parents have generally become extremely knowledgeable about their legal rights and responsibilities in schools. 96% of parents agreed to ask schools how they are teaching the national curriculum and also that it is parents'/guardians' duty to make sure that their children

attend schools. In addition, the majority of parents (96%) felt that it is a good thing for parents to be members of the school governing body. These results explain why the majority of parents are now beginning to participate more active in school activities, showing an increased interest in the education of their children. Parents suggested that it is the parent's/guardian's responsibility to provide time and space for their children's homework (94%), work closely with the school (93%), help children with school homework (93%), while 91% of parents/guardians should be more involved in making decisions about school activities (Shizha, 2005). In Kenya formation of National Parents Association (NPA) which handles all cases to do with students' achievements in schools is in place. In Nyanza parental involvement in child education had been through checking assignments, visiting schools for academic discussions, attending school programs such as PTA Annual General Meetings, availing fee for sustainability in schools and follow up of students discipline. While providing these, barriers have been met such as poverty of citizen that limits their ability, poor communication between school and parents, rogue students who do not inform parents of school program, ignorance on the part of parents, Parent-teacher relation in some cases limit their participation (O,reilly, 2005). Nevertheless, schools have tried to bring parents to the fold after a mismatch in the participation (Robinson, 2009). In Kisumu County most schools are within the urban set up, parents complain that urban influence had negative impact on their children who could not do well in examination and these discourages them to continue supporting Schools (MOE, 2009). Even though Kenya Secondary School Heads Association (KESSHA, 2011) posits that Nyanza parents' participation in School Projects is very Low due to poverty level, low self- efficacy, poor appreciation of parents work by Schools, family size, unemployment as well as inflation are major concerns. A parent attending parents day at Muhoroni secondary school lamented:

*"Our children cannot perform well in schools since we cannot afford fee, provide reading materials, pay for extra coaching simply because we are poor economically, sugar cane has made us more poor than before, the government should build schools".*

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Children learn and develop through three overlapping "spheres of influence:" family, school, and community. Students who have support from their parents at home show better performance at school, while students lacking support are struggling. Getting parents involved in the education of their children appears to be a crucial factor for the continuing educational development and success of children in school (Epstein, 2001). Although studies done concerning this issue in education indicate that parental involvement within lower-income parents and parents with less education aspiration, poor social background participate less often in school-based activities than parents with higher-income and higher education aspirations, and good social background. The study illustrated that when school, family, or community-related barriers limit parents from becoming involved in

School projects, the consequences affect students' academic achievement. It further suggest ways of overcoming barriers to parental involvement in schools which include overcoming time and resource constraints, providing information and training to parents and school staff, restructuring schools to support family involvement, bridging school-family differences, getting external supports for partnerships, meeting families' basic needs, providing flexible times and places for parental involvement, and helping staff communication with parents (Crozier, 2000). In spite of this, many parents do not appear to be getting involved in their children's education (Urdan, 2007). However, in many schools the most that is being asked of parents is to be aware of what is going on in the school, attend school events, or make sure their children complete their schoolwork (Books, 2000). Nevtrtheless, Ki (2006) evaluation study on participatory approach to children's education in Germany, china, Kenya pointed out lack of parental involvement. That was the concern of the study in Muhoroni Secondary Kisumu County.

### 1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the determinants of parental participation in implementation of school academic improvement projects in Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu County a case Muhoroni secondary school.

### 1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following study objectives. To investigate the determinants of parental participation in the implementation of academic improvement projects in Muhoroni secondary school Kisumu County. To determine whether there is the relationship between determinants of parental participation on the school academic improvement projects and achievement of children.

### 1.5 Research Questions

Research questions were: What are the determinants of parental participation in school implementation of academic improvement projects on the achievement of their children? What is the relationship between determinants of parental participation on the school academic improvement projects and achievement of their children?

### 1.6 Significance of the Study

The study was aimed at identifying determinants of parental participation in implementing school academic programs and how this impacted on the academic achievement of their children in school. It was projected that the study would give solution to schools of what should be done to encourage parents to be active participants in school improvement projects for upward trend in school academic improvement.

### 1.7 Basic Assumptions

The study assumed that parents remained the role model to children's education and that their aspirations, self-efficacy for helping their children, educational aspirations, social background, students characteristics supported participation in school improvement projects. To school, parents remained pivotal as their contributions is what support school implementation of projects.

### 1.8 Limitations of the Study

The study was limited by the use of parents only as the major stakeholders in implementation of school projects. The study also considered parents and teachers as major sources of information excluding external sources that could have been beneficial to the study.

### 1.9 Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited by the availability of respondents who were ready to give feedback from the field at the time of need for analysis due to maturity and explanation of purpose given by researcher. Respondents were people of integrity thus gave the right information as was deemed accurate and fully served the purpose of the study. The study covered a public secondary school by name Muhoroni with a population of 684. Both female and male students, parents, and teachers were used for the purpose of this study.

### 2.1 Literature Review

Kuperminc, Darnell and Alvarez-Jiminez (2008) describe parental involvement 'as the degree to which a parent dedicates resources of time and energy to his or her child in a given developmental or educational domain'. The way parents participate depends on their work, and living conditions (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Kuperminc et al., 2008). Poverty, for instance, limits the involvement of parents in the education of their child (Kendal, 2007). None the less, Erickson (2004) proposed five dimensions of parental involvement: parenting that supports children as students, helping with homework, communicating with the school, volunteering at school and participation in school decision making. These five dimensions represent a diversity of activities, ranging from providing the child's basic needs, like food, shelter and safety (Fantuzzo, Tighe & Childs, 2000) to guiding and motivating the child to work hard, coming to school to talk about the achievement of the child, volunteering at activities at school and becoming a member of the parent association (Capacci, 2004). In real life situation, parental participation on students' is determined by family characteristics; social background; students' characteristics; parents and school communication; and school governance.

#### 2.1.1 Family Characteristics

In Spain, Lee (2005) concluded that Parents' educational expectations and encouragements are most important type of family practice that affects all measures of senior achievement. Parents who encourage their children to attend college positively influence their academic achievements (Georgiou, 2007). While encouragement for postsecondary attendance has the strongest positive effects, other family practices that support and enhance learning opportunities at home have consistent positive effects on senior achievements as well. By contrast, indicators such as parenting have only small effects on seniors' academic achievements. Positive effects of volunteering, other support of the school, and participation in PTOs are also reported for both middle school and high school achievement test scores by Georgiou (2007). Educational expectations of parents and their actions have direct effects on test scores, course credits completed, and enrollment in academic curricula. Frequent communication with students regarding educational matters

and frequent museum visits, also have positive long-term effects on one or more of these outcomes (McCarthy, 2000). Studies in US (Reay, 2004), Australia (Kendall, 2007), Japan (Ki & Ouadrego, 2007), in Britain (Eitzen & Scott, 2001) confirms the same. In Kenya study by Hoppers (2007) in Rongo district revealed that parents exert more effort in school projects when their sons and daughters are in form four. Rukaya an elder of the Zongo community in Gwasi district where a majority of the inhabitants are illiterate observed that:

*"In the past, we did not have enough knowledge about education, but now we know the essence of education. So if your child is now in school, you need to help the child. The usual practice of buying ornaments and other things at the expense of our children's education should be discontinued so that the children will become prominent figures in the future. If we don't prioritize our choices in support of our children's education, our children may turn out to be like us mothers, who are now suffering for lack of education"* (Lee, 2008).

Many of the parents interviewed claimed that they wanted to educate their children so that they could receive their assistance during their old age. One of them called Jajano observed:

*"I couldn't attain a higher level of education, but I have resolved to send my children to school so that they can assist me in my old age. In my youthful age, I wish to work very hard to support my children's education for a better future"* (Harris, 2008).

Studies reveal parents regardless of their ethnic origin, social class and gender, want their children to succeed in school and to achieve good results (Vincent, 2000). The need of strengthening the bond of cooperation between the parents and the school remains the core issue Reay (2005).

### 2.1.2 Social background

The social background that is parent's educational level, occupation, income level and ethnicity determine participation (Lee, 2005). Based on a study conducted in a rural Mexican community, Azaola (2007) found that although parents had limited economic and educational resources, they wanted their children to study. The parents believed through education their children would have a better life than they did. Des land and Rousseau (2008) in Germany also found that students benefit from parents being involved with their homework. In urban areas, rich parents may choose private schools, while people in slums do not send their children to school at all because they lack the money to buy school uniforms or books (Cleghorn, 2005). However, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) found that involvement

of parents in school project was motivational. Parents are likely to become involved in their child's education if they see this as part of their parenting role (Eliason, 2003).

### 2.1.3 Student Characteristics

In Malaysia, Lee (2005) found that not only would communication enhance active participation in projects but children in urban schools travel daily between two different worlds, the world of the parents and that of the school and the teachers. The norms and values and the knowledge gained at home may not be of particular value to the child at school, at the same time as the child may face difficulties in making his parents understand the values and the knowledge he/she brings back from school. The deviations can discourage the parent and withdraw from participation in any project (Vincent, 2000). When children see the support, excitement about learning, and teamwork between home and school, they too become excited. They sense the value in learning, and their intrinsic motivation for learning grows (Bishop, 2003; Bonesronning, 2008; Tonso, 2006; Toronto (2000).

### 2.1.4 Parent and school collaboration through communication

In Ireland, Abdi (2005) found teachers concurring that they cannot do it alone, and for effective educational processes to occur in classrooms, parental help in partnership with educators is needed. Epstein and Salinas (2004) stated that a school learning community includes educators, students, parents and community partners who work together to improve the school and enhance students' learning opportunities. Lee (2005) in his study of parental contribution in school project work found that parents and extended families contributed through invitational planning and advisory committees by schools. In classrooms parents are welcomed as regular volunteers or as experts who teach enrichment lessons. In other places, parents share information about careers or invite students to visit their workplaces. Parents have raised money to support activities, and spent many after-school hours helping their children with homework and projects. As Epstein (2001) in Australia put it to schools create a list of concrete ways parents can be involved in their child's education; Let parents know what choices exist; invite parent participation and thank parents for their involvement. Smit (2007) in Egypt reported having phone or face-to-face communication at least twice a year with parents enhances their morale and participation.

### 2.1.5 School governance

In USSR, Fantuzzo, (2004) found that there are two-way connections between the school and community that encourage businesses and other groups to take an interest in schools. Such school-parent relationships are built by the school. When it is strong school gains and vice versa (Sreekanth, 2011). Study by Salinas (2004) on school-parent relations found that about 87% of parents are ready to assist schools complete projects only 13% are not concerned about academic projects that schools do undertake. In Japan and china parents' invitation enabled a high school to complete 80% of school projects that helped improve students' achievements (Vincent, 2000). Study by christenson (2004) found that most of the parents were reported to be attending at least one school governance meeting such as a parent

council or school site council meeting per year. Studies based on parental participation in school projects reveals that not all parents need encouragement to become involved, literature focused primarily on social class, culture, and family school relations, some parents are heavily involved in their children's education and need few incentives (Brantlinger, 2003).

### 2.1.6 School Perception

Lack of parent participation can be seen in part as the parents neglecting their responsibilities, but parents feel unwelcome by school (Bunar, 2001). Parents may not consider themselves to possess any appreciable knowledge that the school is interested in partaking of (Skolverket, 2001). Study by Ki and Ouadrego (2004) in Nigeria, where school personnel initiative and engagement in practices welcome parents to the school, honor their contributions, and connect them to the school community through an emphasis on the children, these practices cultivate and sustain respectful, caring and meaningful relationships between parents and school staff. This was consistent with study by Lee (2005) in South Africa who found that parental participation was a school initiated activity that depend on how parents are handled by school authorities and that their contribution to any project in school highly is a function of school administration. In Kenya, study by Crozier (2005) in Rongo revealed that parents are significantly contributing to school projects. The study noted that school communication procedure has done a lot in their participation in school projects. A parent at St. Josephs' Rapogi observed:

*"Because school is concerned about good performance of our children, teachers are caring, principal is a good person, there is nothing we can fail to participate in provided our children will all pass and proceed to university".*

The above literature review gave open dimension of theorizing the study to be behavioural change theory.

### 2.1.7 Theoretical framework

The study adopted a behavioural change theory (The ASE – Model) postulated by Mandura (1952). The theory explained that to make the parents more involved with the sponsorship of project and in the education of their child, their present attitude, social influence and self efficacy needs to be changed. However, it is not easy to change attitude and behaviour. Several scientific theories exist about behavioural change. One of the models that are assumed to have integrated different behavioural change theories is the ASE-model (Dijkstra & Kuhlman, 1988). The three main determinants why parents become involved in their children's education are consistent with the three factors for behavioural change defined by the ASE-model that put together attitude of the parental, social influence on the part of parent and efficacy of the parent. According to this model the behaviour of parents originates in the motivation or intentions they have (De Vries et al., 1988). Parental intentions concerning the school career of their children originates in how parents think about the consequences of the behaviour that is brought forward by these intentions. The

intentions of the parents are determined by three factors: Attitude, Social Influence and Efficacy expectation (De Vries, 1993). Together with the above discussed results of earlier research on parental involvement, the three factors can be characterized as follows for the present study:

**Attitude (A):** Do the parents have the necessary knowledge and how positive are they about becoming more involved with the schooling of their children and the consequences of this behaviour (pro's and con's)? This depends significantly on how parents construct their parenting role. If parents believe they have a role in the education of their child they are more likely to become involved would willingly participate in school projects (Georgiou, 2007).

**Social influence (S):** How positive are others about parental involvement in their children's school career (social norms, perceived behaviour, - opinions and - support of others)? Invitations are an important influence on becoming involved. If parents receive invitations to become involved, they feel their involvement is appreciated and meaningful (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995). Moreover, other people in the immediate environment of the parents need to value and support their involvement (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005).

**Efficacy expectation (E):** Do the parents expect themselves to be able to show the proposed behaviour, do they assume they have the opportunity to show the intended behavior (possibilities, skills)? The efficacy expectation of parents determines if they think themselves able to exercise the desired behavior or action ( ).

All three aspects of the ASE-model have to be taken into account to change the attitude and behaviour of the parents effectively. This means for instance that behavioural change is improbable when only the attitudes of the parents are tackled. For any effective participation the three corners (attitude, efficacy, and social influence need to be addressed and that is what behavioural change theory talks about (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995; Bird, 2003).

## 3.1 Research Methodology

The study used descriptive survey design and ex post facto that favors both qualitative and quantitative data to achieve study objectives. It was found appropriate for the study because it facilitated collection of data through direct inquiries and observations. It provided an in depth study on parents behaviour (Kombo, 2002). The target population for the study was 684 respondents comprising students (340); teachers (19), and parents (325) in Muhoroni Secondary School. The sample size thus drawn from the target population was 684 as is asserted by Kothari (2006) that when the universe is small the whole population is sampled, hence the case of this study. The study used three data collection instruments that included structured questionnaires, focused group discussions schedule (FGD) as well as key informant guide to collect data from the 684 respondents. Questionnaires were advantageous because it required minimum financial expenses and effort (Mouly (1993). F focused group discussion involved a group of twelve students, teachers and parents in every FGD. This was possible because the study was carried during open students' academic day. Key informant (KI) schedule was used on Parents Teachers

Association (PTA) members and teachers who could not get time to handle questionnaires. It concerns accuracy of the data obtained (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Cook, 1979) Pilot testing of 30% respondents was used to measure the validity of the study. Experts were also used to confirm validity of the instruments by reading manuscript. The result was that the research instruments were fine-tuned to reflect the informed comments prior to the actual data collection. The study ensured reliability of the instruments by pilot-testing (Baker, 1994; Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008), it was meant to identify major problems with the instruments and achieve consistency of responses to the questions asked. This was done by administering the instruments twice allowing an interval of one week in one school in another County outside Kisumu County. This was repeated to achieve consistency in responses. The data collection was done by the researcher and took one day. Authority to collect the data was granted by National council for Science and Technology (NCST), University of Nairobi, District commissioner and District Education Officer (DEO) of the area as well as teachers through their principals. While in the field a letter of introduction was given to respondents for surety of confidentiality and their consent to participate. Data were collected in three phases. Phase one was structured questionnaires to parents and students who had to fill and mark the right answers in open spaces at the end of each question. Second phase was focused Group Discussion (FGD) to section of parents who could not use questionnaires. They were grouped into twelve parents per group after which discussions were held on the same and responses taken for analysis. The third group was key informant where key informants schedule was used to interview PTA executive members to solicit relevant information as was required. Data collected was computerized and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Nie *et al.* (2000). The questionnaires were scored and edited, coded and entered into computer for analysis. A code sheet was used for synthesizing data which was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively because all the data involved in the study could be reduced to numerical values words. Quantitative analysis involved presentation of statistical data in the form of frequency distribution and tables while qualitative data using descriptive statistics. The results were discussed, conclusions and recommendations made based on study findings. Ethical issues in the study were taken into account. Researcher took responsibility to protect the study units by seeking their consent before the study, their confidentiality was assured through explaining the importance of the study and their participation. Further the researcher assured them of data storage in filed locked cabinet after analysis.

#### **4.1 Data Analysis, Presentation, Interpretation and Discussion**

This chapter presents the study findings which have been discussed under thematic and sub-thematic sections in line with study objectives. The study noted that out of 684 (100%) respondents targeted in the study, 684 (100%) response rate was attained meaning that every respondent targeted in this study responded to the questionnaire, focus group discussions and participated in Key informant schedule. Thus 100% participation was achieved as was envisaged. As Nachmias and Nachmias (2005) argued that a response rate

of 75% is accepted for academic surveys and this was achieved by this study. Demographically a total of 452(64.3%) male and 251(35.7%) female participated with age range of below 30 years 23 (7.08%), 31-39 years 115 (35.38%), 40-49years 172(52.92%) and above 50 years 15 (4.62%). In terms of education level of respondents a total of 12(3.69%) had no certificate; 98(30.15%) had primary school certificate; 187(57.54%) had secondary certificate; 10(1.42%) had diploma; 23(3.27%) had degrees; 10(1.42%) had masters degree and 8(1.14%) had doctorate degree.

#### **4.2 Determinants of Parental Participation in School Improvement Projects**

For the study to seek answers to the study objectives, study looked at the major thematic areas as follows family characteristics; parental valuation of education; social background; Students Characteristics and school perception on parents among others. The presentation, interpretation and discussions were done and the results were as follows:

##### **4.2.1 Family characteristics**

Study sought to know how family characteristics influenced the parental participation in implementation of school improvement projects. Of the 684 (100%) respondents, 295 (43.23%) strongly agreed and 94 (13.74%) agreed that family size influenced their participation negatively in implementation of school improvement projects, while 197 (28.8%) and 58 (8.48%) respectively strongly disagreed and disagreed that family size affected participation in implementation of school improvement projects. Thus majority felt that it needs to be addressed if full participation is to be achieved. The study noted that when the size of the family is large consumption increases eating into any savings for educational purposes therefore, the bigger the family the limited resources left for education and vice-versa. In terms of educational aspirations, out of 684 (100%) respondents, 240 (38.01%) and 120 (17.54%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that educational aspirations of the parents positively influenced their participation in implementation of school improvement projects while 80(11.7%) and 164 (23.98%) respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. Only 80 (11.7%) were undecided. This was confirming focused group discussions and key informants results. For the discussion of academic issues with students and teachers study found that of the 684 (100%) respondents, 120 (17.54%) strongly agreed and 240 (38.01%) agreed that discussing academic achievement and goals with children encourages the parent to participate in school improvement projects reason given through key informants and focused group discussions was that the parent become aware of students educational aspirations and would not like to let the child down.

##### **4.2.2 Parental Valuation on Education**

The second determinant of parental participation in implementation of school improvement projects was value attached to education by parental. The respondents were asked whether value they attach to education positively or negatively make them participate in school improvement projects. Their responses were recorded in the Table 5.

**Table 4.1 Distribution of responses in relation to parental valuation of education.**

Responses / Frequencies	Highly value education		Readiness to fund education		Monitoring performance	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Strongly agree	472	69	460	67.25	256	37.43
Agree	101	14.77	60	8.77	164	23.98
Neutral	1	0.15	0	0	15	2.19
Disagree	81	11.84	20	2.92	80	11.7
Strongly disagree	29	4.24	144	21.05	169	24.71
<b>Total</b>			<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>

Out of 684 (100%) respondents, 460 (67.25%) and 60 (8.77%) respectively, strongly agreed and agreed that they were ready to fund their children's education through effectively participating in the implementation of school improvement projects. While 144 (21.05%) and 20 (2.92%) strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively that they were not ready to fund their children's education. This was confirming key informant interview feedback that parents were unprepared to fund education since it was difficult to keep money awaiting expenditure. On monitoring of children, study found that 256 (37.43%) and 164 (23.98%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they were monitoring their child and were encourage to fully participate in implementation of school improvement projects while 169 (24.71%) respondents and 80 (11.7%) respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively that they were monitoring performance of their sons and daughters both at home and school. Therefore a reasonable number was engaged in monitoring students' performance at home and school. In term of placing high value on education, 492 (69%) respondents and 101 (14.77%) respondents strongly agreed

and agreed respectively that they placed high value on the education of their children and this was a motivator to participate in school projects, while 81 (11.84%) respondents and 29 (4.24%) respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that they placed high value on the education of their children. Only 1(0.15%) were undecided. Majority of parents get involved in school projects because of value placed on education. This confirmed focus group discussion results that most parents participated in school projects because of the value they had placed on education of their children.

#### 4.2.3 Social Background

Study sought to know how social background could determine parental participation in the implementation of school improvement projects. Here respondents were asked to show whether, education level, job type, income level and ethnicity could influence their participation in school improvement projects. The responses given were as illustrated in the Table 6:

**Table 4.2. Distribution of responses in relation to social background.**

Responses / Frequencies	Education level		Job type		Income		Race/Ethnicity	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Strongly agree	460	67.25	304	44.44	100	44.62	384	56.14
Agree	60	8.77	180	26.32	40	5.85	131	19.15
Neutral	0	0	60	8.77	54	7.89	11	1.61
Disagree	20	2.92	60	8.77	245	35.82	58	8.48
Strongly disagree	144	21.05	80	11.7	225	34.36	100	14.62
<b>Total</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>

Of the 684 (100%) respondents who participated, 460 (67.25%) respondents and 60 (8.77%) respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that education level of the parent determined their participation in implementation of school improvement projects. Nevertheless, 164 (23.97%) felt that their level of education was not determining their participation in school projects. Majority of parents felt that their education level determined their involvement in school improvement projects. This was confirming focus group discussion that found that those who achieved in education knew how important school projects were to their children's performance. In terms of job type, 484 (70.76%) felt that job type was determining their participation in school projects while 140 (19.84%) felt the type of the job was no determining their project participation. This was confirming key informants finding that even though job type was a determinant, there could have been other determinants.

Results from income noted that 140 (50.47%) respondents felt income was determining their participation in school projects while 270 (70.18%) felt income was not determining their participation. Majority felt income was not a determining factor for participation.

#### 4.2.4 Students' characteristics

As the centre of focus, the study sought to come clear on how student's characteristic could determine their parents' participation in implementation of school projects. Respondents were asked to show how student's attitude determines parents' participation in implementation of school improvement projects. Responses solicited were recorded as follows in the Table 7:

**Table 4.3 Distribution of responses in relation to student's characteristics.**

Responses / Frequencies	Student attitude		Student performance		Student behaviour		Student weaknesses	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Strongly agree	230	33.63	460	67.25	520	76.02	120	17.54
Agree	200	29.24	60	8.77	143	20.91	200	29.24
Neutral	60	8.77	2	0.3	0	0	100	14.62
Disagree	80	11.7	20	2.92	4	0.58	100	14.62
Strongly disagree	114	16.67	142	20.76	17	2.49	164	2.98
<b>Total</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>

Of the 684 (100%) respondents, 430 (62.87%) felt that attitude of students made them to participate in school projects while 194 (27.74%) disagreed that attitude was making them participate in school projects. This was confirming key informant results that attitude was a core factor determining participation in projects. In terms of performance, 520 (76.02%) felt students performance was a

determining factor for participation of parents in school projects. However results from behavior showed that 663 (96.93%) strongly agreed it was determining their participation in school projects.

#### 4.2.5 School Perception

**Table 4.4 Distribution of responses in relation to school perception on parents.**

Responses / Frequencies	School appreciation		School decision making		Governance	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Strongly agree	270	39.47	285	41.67	280	40.94
Agree	160	23.39	115	16.81	200	29.24
Neutral	111	16.23	10	1.46	14	2.05
Disagree	70	10.23	209	30.56	100	14.62
Strongly disagree	73	10.67	65	9.50	90	13.16
<b>Total</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>100</b>

Of the 684 (100%) respondents who participated in the study, 270 (39.47%) respondents and 160 (23.39%) respectively strongly agreed and agreed that school appreciation of their contribution in implementation of school projects was motivating and encouraging. Such made them continue supporting school in projects aimed at improving performance. While 73 (10.67%) respondents and 70 (10.23%) respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively that school appreciation determines their participation in the implementation of school projects. This was confirmed by focus group discussion and key informant. Of the 684 (100%) respondents, 285 (41.67%) respondents and 115 (16.81%) respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that school invitation in decision making made them participate actively in school projects. While 209 (30.56%) respondents and 65 (9.50%) respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed that school invitation to major decision making in the school did not make them participate in school projects. This was consistent with focus group discussion results with the PTA and teachers alike. In terms of school governance, of 684 (100%) respondents who participated, 480 (70.18%) felt that school governance was determining parental participation in projects while 190 (27.78%) disagreed that school governance was not determining their participation in school projects.

## 5.0 Summary, Conclusions and Recommendation

Study made the following conclusion and recommendations as were the study objectives. It was revealed that family background comprising of family size (56.9%), educational aspirations (55.55%), and discussions of academic issues (55.55%), influence parental participation in the implementation of school projects. The findings noted that parental evaluation education through funding of children education (77.02%), and monitoring of children's activities (60%) could not be ignored as a determinant. The findings concluded that the source of background of the parent through value placed on education at (83.77%), educational level (76.02%) job type at (70.76%), and income (50.47%) was very significant in determining participation in school projects. In terms of students characteristics the study concludes that student attitude (90.61%), performance of the student (76.02%) behaviour of the student (69.93%) were core determinants of parental participation in implementation of school projects. Similarly school perception on parent through appreciation (62.86%), parental participation in decision making (57.48%), and involvement the parents in governance determined parental participation in school projects. In order of priority the study scaled down determinants as follows

**Table.5.1 Distribution of respondents**

Determinants	Ranking (%)
Attitude of the student	90.61
Value placed on education by parent	83.77
Funding of children's education by parent	77.02
Educational level of parent	76.02
Job type of the parent	70.76
Behaviour of the student	69.93
Appreciation of parent's contribution by school	62.86
Monitoring educational activities of the child by parent	60
Decision making by parent in school	57.48
Family size of the parent	56.9
Educational respiration of the parent	55.55
Income of the parent	50.47

## 5.2 Conclusion

The study herein makes the following conclusions. Parental participation is paramount for excellent child performance as this encourages both the teacher and student in their long journey to excellent performance. It is important to note that the school as a centre of learning has a role to play in bringing parents and students together especially where economic background of parents is a case of concern in the education welfare of the child and to enhance participation of parents through communication cum invitation in developmental projects. Education institutions need to build and support students character formation since this is essential in future behaviour. There is need to involve the government at a given stage since government presence has impact on parents role and students ethical standards for development of the country.

## 5.3 Recommendations

The study recommends that the schools being centre of activities should appreciate parent's contribution to school activities, allow them to participate in decision making and governance. Schools should maintain students discipline and character formation to enable parents be encouraged to participate in school projects. Parents should build their educational aspirations early enough to show direction for their children to achieve high in education for these will make them partner with schools. Finally stakeholder education should come together to understand issues leading to low participation in implementation of school projects.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Abdi, A. A. & Cleghorn, A. (2005): Sociology of education: Theoretical and conceptual perspectives. A.A.
- [2]. Azaola C. M. (2007): What does education mean for us and how do we get involved? Parents' accounts in a Mexican rural community. *International Journal about Parents in Education*. 1(0), 1-7.
- [3]. Bæch, U. D. K. (2005) School as an arena for activating cultural capital – Understanding differences in parental involvement in school. *Nordic Studies in Education* 03, 217-226.
- [4]. Bakken, A. (2009). Ulikhet på tvers: Har foreldres utdanning, kjønn og minoritetsstatus like stor betydning for elevens arakterer på alle skoler? [Inequality across: Do parents' education, gender and minority status have equal importance for students' grades in all schools?]. Oslo: NOVA (Retrieved: 12.11.09) [http://www.reassess.no/asset/3752/1/3752\\_1.pdf](http://www.reassess.no/asset/3752/1/3752_1.pdf)
- [5]. Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., and Richardson, C. (2003), *Te kotahitanga: The Experiences of Year 9 and 10 Maori Students in Mainstream Classrooms*, Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Black, Middle School. *Journal of School Choice*, 1(1), 85-118.
- [6]. Bonesrønning, H. (2004) The determinants of parental effort in education production: Do parents respond to changes in class size?
- [7]. Bonesrønning, H., & Vaag Iversen, J. M. (2008). Suksessfaktorer i grunnskolen: Analyse av nasjonale prøver. (Success Factors in primary school: An analysis of national tests]. SØF-rapport nr. 5. (Retrieved: 20.12.09) [http://www.udir.no/upload/Rapporter/2010/Nasjonale\\_prover\\_2008.pdf](http://www.udir.no/upload/Rapporter/2010/Nasjonale_prover_2008.pdf)
- [8]. Books. Crozier, G. (2000). *Parents and schools: Partners or protagonists?* Stoke-on Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- [9]. Brantlinger, E. (2003). *Dividing classes: How the middle class negotiates and rationalizes school advantage*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- [10]. Brantlinger, E. (2003). *Dividing classes: How the middle class negotiates and rationalizes school advantage*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- [11]. Brantlinger, E., Madj- Jabbari, M., & Guskin, S. L. (1996). Self-interest and liberal educational discourse: How ideology works for middle-class mothers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(3), 571–598.

- [12]. Brown, G. T. L. (2008), *Conceptions of assessment: Understanding what assessment means to teachers and students*, New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- [13]. Brown, G. T. L. (2009), 'Teachers' self-reported assessment practices and conceptions: Using structural equation modelling to examine measurement and structural models', In T. Teo & M. S. Khine (Eds.), *Structural equation modeling in educational research: Concepts and applications* (pp. 243–266). Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.
- [14]. Brown, G. T. L., Peterson, E., & Irving, S. E. (2009), 'Self-regulatory beliefs about assessment predict mathematics achievement', In D. M. McInerney, G. T. L. Brown & G. A. D. Liem (Eds.), *Student perspectives on assessment: What students can tell us about assessment for learning* (pp. 159–186). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- [15]. Bunar, N. (2001). *Skolan mitt i förorten: Fyra studier om skola, segregation, integration och multikulturalism*. Eslöv: Symposium.
- [16]. Chrispeels, J., & Rivero, E. (2001). *Engaging Latino families for student success: How parent education can reshape parents' sense of place in the education of their children*. Peabody Journal of Education, **76**(2), 119–169.
- [17]. Christenson, S. L. (2004). The family-school partnership: An opportunity to promote the learning competence of all students. *School Psychology Review*, **33**(1), 83–104.
- [18]. Cleghorn, A. (2005) *Language issues in African school settings: Problems and prospects in attaining education for all*. A.A. Abdi, & Cleghorn, A. (Eds.) *Issues in African education – Sociological perspectives*. New York:
- [19]. Palgrave Macmillan. Cook, T. D. and Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [20]. Crozier, G. & Davies, J. (2006). Family matters: A discussion of the Bangladeshi and Pakistani extended family and community in supporting the children's education. *The Sociological Review*, **54**(4), 678–695.
- [21]. Crozier, G. & Davies, J. (2006). Family matters: A discussion of the Bangladeshi and Pakistani extended family and community in supporting the children's education. *The Sociological Review*, **54**(4), 678–695.
- [22]. Crozier, G. (1999), 'Is it a case of 'We know we're not wanted?' The parents' perspective on parent-teacher roles and relationships', *Educational Research*, **41** (3), 315–328.
- [23]. Crozier, G. (2000). *Parents and schools: Partners or protagonists?* Stoke-on Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- [24]. Deslandes, R. & Rousseau, M. (2008) Long-term students' management strategies and parental involvement in homework at the elementary level. *International Journal of Parents in Education*. **2**(1), 13-24.
- [25]. Dweck, C. S. (2007), 'The perils and promises of praise', *Educational Leadership*, October, 34–38.
- [26]. Eitzen, D. S. and M. B. Zinn. (2001). *In conflict and order: Understanding society*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [27]. Eitzen, D. S. and M. B. Zinn. (2001). *In conflict and order: Understanding society*. Boston:
- [28]. Allyn and Bacon. Eliason, C. and L. Jenkins. (2003). *A practical guide to early childhood curriculum*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [29]. Eliason, C. and L. Jenkins. 2003. *A practical guide to early childhood curriculum*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [30]. Epstein, J. L. (2001) *School, family and community partnership*. USA: Westview Press.
- [31]. Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships. Preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder, CO: Westviews Press.
- [32]. Erikson, L. (2004). *Föräldrar och skola*. (Örebro Studies in Education, 10). Örebro: DocuSys.
- [33]. Frome, P. M. and Eccles, J. S. (1998), 'Parents' influence on children's achievement related perceptions', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **74**, 435-452.
- [34]. Fulcher, J. and J. Scott. (2007). *Sociology*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [35]. Fulcher, J. and J. Scott. 2007. *Sociology*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [36]. Georgiou, S. N. (2008), 'Beliefs of experienced and novice teachers about achievement', *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, **28**, 119–131.
- [37]. Greene, P. K., & Tichenor, M. S. (2003). *Parents and schools: No stopping the involvement*. *Childhood Education*, **79**(4), 242-243.
- [38]. Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.

- [39]. Harris A. & Goodall J. (2008) Do parents know they matter? Engaging all parents in learning. *Educational Research*, 50(3), 277-289.
- [40]. Hill, N. E., Castellino, D. R., Lansford, J. E., Nowlin, P., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (2004). Parent Academic Involvement as Related to School Behavior, Achievement, and Aspirations: Demographic Variations Across Adolescence. *Child Development*, 75 (5), 1491-1509.
- [41]. Hoover-Dempsey, K.V. et al (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106, 2, 105-130.
- [42]. Hoppers, W. (2007). Meeting the learning needs of all young people and adults: An exploration of successful policies and strategies in non-formal education. Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2008, Education for All by 2015: will we make it? found on December 27 2008, on 25 'Ned sãn sêdegd f pooré, bi fo me widg f nenga' <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001555/155535e.pdf>
- [43]. Huang L. (2009) Social capital and student achievement in Norwegian secondary schools. *Learning and individual differences* 19, 320-325.
- [44]. Jansen, W. (2006), 'Gender and the expansion of university education in Jordan', *Gender and Education*, 18, 473-490.
- [45]. Ji, S. C. & Koblinsky, A. S. (2009). Parent Involvement in Children's Education: An Exploratory Study of Urban, Chinese Immigrant Families. *Urban Education*, 44, 687-709.
- [46]. Kendall, N. (2007). Parental and community participation in improving educational quality in Africa: current practices and future possibilities. *International Review of Education*, 53, 701-708.
- [47]. Ki, B.J. & Ouadreogo, L.H. (2006). Policy dialogue and education: African experiences. negotiating with development partners: ten-year plan for the development of basic education in Burkina Faso. *Prospects*, 36, 2, 205-221.
- [48]. Kuperminc, G.P., Darnell, A.J. & Alvarez-Jimenez, A. (2008). Parent involvement in the academic adjustment of Latino middle and high school youth: Teacher expectations and school belonging as mediators. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31, 469-283.
- [49]. Kyriakides, L. (1997). Influences on primary teachers' practice: Some problems for curriculum change theory. *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(1), 39-46.
- [50]. Kyriakides, L. (2000). The effectiveness of a school policy on parents working with their own children in school (Evaluation Report). Nicosia, Cyprus: Ministry of Education.
- [51]. Kyriakides, L.(2002). A research based model for the development of policy on baseline assessment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28(6), 05-826.
- [52]. Kyriakides, L. (2004). Differential school effectiveness in relation to sex and social class: Some implications for policy evaluation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*.
- [53]. Lareau A. (2000) Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education. Lanham, Md.: Roman and Littlefield Publishing.
- [54]. Lee, J-S & Bowen, N.K. (2006). Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement Gap among elementary school children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 2, 193-218.
- [55]. Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (2004), 'Collective Responsibility for Learning and Its Effects on Gains in Achievement for Early Secondary School Students', *American Journal of Education*, 104, 103-116.
- [56]. Madison, D.S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [57]. Marks G. N., Cresswell J. & Ainley J. (2006) Explaining socioeconomic inequalities in student achievement: The role of home and school factors. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12(2), 105-128.
- [58]. Maynard, A. E. & Martini M. I. (2005) *Learning in Cultural Context. Family, Peers and School*. New York: Springer Science + Business Media, Inc.
- [59]. McCarthey, S. J. (2000). Home-school connections: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93,145-154.
- [60]. McNeal, R. B. (2001). Differential effects on parent involvement on cognitive and behavioral outcomes by socioeconomic status. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 30, 171-179.
- [61]. Mugenda, O. M. and Mugenda, A.G. (2003). *Research Methods; Quantitative and qualitative Approaches*. Acts Press, ICRAF Complex, United Nations Avenue Nairobi.
- [62]. Mugenda, O. M. and Mugenda, A.G. (2008). *Research Methods; Quantitative and qualitative Approaches*. Acts Press, ICRAF Complex, United Nations Avenue Nairobi.
- [63]. Nie, Stein and Bert (2000). *Stationed Package for Social Science*. New York Melirant Hil.

- [64]. Nordahl, T. & Skilbrei, M. L. (2002) Det vanskelige samarbeidet. Evaluering av et utviklingsprosjekt om samarbeidet mellom hjem og skole [The difficult cooperation. Evaluation of a developmental project on the relationship between home and school]. (Report 13/02) Oslo: NOVA. (Retrieved:12.12.09)[http://www.reassess.no/asset/3094/1/3094\\_1.pdf](http://www.reassess.no/asset/3094/1/3094_1.pdf) O'Reilly, K. (2005). *Ethnographic methods*. London: Routledge.
- [65]. OECD (2004) *Learning for Tomorrow's World. First Results from PISA 2003*. (Retrieved: 17.11.09) <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/60/34002216.pdf>
- [66]. OECD (2009) *Reviews of Migrant Education NORWAY*. (Retrieved: 17.11.09) <http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KD/Vedlegg/Grunnskole/FINAL%20NORWAY%20EPORT%20Migrant%20education.pdf>
- [67]. Oreopoulos, P. (2007), 'Do dropouts drop out too soon? Wealth, health and happiness from compulsory schooling', *Journal of Public Economics*, 91, 2213– 2229.
- [68]. Orodho, A. J. and Kombo, D.K. (2002). *Research Methods*; Nairobi Kenyatta University, Institute of open learning.
- [69]. Orodho, A.J. (2003). *Essential of Education and Social Sciences Research Method*; Nairobi; Masola Publishers.
- [70]. Pant, R. A. (2005). *Cross cultural perspectives on educational research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- [71]. Parameswaran, G., & Hom, H. L. J. (2001), *Cultural Considerations: interpretations of blame and perceived ability among children in India*, *Educational Studies*, 27 (3), 269–279.
- [72]. Patton, M. Q. (2002), *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [73]. Peterson, E. R. and Irving, S. E. (2008), 'Students' conceptions of assessment and feedback', *Learning and Instruction*, 18, 238–250.
- [74]. Ran, A. (2001), 'Travelling on parallel tracks: Chinese parents and English teachers', *Educational Research*, 43 (3), 311–328.
- [75]. Raty, H. 2006. What comes after compulsory education? A follow-up study on parental expectations of their child's future education. *Educational Studies* 32(1) (March): 1–16.
- [76]. Raty, H. 2006. What comes after compulsory education? A follow-up study on parental expectations of their child's future education. *Educational Studies* 32(1)(March): 1–16.
- [77]. Reay, D. & Mirza, H. S. (2005). *Doing parental involvement differently: black women's participation as educators and mothers in black supplementary schooling*. In G. Crozier & D. Reay (Eds.), *Activating participation: Parents and teachers working towards partnership* (pp. 137–154). Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- [78]. Reay, D. (2004). It's becoming a habitus: Beyond the habitual use of Pierre Bourdieu's concept of habitus. *Educational Research Special Issue of British Journal of Sociology of Education on Pierre Bourdieu* 25(4), 431–444.
- [79]. Reay, D. (2004). Gendering Bourdieu's concept capitals? Emotional capital, women and social class. *The Sociological Review* 52(2), 57–74.
- [80]. Reay, D. 2004. Education and cultural capital: The implications of changing trends in education policies. *Cultural Trends* 13(2): 73–86.
- [81]. Reay, D. 2004. Education and cultural capital: The implications of changing trends in education policies. *Cultural Trends* 13(2): 73–86.
- [82]. Reay, D., David, M. & Ball, S. (2001). Making a difference? Institutional habit uses and higher education choice, *Sociological Research* 5(4) <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/5/4/reay.htm>.
- [83]. Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. A. (2009), *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why (BES)*, Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- [84]. Rytönen, K., Aunola, K., and Nurmi, J. E. (2005), 'Parents' causal attributions concerning their children's school achievement: A longitudinal study', *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly-Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 51, 494–522.
- [85]. Rytönen, K., Aunola, K., and Nurmi, J. E. (2007), 'Do parents' causal attributions predict the accuracy and bias in their children's self-concept of maths ability? A longitudinal study', *Educational Psychology* 27, 6, 771–788.
- [86]. Sanders, M. G. and K. C. Lewis. (2004). Partnerships at an urban high school: Meeting the parent involvement requirements of no child left behind. *EJournal of Teaching & Learning in Diverse Settings* 2(1): 78– 98.
- [87]. Sanders, M. G. and K. C. Lewis.(2004). Partnerships at an urban high school: Meeting the parent involvement requirements of no child left behind. *E-Journal of Teaching & Learning in Diverse Settings* 2(1): 78– 98.
- [88]. Sandin, B. (2000). *Barnets århundrade. En essä om kampen om rätt barndom*. (Stencil) Linköpings universitet: Tema Barn.

- [89]. Sayed, A. (2004). *The Suffering of the immigrant*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [90]. Shizha, E. (2005) *Reclaiming our memories: The education dilemma in postcolonial Africa school curricula*.
- [91]. Sjögren, A. (1996). *Föräldrar på främmande mark*. I E. S. Hultinger and C. Wallentin (Red.), *Den mångkulturella skolan* (ss. 229–252). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- [92]. Skolverket, (2001). *Attityder till skolan 2000*. Skolverkets rapport nr 197. Stockholm: Liber.
- [93]. Smit, F., Driessen, G., S., Sluiter, R. & Slegers, P. (2007) Types of parents and school strategies aimed at the creation of effective partnerships. *International Journal about parents in Education*. 1(0), 45-52.
- [94]. Sreekanth Y., & Tooley, J. (2011). Commentary on Reviews of James Tooley's *The Beautiful Tree* and Tooley's reply. *Journal of School Choice*. 5,134-138.
- [95]. Sreekanth, Y. (2009). Bullying: an element accentuating social segregation. *Education* 313, *International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*. 37(3), 233-245.
- [96]. Sreekanth, Y. (2011). Dynamics of Public and Private Sector participation in Education: A perspective on India and beyond. *Educare: International Journal of Educational Studies*. 3 (2), 159-176.
- [97]. SSB (2010). *Innvandrerbegreper i statistikken. Vestlig og ikke-vestlig – ord som ble for store og som gikk ut på dato*. [Immigrant Concepts in the statistics. Western and non Western - words that were too large and that went out of date]. (Retrieved 14.01.10) <http://www.ssb.no/samfunnsspeilet/utg/200804/15/in dex.html>
- [98]. Tillman, L. C. (2003). African American parent involvement in urban school reform: Implications for leadership. In R. C. Hunter & F. Brown (Eds.), *Challenges of urban education and efficacy of school reform* (pp. 295- 312). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- [99]. Tonso, K. L. & Colombo, M. (2006). *Parental Choice and the Decision to Decharter an Urban*, Toronto: the Ministry, (2000). *The Ontario Curriculum – Exemplars, Grades 1–8: Writing*. (Note: The ministry anticipates publishing three elementary-level mathematics exemplar documents as well as a number of secondary-level exemplar documents by the end of 2000).
- [100]. UD/FUG (2007). *Sluttevaluering av utviklingsprosjektet "Minoritets- språkligeforeldre – en ressurs for elevenes opplæring i skolen"*. [Final evaluation of the project "Minority speaking".
- [101]. Urdan, T., Solek, M., & Schoenfelder, E. (2007), 'Students' perceptions of family influences on their academic motivation: A qualitative analysis', *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 22, 7–21.
- [102]. Verma, S. (2010, December 25) *India rising, falling, stumbling, speeding*. *Times of India*, p.5.
- [103]. Vincent, C. (1996). *Parents and teachers: Power and participation*. London: Falmer.
- [104]. Vincent, C. (2000). *Including parents? Education citizenship and parental agency*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- [105]. Wane N. (2005) *Social organization of teacher education in Africa: A Kenyan case study*. A.A. Abdi, & Cleghorn, A. (Eds.) *Issues in African education – Sociological perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [106]. Weiss, H. B., Kreider, H., Levine, E., Mayer, E., Stadler, J. & Vaughan P. (2009). *Beyond the Parent-Teacher Conference: Diverse Patterns of Home-School Communication*. Presented.
- [107]. Williams, R. L. and Clark, L. (2004), 'College students' ratings of student effort, student ability and teacher input as correlates of student performance on multiple choice exams', *Educational Research*, 46, 229–239.
- [108]. Wu, M. Y., & Yi, C. C. (2008). *Reconceptualising parental control and its determinants: the notion of 'Guan'*, Paper presented at the International Conference on Youth studies, June 21, Taipei, Taiwan.
- [109]. Yancey, P. (2000). *Parents founding charter schools: Dilemmas of empowerment and decentralization*. New York: Peter Lang.
- [110]. Yin, R.K. (2003) *Case study research, design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.