

Copyright

by

Claude M. Bonazzo Romaguera

2015

**The Dissertation Committee for Claude M. Bonazzo Romaguera Certifies that this
is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

**Latino/a Teachers and the School-Based Involvement of Latino/a
Parents of Young Students**

Committee:

Robert Crosnoe, Supervisor

Nestor P. Rodriguez

Yasmiyn Irizarry

Aprile D. Benner

Jennifer K. Adair

**Latino/a Teachers and the School-Based Involvement of Latino/a
Parents of Young Students**

by

Claude M. Bonazzo Romaguera, B.S.A.S., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

**The University of Texas at Austin
December 2015**

Dedication

For this dedication there are a number of people I have to include. I do not see this journey as one where it included only a handful of meaningful influential people, but a family of them. First, to my wonderful mother who battled breast cancer, lymphoma, and then passed away. Thank you so much for your strength and compassion. I am truly grateful for every moment I spent with you. You were with me every part of the way, even on the day of my dissertation defense when, under my formal shirt, I wore the shirt I was wearing when you passed away. Te quiero y te amo mucho Mama. To Norma, this would not have been possible without your continuous love, support, and always making sure I didn't have to worry too much about my responsibilities at home. After 16 years together, I am truly grateful that you are still in my life. To my kind, compassionate, and beautiful son, Claudio, who was always willing to help me when I was working and understood that papa was working hard for the family. To my father, wow, what more could ask for in a father? Always willing to help, optimistic, and knows how to bring some calm to the storm. To my brother and sister, I think in many ways we have taught and supported each other in good times and bad but we always find ways to bring peace and love for each other.

To Rob, my advisor and the main reason why this whole journey was able to continue and reach its completion, despite the many difficulties I and my family encountered. It takes a great deal of compassion, patience, and integrity to mentor someone who is not, what I would consider, a typical graduate student. I am forever in debt to you. To Gloria Gonzalez-López, who provided guidance and mentorship in learning how to cultivate compassion for myself and others, and more importantly, how to begin to tame the mind in very profound ways. Finally, along this very rough and at

times exhausting journey, I was fortunate enough to meet and cultivate friendships (y hermana/os por vida) with Kate Averett, Lynnette Short, and Cristian Paredes. Words cannot express how grateful I am that they are in my life. Special recognition goes especially to Kate who helped me find strength and wisdom in some very rough moments I thought I would never be able to overcome.>

Acknowledgements

I am much indebted to and grateful for many people during this journey. I do not consider their contributions whether major or minor, as any less important as a whole. This journey has taught me that we are all interconnected and interdependent in ways that are very profound. I would like to first thank my committee, Rob Crosnoe, Nestor Rodriguez, Yasmiyn Irizarry, Aprile Benner, and Jennifer Adair, who in a short period of time were able to give me excellent feedback at my proposal defense, direction for publications, and future projects.

There are a number of people I would like to thank. I want to start with some of my original cohort members who in direct and indirect ways help me become a better thinker and I would argue, a scholar: Aida Ramos, Jessica Dunning-Lozano, David Glisch-Sánchez, Maggie Tate, Anna Thorton, and Cheng-Peng Lee. I would also like to extend my thanks to Tetyana Pudrovska for wonderful friendship, and opportunities to tell my story, as well as impact the minds of young students in very meaningful ways. To Sharmila Rudrappa, Keith Robinson, Simone Browne, and Ben Carrington, for providing me such a great and enriching intellectual exercise of my knowledge in my comprehensive exams. To Samuel Echevarria Cruz and Evelyn Porter, who were essential components in getting me into this program. To Sanden Averett, for her essential and insightful editing and other support, without which I would not have finished this dissertation. And to those who provided much needed friendship throughout this process, especially Nick Metzler, Arturo Romaguera, Nina Wu, Bill Kelly, Jose Medina, and Marian Morris. Finally, I would like to thank the subsequent cohorts of graduate students with whom I have quickly developed very meaningful friendships that engage my mind and heart: Aida Villanueva, Gracia Sierra, Eric Borja, Shantel Buggs,

Letisha Brown, Thatcher Combs, Carmen Gutierrez, Katherine Hill, Daniel Jaster, Janice Jeang, Paul Kasun, Vrinda Marwah, Marcos Perez, Juan Portillo, Nicholas Reith, Beth Prosnitz, Brandon Robinson, Kate Prickett, Arya Ansari, Julie Skalamera, Chelsea Smith, Amanda Stevenson, Celia Hubert, Ori Swed, Kara Takasaki, Mario Venegas, and many others.

Latino/a Teachers and the School-Based Involvement of Latino/a Parents of Young Students

Claude M. Bonazzo Romaguera, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2015

Supervisor: Robert Crosnoe

Abstract: The goal of this mixed methods study was to identify policy-relevant mechanisms to improve the educational prospects of Latino/as in the U.S., a group with traditionally lower levels of educational attainment compared with other race/ethnic groups. I focused on these processes when children were in elementary school, which is increasingly viewed as a critical window for intervention in the intergenerational transmission of inequality and, within this stage, exploring parent-teacher relations, which has generated much theoretical and policy attention.

Following contextual systems theory, this dissertation examined how the educational involvement of Latino/a parents was related to their children having Latino/a teachers in the primary grades of elementary school. This examination drew on quantitative data (Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Class, 1998-99) to estimate path models in which measures of school-based involvement among Latina mothers in every grade were regressed on teacher ethnicity in the current and all prior grades, controlling for an array of maternal, teacher, child, and school characteristics. The

qualitative data (observational and interview data from ten public schools in a large Texas school district) were analyzed with a grounded theory approach.

Integrating findings across the two sets of analyses yielded four take-home messages. First, although Latino/a teachers interviewed tended to have more welcoming views of Latino/a parents' involvement, this pattern was not consistently seen in the quantitative findings. Second, family SES appeared to be more important than Latino/a status in affecting school-based involvement, although SES might act as a proxy for other family characteristics. Third, although researchers and surveys tend to separate school-based involvement from other types of parental involvement (with educational policies often reflecting this divide), the qualitative data indicate that teachers blur these lines. Fourth, policies aimed at creating home-school partnerships Latino/a parents will require more than just creating opportunities for school-based interactions.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Conceptual Model	10
The Early Education of Latino/a Children.....	13
Parental Involvement and Family-School Relations.....	15
Ethnic Congruence of Adults at Home and in School	18
Conceptual Model, Hypotheses, and Exploratory Questions	22
Chapter 3: Methods.....	26
Quantitative Data	26
Qualitative Data	27
Quantitative Measures in ECLS-K	28
Qualitative Data at SWISD.....	31
Plan for Quantitative Analyses	32
Plan for Qualitative Analyses	35
Chapter 4: Results of Quantitative Analyses	36
Mothers' Perceptions of their School-Based Involvement	36
Finer-Grained Comparisons by Teacher Ethnicity	39
A More Detailed Examination of Maternal Involvement Behaviors.....	42
Chapter 5. Qualitative Results From SWISD	69
Socioeconomic Explanations of Different Levels of Parental Involvement.....	76
The Racialization of Parental Involvement.....	82
Chapter 6: Conclusion and Discussion	90
Four Take-Home Messages	94
Limitations and Future Directions	99
Final Words	102
Appendix SWISD Interview Guide	103
References.....	107

List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables for Kindergarten Wave	46
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables for First Grade Wave	48
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables for Third Grade Wave.....	50
Table 4. Standardized Coefficients from Path Models Predicting Parental Involvement by Latino/a vs. All Other	52
Table 5. Standardized Coefficients from Path Models Predicting Parental Involvement by Latino/a vs. White, Black, or Other	55
Table 6. Odds from Path Models Predicting Attendance at PTA Meetings and Participation in Parent-Teacher Conferences.....	58
Table 7. Odds from Path Models Predicting Attendance at School Events and Participation in Fundraising	62
Table 8. Odds from Path Models Predicting Attendance at School Events and Participation in Fundraising	65

Chapter 1: Introduction

Today, Latino/as¹ are the largest racial/ethnic minority group in the U.S., driven by the growth in immigration from Mexico and the rest of Latin America following the 1965 federal immigration reforms as well as the elevated rates of fertility among such immigrants (Tienda 2009). Importantly, this already large population is increasing in size every year. The growth of this population is particularly apparent in the U.S. educational system. Between 1972 and 2000, Latino/as had an 11 percent increase in enrollment in public schools (Llagas and Snyder 2003), with an expected increase of 25 percent by 2020 (Hussar and Bailey 2011).

Because of the increasing demographic importance of Latino/as in this country, systems and policies should be in place to support the educational progress of young Latino/as so that they can better contribute to the U.S. economy and society at large in the future. This need is especially acute given that educational disparities between Latino/as and other students in the U.S. educational system persist, despite gradual improvements. For example, in recent years, Latino/as' high school graduation rate has inched closer to Whites', but their rates are still over 10 percentage points apart. Similar trends are found in other markers of educational attainment and academic achievement, such as math and reading test scores (U.S. Department of Education 2015; Hemphill and Vanneman 2011; Kao and Thompson 2003).

¹ Because scholars and researchers use Hispanic/Latino interchangeably in their articles and work, this dissertation will primarily use the term Latino/a to refer to people from Latin American countries in which Spanish is the primary language.

The coupling of the growth of the Latino/a population with these continued disparities in academic achievement, school dropout, and college admission presents both a challenge and an opportunity to the U.S. in the 21st Century (Gandara and Contreras 2009). Educational attainment translates into real economic and non-economic advantages in the life course. For example, Autor (2014) found that, while earnings for college graduates have risen anywhere from 20% to 56% over the last four decades (factoring in whether they received a graduate degree), earnings have dropped 11% for high school graduates and 22% for high school dropouts. Non-economic advantages such as civic involvement, cognitive ability, and cultural capital are also accrued through educational attainment (Kingston et al. 2003). In addition, Mirowsky and Ross (2003) have shown that educational attainment influences physical and mental health by facilitating healthier habits and self-control. Thus, education matters a great deal for the individual with aggregated benefits for society, but the group that is making up an increasing share of the national population is attaining education at lower than average rates, putting their futures at risk in ways that could have broader effects on society.

With this challenge in mind, the goal of this dissertation was to identify and explore potential policy-relevant mechanisms of low educational attainment in the U.S. Latino/as population that may be targeted to improve their educational prospects in the future. Given the impossibly broad scope of this goal, I narrowed my focus in two ways (looking at one subset of the Latino/a population, examining a specific policy-relevant mechanism) based on theoretical considerations as well as to connect to timely policy debates. I describe and motivate each of these two more specific foci below.

First, rather than studying the full Latino/a child population across the different levels of the K-12 educational system, I focus on young Latino/as during the early years of elementary school. This age range and this stage of schooling are, collectively, viewed as a critical window for intervention in the intergenerational transmission of inequality. This view is based on evidence that, due to the cumulative nature of cognitive development and learning as well as the cumulative nature of school curriculum, early disparities in academic skills and achievement can compound to create increasingly divergent trajectories of educational attainment (Alexander and Entwisle 1988). What happens early in life and early in the educational career can have long range consequences and, therefore, needs to be the focus of policy intervention.

For example, an influential theoretical model from Alexander and Entwisle (1988) posits that the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities present in the first two years of schooling tend to grow as children move through elementary school and into secondary school. This pattern, documented by Alexander and Entwisle for low-income students and African-American students, has been more recently extended to Latino/a students, especially Latino/a immigrant students, in the work of several sociologists of education. Their research has shown that, due to a lack of early childhood educational opportunities, Latino/as often start off behind other students and then have to make up ground over time (Crosnoe 2007; Reardon and Galindo 2009). Given the growing recognition that early interventions bring greater long-term returns to investment than those targeting older youth and adults (Heckman 2006), this theoretically grounded and empirically supported cumulative pattern is relevant to educational policy. Attention

needs to be focused on what factors reduce disparities in school readiness between Latino/as and other children early in school so that they do not have to make up ground.

Second, among the many potential policy-relevant mechanisms to study in relation to Latino/a educational disparities, I focus on a particular schooling-related social dynamic (parent-teacher relations) that has generated much theoretical and policy attention already. Although most research on educational disparities in the sociological and economic tradition focuses on structural and institutional forces, social psychological forces are likely also at work, and they, too, demand attention (Garcia and Jensen 2009; Kao and Thompson 2003; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2002; Tienda 2009). Macro-level stratification processes, including racism, segregation, and economic marginalization, are closely related to the immigrant experience in the U.S. and are highly relevant to educational inequality (Crosnoe 2005; Cutler, Glaeser and Vigdor 2008; Logan, Stowell and Oakley 2002). They are not the whole story though, as interpersonal processes matter too, both as conduits of macro-level influences and in other own right (Crosnoe and Benner 2015).

Over the last several decades, what goes on between parents and teachers in and around school has been a major focus of theory, research, and policy on educational disparities, in general and specific to the Latino/a population (Christenson and Sheridan 2001; Crosnoe et al. 2010; Crosnoe 2010; Epstein 2005). In quantitative research, parental involvement in school is typically measured in terms of the frequency of parents' engagement in activities that involve their presence at school and face-to-face interactions with school personnel and other parents. In this form, school involvement

appears to promote children's achievement and basic school functioning. On the basis of such evidence, increasing parents' involvement in school has been a popular goal of school reforms for some time (Domina, 2005; Pomerantz, Moorman, and Litwack 2007). This literature has been widely criticized on several grounds: 1) it is uni-directional, appearing to place the burden of family-school interaction solely on parents and absolving teachers of their role in supporting and eliciting it or instead blocking and discouraging it, 2) it is narrow and culturally biased, ignoring the diverse ways that different groups of parents conceptualize involvement and try to be involved. Both of these issues are especially acute for Latino/a families, many of whom are immigrants. They have often have less familiarity with how U.S. schools work, face language barriers with their children's schools, and have less exposure to the White middle class norms of parenting that are so diffused within U.S. schools (Adair, Tobin, & Arzubiaga 2012; Robinson & Harris, 2013; Rist 2000; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2002). Even if this conceptualization of parental involvement is unfair to Latino/as or devalues them, they are still judged by it. Teachers view how much Latino/a parents adhere to these norms and develop perceptions of them accordingly, and these perceptions can then influence how much teachers invest in the children of Latino/a parents, creating an exacerbating cycle of cultural unfairness (Crosnoe and Ansari 2015).

In focusing on this conventional conceptualization and operationalization of school-based parental involvement in the Latino/a population, I am guided by these critiques. My intent is two-fold. 1) to show how the school-based involvement of Latino/a parents is related to who their teachers are and what their histories with teachers

are in the school over time; and 2) to unpack teachers' perceptions of parents' engagement in the types of school involvement that they expect and these perceptions may mix both bias and support in different ways by teachers' ethnicities.

In this spirit, contextual systems theory (Pianta and Walsh 1996; Rimm-Kaufman and Pianta 2000) ties together this interest in early education as a critical stage of schooling and the interplay between parents and teachers during this stage. It emphasizes that early educational inequalities are exacerbated—with long-range consequences—when families and schools are out of step with each other, at a distance, or actively antagonistic, and it posits that bringing the two “into positive conversation” is one way to promote the success of traditionally disadvantaged groups of children. Parent involvement at school is an important component of this process that has the added advantage of already being the focus of extensive educational policy investment, including No Child Left Behind (Epstein, 2005). The theory also has been interpreted as suggesting that parental engagement within the school context is more likely when parents and teachers are from similar segments of the population with similar social statuses, traditions, and cultural histories that reduce the odds of miscommunication, misunderstandings, and misperceptions (Crosnoe 2012). For example, evidence that socioeconomic and racial/ethnic differences undermine positive parent-teacher relations suggests that corresponding similarities may facilitate them, allowing parents to understand what teachers want from them in terms of involvement while helping teachers have broader conceptions of how parents can be involved (Dearing et al. 2004; Mayer 1997; McLoyd 1998).

These scenarios are relevant to understanding what happens to Latino/a children given the contemporary school context characterized by the convergence of the low socioeconomic status, minority ethnicity, potential language barriers, and relative lack of experience in U.S. education of many Latino/a parents (especially immigrants) and the overrepresentation of middle class Whites in the teaching profession. This convergence means that Latino/a parents may be less likely to see the school as a place where they should be involved and are welcome to be involved and to see visible school involvement as a way of helping their children succeed. It also means that teachers may be more likely to have negative views of Latino/a parents due to narrow ideas of what “good” parental involvement is (Crosnoe and Ansari 2015; Lopez, Scribner and Mahitivanichcha 2001; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2002; Yoshikawa and Kalil 2011).

Following contextual systems theory, therefore, I explored the link between the school-based involvement of Latino/a parents of elementary school students and the races/ethnicities of their children’s teachers over time, especially whether those teachers were Latino/a too. Specifically, the aims of this dissertation were:

Aim 1. To draw on nationally representative data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Class of 1998-99 (ECLS-K) to quantitatively examine the degree to which the school-based involvement of Latina mothers is reactive to their children’s teachers (past and present) also being Latino/as. Lagged structural equation models estimated how a conventional school involvement scale was predicted by parent-teacher ethnic match in the current year of elementary school and all prior years from kindergarten, net of other kinds of matches (e.g., by socioeconomic status) and taking

account the significant diversity among Latino/as in origins, current circumstances, and acculturation (e.g., region, language). These analyses were intended to document how a source of similarity between parents and teachers might help make Latino/a parents more visible in school.

Aim 2. To draw on observational and interview data collected in ten public schools in the SouthWest Independent School District (SWISD) to qualitatively explore potential explanations for observed links between parent-teacher ethnic matches and parents' school-based involvement during the primary grades. Qualitative methods identified major themes in the ways in which teachers perceived and communicated with Latino/a parents depending on whether they themselves were Latino/a and on the school and classroom contexts in which they met parents, particularly concerning teachers' perceptions of the values, motivations, and behaviors of Latino/a parents and how they think that parents understand and respond to these perceptions. The analyses for this aim elucidated how the potential for similarity to make Latino/a parents more visible in school in Aim 1 may work.

This mixed methods approach allowed for a more comprehensive look at an important aspect of Latino/a parental involvement within the context of U.S. schools during a critical period of education. ECLS-K provides a broad representative look at how parent-teacher ethnic matches may shape parental involvement on the national scale, and the SWISD data helped me dig into the nuances, details, and mechanisms of these broad population patterns. This research has the potential to contribute to sociological, psychological, and educational theories that emphasize families and children within the

issue of educational stratification (Entwisle and Alexander 1993; Kao and Thompson 2003) as well as policy/practice (Crosnoe and Turley 2011; Fuller 2007; Gandara and Contreras 2009; Valencia 2010; Yosso 2005).

Chapter 2: Literature Review and Conceptual Model

Statistically speaking, Latino/as constitute an at-risk group within U.S. schools, meaning that—despite a great deal of variability among them—they have probabilistically higher odds of negative school outcomes, such as low achievement, dropout, and truncated attainment than the general school-age population (Gandara and Contreras 2009). These lower odds of educational success then play a role in the higher rates of poverty and lower rates of social mobility in this population. To be sure, this “risk” is not fixed, and various Latino/a educational disparities have decreased over time even if they have not closed. For example, Latino/a students start elementary school with lower achievement than the general student population, but they close some of this gap in subsequent years (Crosnoe and Turley 2011). As another example, Latino/as lag behind their Asian, White, and Black peers in high school and college graduation, but these gaps have shrunk in recent years (Fry 2014). Such patterns of risk and resilience are precisely why Latino/as are a population of special interest in many major educational policies, including No Child Left Behind (Capps et al. 2005; Gandara and Contreras 2009). They reflect the triangulation of three demographic and structural factors within the Latino/a population. These factors overlap, but they each matter in unique ways.

First, Latino/as are an ethnic minority in the U.S., which means that they are often subjected to major racially and ethnically-based stratifying forces that can limit their educational opportunities, such as segregation and discrimination. The deep and widening community and school segregation among Latino/as can keep Latino/as from achieving their academic potential by impacting student performance (Logan, Minca and Adair

2012; Logan et al. 2002). At the same time, discrimination undermines academic progress through the over identification of Latino/a children in special education programs, punitive educational policies, and lowered performance expectations from school personnel (Adair 2012).

Second, Latino/a families have high levels of socioeconomic disadvantage relative to the general population, and especially Whites, with lower than average incomes, wealth, and rates of educational attainment. (Gandara and Contreras 2009). These disadvantages are even more pronounced in some segments of the Latino/a population, including Mexican-Americans and immigrants (Crosnoe 2010; Fortuny et al. 2009; Tienda 2009); for example, the poverty rate for Mexican immigrants is estimated to be as high as 27 percent (Gonzalez-Barrera and Lopez 2013). Socioeconomic disadvantage is, of course, incredibly relevant to educational success, and its potential to disrupt academic progress is an underlying cause of the importance of race/ethnicity for educational outcomes discussed above (Crosnoe and Turley 2011; Crosnoe 2005; Duncan and Magnuson 2013). It comes with many stressors and hardships (e.g., job turnover, financial worries, residential instability), time constraints on parenting behavior, inadequate means to invest in children's education, exposure to dangers (e.g., neighborhood crime), and a lack of social status that marginalizes parents and their children in institutional systems such as schools (Duncan and Magnuson 2005; Magnuson and Duncan 2014).

Third, the majority of Latino/as in the U.S. school system are children of immigrants or immigrants themselves. Immigrants face many obstacles to educational

success in the U.S., including the higher rates of poverty among many immigrant groups (including Latino/a immigrants) that matter so much academically for the reasons just described (Hernandez, Denton and Macartney 2007). Beyond this socioeconomic disadvantage, many immigrant parents lack sufficient English proficiency, knowledge of the nuances of U.S. schools, and social status that would enable them to utilize the resources available at home, school, and in the community that could facilitate educational success for their children. Their children's English language learning status can also be misinterpreted as a lack of academic skills, channeling them into special education programs that stunt their academic progress over time (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2002). Moreover, in the current climate of anti-immigrant political rhetoric and public debate, immigrants encounter various forms of discrimination (e.g., punitive educational and immigration policies) and other social pressures (e.g., fears of raids or deportation) that impede their children's developmental trajectory (Adair 2012; Fortuny et al. 2009; Hernandez 2004).

The triangulation of these three factors, therefore, suggests that Latino/a children are quite vulnerable in the stratified American society in general and in the stratified American educational system in particular. Importantly, however, the same immigrant status that intersects with ethnic minority status and low socioeconomic status to create this vulnerability also comes with substantial resources that qualify this vulnerability. These resources include strong social networks, tight-knit communities, and committed parents and adults (Kao 1999). For example, bilingualism has been shown to translate into cognitive advantages, and immigrant children are better poised than native children

to achieve bilingualism (Goldenberg 1996; Goldenberg 2008; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). At the same time, the supportive relationships with adults facilitated by the dense family networks within immigrant communities are associated with increased academic engagement, better mental health, and more positive senses of well-being (Harker 2001; Suárez-Orozco, Rhodes and Milburn 2009).

Given how fast the Latino/a population is growing, this vulnerability and resilience among Latino/as raises the stakes of efforts that draw on their many resources and strengths to help them succeed in the U.S. schools. Those efforts are relevant not only to the future prospects of Latino/a students themselves but also to the economic productivity and stability of the nation as a whole (Souto-Manning 2010; Adair 2012). These stakes increase the need for educational research to investigate new ways that Latino/a children overcome obstacles and find success.

The Early Education of Latino/a Children

In exploring educational risk and resilience in the Latino/a population, a focus on the early years of the educational career—the transition into and through elementary school—is important for several reasons. One is that the early educational career seems to be a time in which disparities between Latino/a children and their peers are pronounced but also reactive to change. For example, evidence of a Latino/a immigrant advantage in academic progress that sometimes characterizes the secondary school population and thereby chips away educational disparities between Latino/as and other students, is weaker and far more inconsistent during the early elementary school years (Crosnoe and Turley 2011; Gandara and Contreras 2009; Magnuson and Waldfogel 2005). Another

reason is that this early period serves as the foundation for the entire educational career, with disparities between demographic groups setting the stage for future educational opportunities and investments in schools (Alexander, Entwisle and Olson 2014). A third reason is that, precisely because of this life course pattern, evidence clearly demonstrates that human capital interventions bring a better return on investment when focused on the earlier stages of students' educational journey (Crosnoe and Turley 2011; Entwisle, Alexander and Olson 2005).

Together, these three reasons suggest that Latino/a children are particularly vulnerable at the beginning of formal schooling and that efforts to address this early vulnerability will have outsized effects. If they get a better start in school, they will have less ground to make up over time, and their long-term educational trajectories (all Latino/as, not just immigrants) will be more positive. Unfortunately, researchers have mainly focused on Latino/as at the secondary school level because of the proximity of this period to adult socioeconomic attainment and its concomitant usefulness for observing intergenerational socioeconomic mobility. This understanding of how Latino/as end up should be coupled with an equal understanding of how they start out (Crosnoe and Turley 2011; Entwisle et al. 2005; Heckman 2006).

In this spirit of constructing a more balanced view of the educational life course among Latino/as, this dissertation focuses on the primary grades of elementary school. In doing so, I recognize that many factors underlying the risk and resilience of Latino/as could be considered. I am focusing on one—parental involvement in education within the general context of family-school relations—for reasons that connect theory and policy.

Parental Involvement and Family-School Relations

The fundamental component of contextual systems theory is that children will do better academically transitioning into and through elementary school when the two dominant ecological systems of their lives—their families and their schools—directly and indirectly complement and supplement each other (Pianta and Walsh 1996; Rimm-Kaufman and Pianta 2000). According to this perspective, a major reason children from historically disadvantaged segments of the population fall behind their peers from other groups early in their school career is because their families and schools are out of synch or even in conflict, such as when teachers have a deficit view of some parents that ignores the strengths that they could draw on to support the school. At the same time, a major reason that these same children are resilient during this same period is because their families and schools find ways to effectively partner with and support each other, such as when parents and teachers cross cultural and socioeconomic divides to understand and value each other's perspectives and contributions (Adair & Tobin 2008; Adair, Tobin, & Arzubiaga 2012; Crosnoe 2012; Souto-Manning 2010). This perspective, therefore, calls for a closer inspection of family-school relations when children are young as a resource for improving the long-term educational prospects of Latino/as.

For the most part, sociologists of education have approached the topic of family-school relations in terms of parental involvement at school, focusing on what parents are doing vis a vis teachers and schools. In addition to the fact that such school-based involvement is often narrowly defined in terms of a finite number of behaviors, this construct focuses too much on parental behaviors without adequate consideration of the

school context in which they occur. Such behaviors include having an active presence in the school through attendance at school meetings, maintaining regular conversation with teachers (e.g., parent-teacher conferences, email, notes), and volunteering in the classroom and/or school (Pomerantz et al., 2007).

On the population level, these kinds of behaviors have well-documented associations with numerous markers of achievement, such as smoother transitions into kindergarten (Schulting, Malone and Dodge 2005), reading and math scores during elementary school (Hill 2001), increased academic aspirations among youth as well as an indirect influence on achievement vis-à-vis school behavior at the middle and high school levels (Hill et al. 2004). Although in part due to selection (i.e., parents who get involved differ from those who do not in ways that may also affect their children's schooling outcomes), these associations appear to have some causal component (Pomerantz et al. 2007). Explanations for these apparent academic benefits of parents' school-based involvement include the development of foundations for better adjustment to the educational experience for children and an increase in their perceptions of the value of schooling (Eccles and Harold 1993). In addition, as parents develop a better understanding of the written and unwritten rules of school, they also develop an enhanced sense of efficacy and motivation to advocate for their children. Educators and administrators also benefit from parental involvement as it provides them with a better awareness of children's special needs and/or talents, as well as a better understanding of the circumstances and concerns of the parents. Importantly, the links between parents' school-based involvement and children's outcomes may not solely reflect some inherent

value of involvement behavior but instead be a function of how schools reward children—through increased investment, higher expectations, and giving the benefit of the doubt for struggles—for having parents who follow the *traditional* scripts of involvement, even if these scripts are not understood by, realistic for, or valued by parents for a variety of cultural reasons (Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler 1997; Pomerantz et al. 2007). Because school-based involvement has some academic benefits and because it is subject to cultural biases (both in how it is viewed and how it is supported and elicited), it can be a source of inequality.

Increasingly, researchers have shifted away from this focus on parental behavior alone to consider the complex ways in which parents and school personnel interact, emphasizing both the supply of and demand for parents' school-based involvement. This shift in attention from parents' school-based involvement behaviors to the broader conceptualization of family-school relations recognizes that what parents do may matter more or less depending on what schools are or are not doing, and vice versa, which then elucidates ways that cultural biases may be involved. The resulting emphasis on family-school partnerships as necessary to the success of children beyond parental involvement per se (Epstein and Sheldon 2006) is well aligned with contextual systems theory.

For these reasons, parents' school-based involvement and family-school relations have been a critical component of educational policy for years, especially after the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. In this policy agenda, the responsibility for a child's education is viewed as shared between schools and families, with an emphasis on building this actively shared responsibility to reduce the

achievement gap among minorities and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. This idea was later reinforced with the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which mandated that all schools construct family-school compacts to meet educational challenges and reduce educational disparities (Epstein 2005). If having parents present in school and interacting with school personnel is important to the educational fortunes of Latino/a children within a school system that values and expects both, then understanding what leads Latino/a parents to be visible in schools is important. This dissertation focuses on one such factor, which I turn to next.

Ethnic Congruence of Adults at Home and in School

Historically, most elementary school teachers in the U.S. have been White, meaning that most Latino/a parents with children in elementary school have interacted with a series of teachers of a different ethnic background. As the makeup of the general population has shifted in recent decades, however, the composition of the elementary school teaching population has also diversified, so that more teachers are Latino/as. In 1986, 91% of teachers were White. In 2011, 84% were White, with Latino/as accounting for the majority of the increase in non-White teachers (Feistritzer 2011). Consequently, the chances that Latino/a parents will meet with teachers of the same or similar ethnic background in their children's schools is on the rise. This changing reality may be positive for Latino/a children by strengthening connections between home and school (Picower 2009).

Why would parents and teachers being of the same ethnicity support positive parent-teacher relations and encourage parents' visible presence at schools? One of the

main contributors to parental involvement is how parents see their own role in the process overall (Hoover-Dempsey et al. 2005). Role construction is based upon expectations shaped by individuals and groups that are important to the person (Biddle 1986; Biddle 1979; Hoover-Dempsey et al. 2005). As such, people from different cultures often have different ideas of what parental involvement entails. Indeed, Latino/a culture and the culture of U.S. schools differ in many ways with regard to the education of children and the perceived roles parents and teachers should play. For example, many Latino/a families have a cultural orientation to parenting that makes them more likely than other parents to view parents and teachers as having parallel roles, with parents responsible for the moral/behavioral development of their children and teachers and schools responsible for their academic education (Crosnoe and Ansari 2015; Hill and Torres 2010; Reese et al. 1995). As a result, they may be less comfortable than other parents seeing themselves and their child's teacher as equal partners at school and, thus, focus on what is happening at home and avoid being intrusive at school. In contrast, teachers without this cultural orientation (i.e., most teachers) view parent participation in school events, such as attending PTA meetings or volunteering in the classroom, as markers of parents' investment in children's schooling (Bakker, Denessen and Brus-Laeven 2007) and see the absence of Latino/a parents as indication that they do not care (Quirocho and Daoud 2006).

This cultural misunderstanding may lead to fewer invitations for, and elicitation of, involvement on the part of teachers (Bakker et al. 2007; Rist 1970; Rist 2000),

creating a domino effect which overlooks the value convergence² that actually exists between Latino/a parents and school (Fraga and Garcia 2010). Some interventions—such as Lee y Seras—recognize this potential misunderstanding and actively try to reduce the odds it will happen by demystifying U.S. schools for Latino/a immigrants and connecting them to teachers in their children’s schools so that teachers can have a better understanding of how they view the role of parents in education (Goldenberg and Light 2009). Ethnic matching could facilitate this process. As Adair (Adair and Tobin 2008; Adair 2012) has shown, Latino/a parents and Latino/a teachers may also have this cultural misunderstanding, especially when they differ in socioeconomic status, language use, and experience with U.S. schools. Yet, Latino/a teachers are likely to be more aware of the potential for this misunderstanding, generally have more knowledge of where parents are coming from in terms of involvement and family-school relations, and recognize the need to bridge any false divide between home and school through engagement with the community, home visits, and specifically inviting parents to the classroom (Lucas 1997).

In general, although many teacher training programs are moving away from depicting “parenting practices that deviate from standards [derived from middle-SES European American goals]...as deficits” (Harwood et al. 2002: 36), the lack of Latino/a teachers with firsthand knowledge of the culture leads to stereotypes and

² “Value convergence is defined as the extent to which the expectations of education practitioners and education reformers, as well as expectations of Latino parents regarding themselves, their children, and the schools are consistent and complementary with one another at minimum and fully collaborative at best.” (Fraga and Garcia 2010: 57)

overgeneralizations. Delpit (2006) has argued that educators need to comprehend the realities of what Latino/a parents are confronted with in their everyday lives and understand behaviors within the family. Latino/a teachers are in a unique position to do so, to the benefit of both the parents and the school, as Latino/a parents become more involved in the school while also continuing their involvement in the home.

Still, despite the change in approach that may be taking place, many of the frustrations expressed by Latino/as (including immigrants) regarding the education of their children are related to the limitations in communication caused by the English/Spanish language barrier. For example, Quioco and Daoud (2006) found that parents often felt unsupported by teachers and the school when assignments and books were not translated into Spanish and were concerned that their children were not receiving the same quality of education as other students. These parents indicated that there was a need for a community liaison to aid with communicating concerns with the school about their children's education. A larger presence of Spanish-speaking Latino/a teachers in the school would undoubtedly ease parents' concerns by enabling them to speak with the teachers directly. The direct line of communication would also make it easier for teachers to include Latino/a parents through invitations to participate in various aspects of the child's in-school experience.

In sum, ethnic matches between Latino/a parents and teachers should facilitate more active involvement of Latino/a parents in their children's elementary schools through both supply and demand forces (i.e., how parents approach schools, how schools reach out and react to parents). This pattern is likely to play out both concurrently (i.e., when a

Latino/a child's current teacher is Latino/a) and cumulatively (i.e., when a Latino/a child has had a series of Latino/a teachers), as teachers can help to socialize parents about schooling in a way that they carry on after their children have moved to a new grade and classroom. Thus, contact with a teacher in any given year is part of a cumulative process of parent-teacher relations (Crosnoe, Augustine and Huston 2012; Feistritzer 2011). Let me be clear that I am not arguing that Latino/a children should only have Latino/a teachers. Instead, the policy implications of my theoretical argument are in line with recent attempts to increase the number of Latino/a teachers in the U.S., such as President Obama's 2010 executive order that included a component for the recruitment of Latino/a teachers with several initiatives and partnerships that are focused on realizing a better representation of Latino/a educators.

Conceptual Model, Hypotheses, and Exploratory Questions

Based on the added value of ethnic matches to family-school relations highlighted by contextual systems theory that I have laid out above, the conceptual model of this dissertation is presented in Figure 1. It starts with the assessments of Latino/as parents of their own school-based involvement and then shifts to how their children's teachers see this involvement.

The main component of the model is the direct link between racial/ethnic parent-teacher matches and Latino/a parents' involvement in school activities (designated by the bolded black arrow, which means it will be tested directly), which will provide a window into the contested nature of family-school relations. Based on this conceptual model, the

first aim of this study was to statistically test in ECLS-K a series of hypotheses about the focal link between ethnic-matching and involvement.

- Latino/a parents will report higher school-based involvement (overall and across diverse activities) when their children's current teachers are Latino/a.
- Latino/a parents will report more involvement both overall and across diverse activities the greater the number of Latino/a teachers their children have across elementary school.

Testing these hypotheses will take into account other kinds of matches between parents and teachers as well as the significant diversity among Latino/as in where they migrated from, their current status in the U.S., and their level of acculturation.

The conceptual model also includes a mechanism component (designated by the bolded bracket along the bottom), exploring possible reasons why parent-teacher ethnic matching in the past and present might facilitate Latino/a parents' involvement at school. Doing so was a way of understanding just how schools may be biased against Latino/a parents in ways that might discourage their presence in schools or ignore the diverse ways that they can be involved but also a way of elucidating how teachers might try to find common ground with Latino/a parents and form partnerships with them.

Given the dearth of research in this area, my investigation of this component was exploratory. Based on the related areas of research discussed above, I could speculate about some likely mechanisms, including teacher investment in Latino/a education, trust, and shared language. These mechanisms are a priori, meaning that they are grounded in the literature. Yet, this issue is understudied and undertheorized enough that many

possible mechanisms could be at work that are harder to predict. Consequently, I knew that some mechanisms beyond those a priori mechanisms would likely emerge from my exploration of the SWISD data. Thus, instead of testing hypotheses, this aim was organized around an exploratory question:

- What are the social and psychological mechanisms that shape how Latino/a and non-Latino/a teachers perceive Latino/a parents' school-based involvement?

The qualitative data from SWISD complements the data in ECLS-K since teachers were given an opportunity to articulate the challenges and concerns they encounter when teaching their children and the difficulties they encounter when involving their parents. Again, I will be able to take into account possible sources of similarity between parents and teachers beyond ethnicity and potential differences in teachers' perceptions of parents according to acculturative and other differences among parents, such as English language facility.

Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler's (1997) review of why parents become involved at school noted that the literature primarily focuses on mother's parental involvement due to the patterns that emerge from traditional gender roles, socioculturally assigned functions, and distributions of power by gender. Although these gender roles are shifting with respect to Latino fathers' involvement in child-rearing (McLoyd, Cauce and Takeuchi 2000), Latino fathers, who have lower levels of education and work more hours at lower paying jobs, tend to be less involved in the caregiving activities than Black and White fathers (Leavell et al. 2012). Thus, although focusing on both parents is ideal, focusing on

mothers alone is preferable in general, and in this specific population, when only one parent can be considered. Because the quantitative and qualitative data used in this dissertation were drawn from samples almost entirely made up of mothers, I focused on mothers' parental involvement.

Chapter 3: Methods

This dissertation used a mixed methods approach to investigate parent-teacher racial/ethnic-matching and school-based parental involvement among Latino/a mothers with two main sources of data: quantitative data from a national survey and qualitative data from in-depth interviews in a specific school district. This approach provided insight into the mechanisms that explain nationwide patterns of involvement in the eyes of the mothers themselves. Using different methods reduces non-sampling error by providing redundancy in the findings and also reduces potential bias from nationally representative patterns with local explanations of participation in parental involvement with teacher interviews (Axinn and Pearce 2006).

Quantitative Data

The quantitative data source, ECLS-K, was constructed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). It is a nationally representative dataset that focuses on the schooling experiences of children from kindergarten into middle school. The base year unweighted sample consisted of 22,782 children who were selected in a stratified sampling design organized by 100 primary sampling units (normally counties). They attended 1,277 elementary schools with kindergarten programs. Data collection began in the fall of 1998 (first half of kindergarten), with follow-up waves in spring 1999 (second half of kindergarten), fall 1999 (first half of first grade; 25% subsample), spring 2000 (second half of first grade), spring 2002 (second half of third grade), spring 2004 (second half of fifth grade), and spring 2007 (second half of eighth grade). I analyzed

kindergarten, first grade, and third grade since my qualitative data focus on elementary observations and interviews from the primary grades.

These data were particularly useful in that they go beyond information on children to include detailed measures of parents' perceptions of their own involvement in school-based activities. Moreover, the dataset has a large sample of Latino/a families, including both U.S.-born and foreign-born parents and children ($n = 2816$ Latino/as: 1639 U.S.-born, 1177 foreign-born).

My analytical sample includes all Latino/a children who participated in the kindergarten, first grade, and third grade waves (new $n = 1976$). The potential bias of excluding families who dropped out over time was addressed by applying the longitudinal sampling weights that account for differential attrition across waves. Within this sample, all item-level missing data was estimated (methods discussed below), including any missing information on the focal parent involvement measures.

Qualitative Data

The qualitative data were collected in the Southwestern Independent School District (SWISD) during the 2010-2011 school year. In-depth interviews (see Appendix) were conducted with pre-kindergarten (Pre-K), kindergarten, first grade, and second grade teachers. Nine of the sixty-six elementary schools in SWISD were sites of this data collection. Fifty-seven classrooms were observed (and fifty-eight teachers were interviewed), of which thirty-six were Pre-K, eight were kindergarten, eight were first grade, and six were second grade. Some of the Pre-K classrooms were housed in elementary schools, but, because of space limitations at six elementary campuses, a

separate site, the Cole Pre-Kindergarten Demonstration School, was established by the district to hold the overflow. .

Several characteristics made SWISD an ideal place, such as the high proportion of Latino/a students and teachers, to examine the mechanisms and nuances that underlie the way teachers perceive how involved Latino/a parents are in their child's education. During the 2010-2011 school year, the racial/ethnic breakdown of the student population SWISD was 60.3% Latino/a (24.3% White, 9.5% African-American, 3.3% Asian-American, 2% Native Americans, 2.3% other). Over half of the district's students (64%) were economically disadvantaged, and almost a third (28.7%) were English language learners. Of the 123 campuses within the district, only eight were rated as academically unacceptable. As for the racial/ethnic composition of the elementary schools in SWISD, the majority of teachers were White (58.1%), a third were Latino/a (34.1%), and 6.2% were Black. Of note is that the highest concentrations of Latino/a teachers in SWISD were found at the elementary school level.

Quantitative Measures in ECLS-K

Descriptive statistics for the ECLS-K variables are included in Tables 1-3.

Parental involvement at school. I used six binary parent-reported indicators of school-based involvement in each wave (1 = yes), including attendance at open houses and PTA meetings, participation in regularly scheduled parent-teacher conferences, attendance at a school or class event (e.g., play, sports, fairs), participation in fundraising, and volunteering at school . These indicators were tested individually and as a summed total of parental involvement. These measures capture most of the major school-based

involvement behaviors that are outlined by Pomerantz and her colleagues (2007) in their review of the literature on parental involvement. ECLS-K does include measures of teachers' ratings of parents' school-based involvement. Even though the first aim concerned parents own assessments, I wanted to use the teachers' assessments as a point of comparison. Unfortunately, the teacher assessment data had high levels of missingness, rendering those comparisons somewhat useless.

Race/ethnicity and immigration status. The ECLS-K dataset has categorical measures of race/ethnicity for both parents and teachers (Latino/a, White, African-American, Asian-American, Other). Parents reported their birthplace, thereby indicating whether they were U.S.-born or foreign-born, facilitating the creation of a binary indicator of whether the Latina mother was born outside the U.S. Teachers were not asked to report their immigration status. I also conducted supplemental analyses that broke down that non-Latino/a reference category into whether teachers were White or African-American (Asian teachers were too few) and additional analyses that focused exclusively on the immigrants with controls by primary Latin American regions.

Maternal characteristics. To account for potential common influences on Latina mothers' parental involvement and their exposure to Latino/a teachers in their children's schools, I measured mothers' age, family income, and years in the US as continuous variables. All other indicators were recoded into binary indicators: marital status (married to child's parent vs. married to other partner, single-parent, or other status), mother's educational attainment (high school or lower vs. some college or higher), birth status (U.S. vs. foreign-born), and employment status (Working full or part time vs.

Mother not working or no info), what country or region mother was born (Mexico vs. Cuba, Puerto Rico, South/Central America, or other Latin American country) and years mom was schooled outside of the United States.

Child characteristics. To capture the potential for children's characteristics to select them into different classrooms and elicit differing levels of parental involvement, another set of controls included child gender, race/ethnicity, age, problem behavior (externalizing symptoms), work habits (approaches to learning), math and reading proficiency, and number of siblings. Using the Social Rating Scale, teachers reported how often (1 to 4) they witnessed the children engaging in such behaviors as getting into fights or arguments, not paying attention, and getting distracted easily. Math and reading proficiency was measured with Item Response Theory measures from standardized achievement tests math and reading in the spring of kindergarten. To capture personal factors that tap into psychological characteristics related to academic functioning in school, parents reported how often (1 to 4) they witnessed their children exhibit behaviors such as concentrate on tasks, eager to learn new things, show interest in a variety of things. This subscale was only created if there were valid data on at least 4 of the 6 items.

Teacher characteristics. At each wave of data collection, a number of teacher characteristics were measured to control for potential factors co-occurring with teacher race/ethnicity that might influence parental involvement. They include age, race/ethnicity, gender, educational attainment (Master's degree or higher vs. Bachelor's degree or lower), teacher experience (years at school and years teaching grade level),

class size, and number of college courses completed (ESL, development, early education, elementary education).

School-level controls. Three indicators gauged the compositional characteristics of the schools sampled: percentage of Latino/a students in school, percentage of Latino/a teachers in school, percentage of students who are eligible for free lunch (a proxy for the socioeconomic composition of the school), and school sector (1 = private).

Other first and third grade controls. Finally, some new variables in first and third grade were added to the models that were appropriate to help tease out additional nuances with each grade: Teacher years doing language class: ESL or Bilingual, new school in sample, Does teacher have ESL certification, teacher speaks Spanish, Spanish instruction is used in class, number of full time ESL/Bilingual teachers, and number of part time ESL/Bilingual teachers.

Qualitative Data at SWISD

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 58 teachers from SWISD during the focal school year. These interviews covered several topics, one of which concerned teachers' narratives about parental involvement with the goal of illuminating some of the nuances of how teachers define parental involvement, what they expect from parents, and the challenges they encounter when trying to involve parents. The interviews were conducted by a research team of five graduate research assistants, and they ranged in length from 30-60 minutes. Each teacher signed a consent form agreeing to participate in the study, were guaranteed anonymity by the use of pseudonyms, and paid \$50. The sample of teachers was 65% Latino/a, 33% White, and 2% African-American.

The interview guides used by the research team included four sections: teacher background, classroom challenges, alignment, and alignment experiences. Background questions focused on gathering information about the teacher's racial/ethnic background and professional and educational experience (highest degree, certifications, length of time teaching in school and overall teaching experience, and other grades they may have taught). This section was also used as a way to develop rapport and a sense of his/her tenure as an educator. The second section included questions on the makeup of the class (e.g. English language learners, low-income children) and what a typical day looked like for that teacher. Interviewers were prompted to ask how the teacher defined success for students and for the classroom, and how their definition differed based on students' backgrounds. Lastly, teachers were asked in what ways parents are involved in their child's education, with additional questions used to probe why is it important for the parents to get involved, and how their involvement differs from other classrooms. The third and fourth sections mainly focused on the goals for a larger study that investigated how each grade is aligned with their curriculum both within each grade level and across grade levels. Although these sections were not directly related to the aims of this dissertation, some questions were useful for understanding the context in which teachers found themselves and whether they felt that they were a part of a larger community of teachers that worked together in the best interests of the school and its children.

Plan for Quantitative Analyses

Hypothesis-testing was conducted with longitudinal path analyses—with observed rather than latent variables—in Mplus, which is a structural equation modeling

software (Muthen and Muthen 2010). Path analysis is an extension of multiple regression in that it provides estimates of the magnitude and significance of causal patterns between exogenous variables and endogenous variables. Furthermore, this method allowed me to study direct and indirect associations between predictors and outcomes and to simultaneously examine multiple predictors and outcomes (Stage, Carter and Nora 2004).

Figure 2 depicts the basic path model. In this model, the measure of parental involvement reported by parents at each wave was regressed on the marker of whether the teacher in that wave was Latino/a and whether the teachers in all prior waves were Latino/as. For example, the third grade measure of involvement was predicted by the Latino/a status of the teacher in third grade, first grade, and kindergarten. At the same time, all autoregressive paths among the measures of parental involvement were estimated (e.g., third grade parent involvement was predicted by first grade involvement, which was predicted by kindergarten involvement). The maternal, teacher, and child characteristics (time-varying and time-invariant) were entered as covariates alongside the teacher race/ethnicity variables at each wave.

After first looking at whether the Latino/a status of teachers concurrently and prospectively predicted the school-based involvement of Latina mothers, I extended the models to take a more in-depth look by:

- 1) Examining the full set of teacher race/ethnicity dummy variables rather than just the Latino/a vs. non-Latino/a distinction to explore whether the coupling of Latina mothers with teachers of various non-Latino/a race/ethnicities was more or less associated with Latina mothers' school-based involvement.

2) Iteratively adding several teacher characteristics to get at other kinds of parent-teacher demographic matches that might be confounded with parent-teacher racial/ethnic matching (e.g., whether mothers and teachers had the same education level, both spoke Spanish, were of similar age, were both women).

3) Gauging how much the initially observed associations between teacher race/ethnicity and mothers' school-based involvement persisted when controlling for diversity within the Latino/a population according to socioeconomic status, what Latin American country or region they were born in, how long the mother has been in the U.S., and whether mother attended school outside of the U.S.

4) Estimating models for each parental involvement item, which required a different estimation technique given that these items were binary, to examine whether general patterns subsumed differences across specific forms of involvement.

Across these various modeling steps, multiple imputation from estimates of 25 datasets were used to estimate missing data. This missing data technique estimated average coefficients across different data sets with plausibly imputed values for missing data, allowing the data for all cases to be estimated, regardless of missingness. All models also employed longitudinal sampling weights, which, in addition to addressing differential attrition across waves, accounted for threats to the national representativeness of the sample from several planned oversamples that led to unequal odds of sample selection across cases. The CLUSTER feature in Mplus was used to address violations to independence assumptions related to the clustering of students within schools, thereby achieving more robust standard errors.

Plan for Qualitative Analyses

To gain insight into the underlying mechanisms that relate to the associations in the qualitative analyses, I followed the general guidelines developed by Miles and Huberman (1984). First, another member of the research team and I created a detailed codebook of initial themes by randomly selecting five interview transcripts and hand-coding to identify preliminary themes that relate to parental involvement. The two main themes that emerged from the preliminary coding were: teachers' definitions of parental involvement and how teachers experienced parental involvement with parents. Second, I reviewed all of the teachers' transcripts using NVivo and coded using a priori themes while also looking for emerging theoretical themes about parental involvement and how it relates to the Latino/a experience.

Chapter 4: Results of Quantitative Analyses

Recall that the first aim of this study was to quantitatively examine the degree to which the school-based involvement of Latina mothers is reactive to their children's teachers (past and present) also being Latino/as. To pursue this aim, I conducted a series of longitudinal path models with data from ECLS-B. Mplus allowed me to estimate the missing data, control for the clustering of the sample, and address biases related to differential attrition. For the main outcome of parents' perceptions of their involvement behaviors, I began with a baseline model that regressed each of the three involvement measures (kindergarten, first grade, and third grade) on any measure of teacher Latino/a status in the corresponding grade level and any prior grade levels. This baseline model also accounted for any measures of involvement prior to the focal grade-level measure of involvement (i.e., measuring involvement in a lagged or autoregressive framework). In order to capture internal diversity in the Latino/a population and to address possible sources of endogeneity in having Latino/a teachers, I then estimated a second model that included several sets of covariates (teacher characteristics, school characteristics, maternal characteristics, child characteristics, and other first/third grade factors).

Mothers' Perceptions of their School-Based Involvement

Were the involvement behaviors of Latina mothers in any one grade associated with whether their children's teachers in that grade and all prior grades were Latino/a, net of any continuity in their involvement across grades? Table 4 presents the results from path models that I estimated to answer this question. The coefficients in Table 4 are

standardized b coefficients that represent the change in the dependent variable that is associated with one-unit change in the independent variable.

Model 1 in Table 4 contains the grade-specific measures of teachers' Latino/a status and the lagged measures of prior mothers' involvement. This model revealed no significant coefficients for teachers' Latino/a status across the three grade levels. Whether kindergarten teachers were Latino/a or not did not predict Latina mothers' involvement when children were in kindergarten or in first or third grades, whether first grade teachers were Latino/a or not did not predict Latina mothers' involvement when children were in first or third grades, and whether third grade teachers were Latino/a or not did not predict Latina mothers' involvement when children were third grades. The autoregressive paths between the maternal involvement measures across grades were significant and strong. Mothers' perceptions of their involvement when children were in kindergarten predicted their involvement when children were in first grade ($b = .30, p < .001$) and in third grade ($b = .16, p < .001$). These two effect sizes represented 16% of a standard deviation in the first grade involvement scale and 8% of a standard deviation in the third grade involvement scale, respectively. At the same time, mothers' perceptions of their involvement when children were in first grade significantly predicted their involvement in third grade ($b = .21, p < .001$), an effect size equal to 11% of a standard deviation in the scale for third grade involvement.

Model 1 in Table 4 added all of the covariates from the five sets of categories. The significant predictors of kindergarten maternal involvement were: having a Latino/a teacher at kindergarten, percent of students eligible for free lunch in the school, family

income, mother's education, race of child other than white, and child does not speak English at home. The significant predictors of first grade maternal involvement were: kindergarten maternal involvement, enrollment in a private school, mother married to the child's other parent, mother's work status, foreign-born mother, mother born in Cuba, child did not speak English at home, and math IRT score. The significant predictors of third grade maternal involvement were: kindergarten and first grade maternal involvement, percentage of Latino/a students in school, percentage of Latino/a teachers in school, maternal age, mother's education, mother born in Cuba, child identified as Hispanic, and math IRT score.

The inclusion of these covariates led to two important changes in the focal results. First, one of the teacher Latino/a status variables predicted one of the maternal involvement measures. Specifically, when children had a Latino/a teacher in kindergarten, their mothers reported more school-based involvement during that same year ($b = .224, p < .05$), although not in subsequent years. This effect size equaled 12% of a standard deviation in the kindergarten maternal involvement scale. Second, the autoregressive associations between prior and later maternal involvement measures (i.e., kindergarten involvement predicting first and third grade involvement, first grade involvement predicting third grade involvement) were somewhat attenuated by the inclusion of the five sets of covariates, although all remained statistically significant.

The results of these two models suggest that, net of many of the factors that likely selected the children of Latina mothers into having Latino/a teachers as well as the continuity in maternal involvement over time, having Latino/a teachers might have

promoted the school-based involvement of Latina mothers. This apparent effect, however, was limited to the very beginning of elementary school and did not linger into or repeat in later primary grades. Parent-teacher ethnic matching did seem to matter, therefore, but not only in a limited, time-specific way.

Finer-Grained Comparisons by Teacher Ethnicity

The models just described examined the general “effect” of having a Latino/a teacher on Latina mothers’ school-based involvement. An important follow-up consideration is whether this general effect is consistent across different kinds of comparisons; in other words, does having a Latino/a teacher matter more or less relative to having a White, African-American, or other teacher? If so, then having a Latino/a teacher would only matter if she or he replaced another teacher of a specific race. Table 5 presents the results from path models that I estimated to explore these comparisons across various teacher ethnicities. Again, the coefficients in Table 5 are standardized b coefficients, so they can be interpreted as capturing the change in the dependent variable associated with a one-unit change in the independent variable.

Model 1 in Table 5 contains the grade-specific measures of teachers’ ethnicities, focusing on Black, White, and Other teacher ethnicities with Latino/a status as the reference. Thus, the teacher ethnicity dummy variables estimated how much more or less involved Latina mothers were in each grade when their children had a teacher who was Black (or White or of another ethnicity) compared to when they had a teacher who was Latino/a. This model revealed no significant coefficients for any of the teacher ethnicity dummy variables for mothers’ involvement behaviors in any grade, net of prior

involvement. As was the case for the initial models in Table 4, the autoregressive paths between the maternal involvement measures across grades in the models in Table 5 were significant and strong. Mothers' perceptions of their involvement when children were in kindergarten predicted their involvement when children were in first grade ($b = .46, p < .001$) and in third grade ($b = .18, p < .001$). These two effect sizes represented 24% of a standard deviation in the first grade involvement scale and 9% of a standard deviation in the third grade involvement scale, respectively. At the same time, mothers' perceptions of their involvement when children were in first grade significantly predicted their involvement in third grade ($b = .30, p < .001$), an effect size equal to 15% of a standard deviation in third grade involvement.

Model 2 in Table 5 added all of the covariates from the five sets of categories. Among the significant predictors of kindergarten maternal involvement were: percent of students eligible for free lunch in school, percent of Latino/a teachers in school, mother married to child's other parent, family income, mother's education, race of child other than White, number of siblings, and child does not speak English at home. The significant predictors of first grade maternal involvement were: kindergarten maternal involvement, teacher's years in age, enrollment in private school, mother married to child's other parent, mother's work status, foreign-born mother, child did not speak English at home, and child's reading IRT score. The significant predictors of third grade maternal involvement were kindergarten and first grade maternal involvement, teacher's gender, class size, percentage of Latino/a students in school, percentage of Latino/a teachers in school, maternal age, mother married to child's other parent, mother's

education, mother born in Cuba, mother born in South/Central America, and child's math IRT score.

Once these covariates were included in the model, the coefficient for having a White teacher in kindergarten reached conventional levels of statistical significance ($b = -.19, p < .05$). The negative coefficient means that Latina mothers whose children had a White teacher reported less school-based involvement during that year than Latina mothers whose children had a Latino/a teacher. This effect size equaled 10% of a standard deviation in the kindergarten maternal involvement scale. Of note is that the non-significant coefficients for having a Black teacher and for having a teacher of another ethnicity were similar in magnitude to the significant coefficient for having a White teacher. The difference in significance levels across these coefficients, therefore, likely reflected the smaller sample sizes of Black teachers and teachers of other ethnicities, relative to the sample size of White teachers. As in the previous pair of models in Table 4, the autoregressive associations between prior and later maternal involvement measures (i.e., kindergarten involvement predicting first and third grade involvement, first grade involvement predicting third grade involvement) in this pair of models were somewhat weakened by the inclusion of the five sets of covariates, although all remained statistically significant.

The results of these two models with more extensive teacher ethnicity comparisons seemed to suggest that the initially observed difference in Latina mothers' school-based involvement at the start of school by whether or not their children had a Latino/a teacher was driven by the difference between having a Latino/a teacher and a

White teacher. If true, then having any type of racial/ethnic minority teacher might have been what mattered, not having a Latino/a teacher per se. Yet, closer inspection revealed that this observed difference among non-Latino/a teacher ethnicities likely reflected differences in sample sizes rather than differences in meaningful associations between teacher ethnicity and maternal involvement. Again, whatever association between the ethnicities of teachers and the involvement behaviors of mothers that did emerge was limited to the very first year of kindergarten.

A More Detailed Examination of Maternal Involvement Behaviors

Another way to take a closer look at the general “effect” of teacher Latino/a status on the school-based involvement of Latina mothers was to look specifically at each of the different aspects of the maternal involvement scale that I initially grouped together. Recall that the six binary indicators of school-based involvement that I summed for the overall scale were mothers’ attendance at open house and PTA meetings, participation in regularly scheduled parent-teacher conferences, attendance at a school or class event (e.g., play, sports, fairs), participation in fundraising, and volunteering at school. Tables 6-8 present the results from path models that I estimated for each of these six binary items. Because of the binary (vs. continuous) nature of the outcomes, I used logistic regression to estimate these models, and I report the odds ratios in the tables. These ratios represent the odds that an outcome would occur given a particular exposure (here, having a teacher who was Latino/a, compared to the odds of the outcome occurring in the absence of that exposure (here, having a teacher who was Black, White, or of another ethnicity). The tables contain only the results for the fully controlled models, meaning the

models including all of the prior versions of the involvement outcome as well as the five sets of covariates.

Table 6 presents the results for attendance at PTA meetings and parent-teacher conferences. In the first model, having a Black teacher in kindergarten significantly predicted higher odds of a Latina mother attending PTA meetings during that same period compared to having a Latino/a teacher ($OR = 2.34, p < .01$). This odds ratio can be interpreted by subtracting 1 and multiplying by 100% to capture the percent change in odds of PTA attendance between having a Black vs. Latino/a teacher. In this case, Latina mothers had 134% odds of attendance when their children had a Black teacher in kindergarten than when they had a Latino/a teacher in that grade. At the same time, having a White teacher ($OR = 1.50, p < .05$) or a teacher of another ethnicity ($OR = 2.27, p < .05$) in third grade significantly predicted higher odds of a Latina mother attending PTA meetings compared to having a Latino/a teacher during that same period. In the second model, having a White teacher ($OR = 1.72, p < .05$) in first grade significantly predicted higher odds of a Latina mother attending parent-teacher conferences compared to having a Latino/a teacher during that same period.

Next, Table 7 presents the results for attendance at school events and participation in fundraising. In the first model, having a White teacher ($OR = 1.13, p < .05$) in third grade significantly predicted higher odds of a Latina mother attending school events compared to having a Latino/a teacher during that same period. A similar pattern was found for having a Black teacher in third grade ($OR = 1.18, p < .05$). In the second model, having a teacher of another ethnicity in kindergarten significantly predicted lower odds of

a Latina mother participating in school fundraising activities during that same period compared to having a Latino/a teacher ($OR = .41, p < .01$). Because this odds ratio is lower than 1, it indicates a negative association—subtracting it from 1 and multiplying by 100% indicates a 59% decrease in the odds of participation associated with having a teacher of another ethnicity compared to having a Latino/a teacher. This model also revealed the first evidence of lagged effect, given the significant coefficient for having a teacher of another ethnicity in kindergarten and Latina mothers' participation in fundraising when children were in first grade ($OR = .33, p < .01$).

Finally, Table 8 presents the results for volunteering at school and attendance at open house events. In the first model, having a White teacher ($OR = .47, p < .05$) in kindergarten significantly predicted lower odds of a Latina mother volunteering at school events compared to having a Latino/a teacher during that same period. The coefficient for having a Black teacher in kindergarten was similar although only marginally significant. In the second model, having a Black teacher ($OR = .58, p < .05$) in kindergarten significantly predicted lower odds of a Latina mother attending open house compared to having a Latino/a teacher during that same period.

In sum, this last set of models was the most detailed, in that they examined each maternal involvement behavior in relation to multiple teacher ethnicities at multiple time points. Unlike the focal models that used the full maternal involvement scale and compared having a Latino/a teacher to not having one in any given grade, these models revealed some instances of an association between teacher ethnicity and Latina mothers' involvement after kindergarten, of a negative association between having a Latino/a

teacher and Latina mothers' involvement, and of a lagged association between teacher ethnicity at one grade and Latina mothers' involvement at a later grade. Overall, however, the main take-away from these results is that the general positive association between a child being in a kindergarten class with a Latino/a teacher and her or his mother being involved in school-based activities was driven by three aspects of such involvement (fundraising, volunteering, and open house events) and was more about having a Latino/a teacher than not having a White or Black teacher

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables for Kindergarten Wave

	U.S.-Born Mothers			Foreign-Born Mothers		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Parent Involvement from Parent's Perspective</i>						
Attend a PTA meeting	895	0.31	0.46	1081	0.37	0.48
Attend open house	895	0.66	0.47	1081	0.59	0.49
Attend parent advisory group	895	0.09	0.29	1081	0.11	0.31
Attend school event	895	0.62	0.49	1081	0.46	0.50
Attend parent-teacher conference	895	0.81	0.39	1081	0.81	0.39
Acted as school volunteer	895	0.41	0.49	1081	0.30	0.46
Participated in fundraising	895	0.51	0.50	1081	0.38	0.49
Composite of parent's perception	895	3.41	1.84	1081	3.01	1.68
<i>Parent Involvement from Teacher's Perspective</i>						
Parents attend conferences	786	0.91	0.29	887	0.89	0.32
Parents came for informal meetings	670	0.87	0.33	744	0.87	0.34
Parent returned phone calls	567	0.93	0.26	511	0.89	0.31
Parent volunteered in school	720	0.48	0.50	787	0.36	0.48
Composite of teacher's perception	803	2.70	1.17	913	2.38	1.15
<i>Child Characteristics</i>						
Gender (female)	895	0.49	0.50	1081	0.50	0.50
White	895	0.06	0.24	1081	0.02	0.14
African-American	895	0.01	0.11	1081	0.00	0.05
Latino/a	895	0.92	0.27	1081	0.97	0.16
Asian-American	895	0.00	0.03	1081	0.00	0.06
Other	895	0.01	0.07	1081	0.00	0.04
Age (in years)	871	5.66	0.36	1053	5.62	0.35
Externalizing symptoms	829	1.66	0.63	986	1.60	0.58
Approaches to learning	837	3.04	0.69	994	3.07	0.69
Math IRT Score	879	28.48	10.14	1052	25.58	9.77
Reading IRT Score	803	36.37	11.59	674	35.17	11.91
Number of siblings	840	1.54	1.16	1061	1.69	1.23
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Two-parent family	895	0.68	0.47	1081	0.77	0.42
Step-family	895	0.07	0.26	1081	0.05	0.23
Single-parent family	895	0.25	0.43	1081	0.17	0.38
Other family structure	895	0.00	0.00	1081	0.00	0.00
Family income	895	40847.53	34285.66	1081	29798.48	34055.58
Household size	840	4.71	1.39	1061	5.06	1.60
Age (in years)	892	31.26	5.89	1079	32.32	5.89

Table 1 continued on next page

Table 1 (continued)

	U.S.-Born Mothers			Foreign-Born Mothers		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Working full-time	895	0.48	0.50	1081	0.35	0.48
Working part-time	895	0.19	0.39	1081	0.15	0.36
Not working	895	0.33	0.47	1081	0.50	0.50
No employment info	895	0.00	0.07	1081	0.00	0.07
Ever worked	895	0.71	0.45	1081	0.52	0.50
Mom non-English to kid	891	2.15	1.15	1076	3.40	0.96
Kid non-English to mom	891	1.87	1.06	1075	3.05	1.09
Kid does not speak English at home	895	0.26	0.44	1081	0.79	0.41
Less than high school	895	0.23	0.42	1081	0.47	0.50
High school degree	895	0.37	0.48	1081	0.27	0.44
Vocational school or some college	895	0.30	0.46	1081	0.19	0.39
College graduate	895	0.08	0.28	1081	0.06	0.24
Master's/Ph.D.	895	0.02	0.14	1081	0.01	0.12
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>						
Gender (female)	836	0.99	0.12	959	0.96	0.20
Teacher's age in years	814	42.12	10.40	935	40.79	10.56
White	849	0.70	0.46	980	0.52	0.50
African-American	849	0.16	0.37	980	0.36	0.48
Latino/a	849	0.05	0.21	980	0.05	0.22
Asian-American	849	0.04	0.19	980	0.03	0.17
Other race	849	0.02	0.13	980	0.01	0.11
High school degree	849	0.00	0.03	980	0.00	0.06
Associate's degree	849	0.01	0.10	980	0.01	0.11
Bachelor's degree	849	0.59	0.49	980	0.61	0.49
Master's degree	849	0.31	0.46	980	0.30	0.46
Ph.D.	849	0.00	0.06	980	0.00	0.06
College course in ESL	683	1.51	2.07	837	2.24	2.25
College course in development	787	3.54	1.95	915	3.24	1.93
College course in early education	809	4.20	2.18	906	3.88	2.28
College course in elementary education	813	5.29	1.62	932	5.04	1.79
Years at school	835	8.84	7.95	970	7.99	7.71
Years at this grade level	842	8.46	7.86	972	7.30	7.16
Combined teacher experience	843	0.04	0.96	976	-0.09	0.89
<i>School Characteristics</i>						
Private school enrollment	683	0.21	0.41	777	0.12	0.32
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	503	37.98	31.55	528	49.81	32.89
Percent of Latino/a students in school	624	39.21	32.38	724	54.21	32.46
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	633	17.38	24.59	714	22.74	24.33

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables for First Grade Wave

	U.S.-Born Mothers			Foreign-Born Mothers		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Parent Involvement from Parent's Perspective</i>						
Attend a PTA meeting	895	0.34	0.47	1081	0.46	0.50
Attend open house	895	0.61	0.49	1081	0.69	0.46
Attend school event	895	0.58	0.49	1081	0.59	0.49
Attend parent-teacher conference	895	0.69	0.46	1081	0.86	0.35
Acted as school volunteer	895	0.37	0.48	1081	0.30	0.46
Participated in fundraising	895	0.48	0.50	1081	0.47	0.50
Composite of parent's perception	895	3.07	2.11	1081	3.38	1.58
<i>Parent Involvement from Teacher's Perspective</i>						
Parents attend conferences	738	0.91	0.28	854	0.91	0.28
Parents came for informal meetings	597	0.83	0.37	735	0.86	0.35
Parent returned phone calls	513	0.88	0.32	546	0.85	0.36
Parent volunteered in school	678	0.43	0.50	761	0.37	0.48
Composite of teacher's perception	756	2.54	1.16	882	2.44	1.12
<i>Child Characteristics</i>						
Gender (female)	895	0.49	0.50	1081	0.50	0.50
White	895	0.06	0.24	1081	0.02	0.14
African-American	895	0.01	0.11	1081	0.00	0.05
Latino/a	895	0.92	0.27	1081	0.97	0.16
Asian-American	895	0.00	0.03	1081	0.00	0.06
Other	895	0.01	0.07	1081	0.00	0.04
Age (in years)	867	7.21	0.36	1055	7.16	0.36
Externalizing symptoms	767	1.64	0.64	897	1.58	0.60
Approaches to learning	772	3.01	0.70	908	3.01	0.70
Math IRT Score	866	50.77	14.29	1052	47.98	14.03
Reading IRT Score	828	63.59	18.84	877	60.58	18.15
Number of siblings	693	1.55	1.08	1081	1.76	1.23
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Two-parent family	895	0.52	0.50	1081	0.77	0.42
Step-family	895	0.07	0.26	1081	0.06	0.24
Single-parent family	895	0.17	0.37	1081	0.17	0.38
Other family structure	895	0.01	0.09	1081	0.00	0.05
Family income	739	39448.58	29366.48	1081	26672.06	21359.66
Household size	693	4.69	1.37	1081	5.09	1.62
Age (in years)	685	32.47	6.28	1077	33.36	5.92

Table 2 continued on next page

Table 2 (continued)

	U.S.-Born Mothers			Foreign-Born Mothers		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Working full-time	895	0.39	0.49	1081	0.37	0.48
Working part-time	895	0.16	0.36	1081	0.16	0.37
Not working	895	0.21	0.41	1081	0.47	0.50
No employment info	895	0.24	0.42	1081	0.01	0.10
Kid does not speak English at home	739	0.19	0.40	1080	0.79	0.41
Less than high school	895	0.15	0.36	1081	0.47	0.50
High school degree	895	0.29	0.46	1081	0.26	0.44
Vocational school or some college	895	0.28	0.45	1081	0.20	0.40
College graduate	895	0.08	0.27	1081	0.06	0.24
Masters/Ph.D.	895	0.02	0.13	1081	0.02	0.12
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>						
Gender (female)	746	0.97	0.17	871	0.95	0.22
Teacher's Age in Years	742	41.03	10.70	868	40.15	11.07
White	895	0.60	0.49	1081	0.40	0.49
African-American	895	0.13	0.34	1081	0.29	0.45
Latino/a	895	0.04	0.20	1081	0.05	0.22
Asian-American	895	0.04	0.20	1081	0.03	0.18
Other race	895	0.01	0.12	1081	0.02	0.13
High school degree	895	0.01	0.08	1081	0.00	0.06
Associate's degree	895	0.00	0.06	1081	0.00	0.00
Bachelor's degree	895	0.53	0.50	1081	0.52	0.50
Master's degree	895	0.28	0.45	1081	0.27	0.44
Ph.D.	895	0.00	0.05	1081	0.01	0.07
College course in ESL	659	1.51	2.06	801	2.47	2.36
College course in development	666	2.97	1.91	793	2.97	2.01
College course in early education	666	2.92	2.37	778	2.82	2.36
College course in elementary education	696	5.45	1.46	819	5.39	1.51
Years at school	750	7.87	7.77	875	6.43	6.60
Years at this grade level	750	6.95	7.56	875	5.82	6.50
Combined teacher experience	750	0.82	1.56	875	0.55	1.30
<i>School characteristics</i>						
Private school enrollment	895	0.18	0.39	1081	0.09	0.29
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	512	32.85	31.83	524	44.11	35.04
Percent of Latino/a students in school	637	41.72	32.76	717	56.62	32.21
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	618	17.58	23.40	705	25.06	25.32

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables for Third Grade Wave

	U.S.-Born Mothers			Foreign-Born Mothers		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Parent Involvement from Parent's Perspective</i>						
Attend a PTA meeting	895	0.36	0.48	1081	0.49	0.50
Attend open house	895	0.68	0.47	1081	0.72	0.45
Attend school event	895	0.61	0.49	1081	0.59	0.49
Attend parent-teacher conference	895	0.76	0.43	1081	0.79	0.41
Acted as school volunteer	895	0.35	0.48	1081	0.28	0.45
Participated in fundraising	895	0.49	0.50	1081	0.40	0.49
Composite of parent's perception	895	3.25	2.03	1081	3.25	1.83
<i>Parent Involvement from Teacher's Perspective</i>						
Parents attend conferences	608	0.89	0.31	656	0.92	0.27
Parents came for informal meetings	476	0.83	0.38	526	0.86	0.35
Parent returned phone calls	426	0.92	0.27	400	0.87	0.34
Parent volunteered in school	547	0.40	0.49	578	0.28	0.45
Composite of teacher's perception	619	2.50	1.18	683	2.29	1.09
<i>Child Characteristics</i>						
Gender (female)	895	0.49	0.50	1081	0.50	0.50
White	895	0.06	0.24	1081	0.02	0.14
African-American	895	0.01	0.11	1081	0.00	0.05
Latino/a	895	0.92	0.27	1081	0.97	0.16
Asian-American	895	0.00	0.03	1081	0.00	0.06
Other	895	0.01	0.08	1081	0.00	0.04
Age (in years)	839	9.21	0.36	1027	9.17	0.36
Externalizing symptoms	619	1.73	0.59	679	1.61	0.54
Approaches to learning	620	2.97	0.67	683	3.03	0.67
Math IRT Score	838	80.00	17.37	1025	77.55	17.39
Reading IRT Score	835	101.46	19.93	1018	96.59	20.38
Number of siblings	735	1.58	1.03	960	1.86	1.19
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Two-parent family	895	0.54	0.50	1081	0.68	0.47
Step-family	895	0.10	0.29	1081	0.06	0.24
Single-parent family	895	0.17	0.38	1081	0.14	0.35
Other family structure	895	0.01	0.11	1081	0.00	0.05
Family income	735	40833.33	29577.71	960	29270.83	23369.17
Household size	735	4.71	1.35	960	5.15	1.61
Age (in years)	723	35.74	6.23	956	36.51	5.98

Table 3 continued on next page

Table 3 (continued)

	U.S.-Born Mothers			Foreign-Born Mothers		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Working full-time	895	0.41	0.49	1081	0.40	0.49
Working part-time	895	0.17	0.38	1081	0.14	0.35
Not working	895	0.20	0.40	1081	0.33	0.47
No employment info	895	0.20	0.40	1081	0.13	0.33
Less than high school	895	0.14	0.35	1081	0.37	0.48
High school degree	895	0.25	0.43	1081	0.22	0.41
Vocational school or some college	895	0.31	0.46	1081	0.20	0.40
College graduate	895	0.08	0.28	1081	0.08	0.27
Masters/Ph.D.	895	0.03	0.17	1081	0.02	0.15
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>						
Gender (female)	618	0.92	0.27	677	0.90	0.30
Teacher's Age in Years (not asked)	–	–	–	–	–	–
White	895	0.47	0.50	1081	0.35	0.48
African-American	895	0.12	0.33	1081	0.17	0.37
Latino/a	895	0.04	0.19	1081	0.05	0.22
Asian-American	895	0.02	0.14	1081	0.02	0.15
Other race	895	0.02	0.13	1081	0.01	0.10
High school degree	895	0.00	0.00	1081	0.00	0.00
Associate's degree	895	0.00	0.03	1081	0.00	0.03
Bachelor's degree	895	0.46	0.50	1081	0.41	0.49
Master's degree	895	0.23	0.42	1081	0.21	0.40
Ph.D.	895	0.01	0.07	1081	0.00	0.06
College course in ESL	533	1.32	1.97	594	2.40	2.39
College course in development	558	2.78	1.91	591	2.59	1.77
College course in early education	543	2.32	2.28	565	2.34	2.23
College course in elementary education	583	5.34	1.54	626	5.30	1.58
Years at school	612	8.03	7.55	664	7.62	6.95
Years at this grade level	617	6.22	6.24	667	5.84	5.57
Combined teacher experience	618	0.71	1.33	669	0.63	1.18
<i>School characteristics</i>						
Private school enrollment	895	0.16	0.37	1081	0.08	0.27
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	637	44.58	32.80	767	60.91	31.14
Percent of Latino/a students in school	639	43.88	34.08	743	61.02	31.92
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	558	20.75	24.94	648	27.89	25.03

Table 4. Standardized Coefficients from Path Models Predicting Parental Involvement by Latino/a vs. All Other

	Model 1						Model 2					
	<i>(n = 1,812)</i>						<i>(n = 1,812)</i>					
	K		1 st		3 rd		K		1 st		3 rd	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
<i>Teacher Race/Ethnicity</i>												
Latino teacher at K	0.150 †	(0.09)	0.060	(0.09)	-0.110	(0.09)	0.224 *	(0.09)	0.058	(0.06)	-0.015	(0.08)
Latino teacher at 1st	--	--	0.070	(0.09)	-0.150	(0.10)			0.028	(0.01)	0.017	(0.09)
Latino teacher at 3rd	--	--	--	--	0.020	(0.12)					-0.099	(0.12)
<i>Parents' Perspective of PI</i>												
K Parental Involvement			0.300 ***	(0.03)	0.160 ***	(0.04)			0.385 ***	(0.03)	0.146 ***	(0.03)
1st Parental Involvement					0.210 ***	(0.05)					0.254 ***	(0.04)
3rd Parental Involvement												
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>												
Teacher's age in years							-0.004	(0.00)	-0.006 †	(0.00)	--	--
Female							0.251	(0.16)	-0.058	(0.15)	0.217 †	(0.12)
College course in ESL							-0.002	(0.02)	-0.005	(0.02)	-0.017	(0.02)
College course in development							-0.037 †	(0.02)	0.029 †	(0.02)	0.010	(0.02)
College course in early education							0.013	(0.02)	-0.012	(0.02)	-0.026	(0.02)
College course in elementary education							0.008	(0.02)	0.032	(0.02)	-0.026	(0.03)
Masters or higher (Bachelors or lower)							-0.080	(0.07)	0.001	(0.06)	0.084	(0.07)
Class size							-0.002	(0.01)	0.004	(0.01)	-0.016 *	(0.01)
Years at school							-0.006	(0.01)	0.000	(0.01)	0.000	(0.01)
Years teaching grade level							0.010	(0.01)	0.004	(0.01)	-0.008	(0.01)

Table 4 continued on next page

Table 4 (continued)

<i>School Characteristics</i>		0.00		0.00		0.00
Private school enrollment	0.196	(0.13)	0.233 *	(0.11)	0.069	(0.11)
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	-0.004 *	(0.00)	0.000	(0.00)	-0.001	(0.00)
Percent of Latino/a students in school	0.000	(0.00)	-0.001	(0.00)	0.005 ***	(0.00)
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	0.004	(0.00)	0.000	(0.00)	-0.005 *	(0.00)
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Maternal age ¹	0.010 †	(0.00)	0.003	(0.01)	0.014 *	(0.01)
Married to child's parent (All other family types) ¹	0.172 *	(0.08)	0.155 **	(0.05)	0.224	(0.07)
Family income ¹	0.004 ***	(0.00)	0.001	(0.00)	-0.001	(0.00)
Some college or higher (high school or lower) ¹	0.233 *	(0.10)	-0.032	(0.10)	0.243 *	(0.11)
Working full or part time (Mother not working or no info) ¹	0.047	(0.06)	0.386 ***	(0.05)	-0.023	(0.06)
Foreign-Born mothers	0.128	(0.12)	0.557 ***	(0.11)	0.151	(0.15)
Mother born in Cuba ²	0.191	(0.17)	-0.232 *	(0.11)	-0.431 *	(0.18)
Mother born in Puerto Rico ²	-0.233	(0.21)	-0.266	(0.20)	0.088	(0.19)
Mother born in South/Central America ²	-0.222 †	(0.11)	-0.018	(0.09)	-0.206 †	(0.11)
Mother born in other Latin American Country ²	-0.208 †	(0.11)	-0.078	(0.11)	0.087	(0.10)
Years mother in U.S.	0.001	(0.01)	-0.005	(0.00)	-0.003	(0.01)
Years attended school outside of U.S.	-0.029	(0.08)	-0.023	(0.08)	0.011	(0.09)
<i>Child Characteristics</i>		0.00		0.00		0.00
Gender (female) ¹	0.062	(0.06)	0.016	(0.05)	0.010	(0.06)
Child age in years ¹	0.004	(0.09)	-0.100	(0.07)	-0.027	(0.09)
Child race other than white ¹	-0.641 *	(0.29)	0.098	(0.27)	-0.177	(0.26)
Child identified as Hispanic ¹	0.071	(0.17)	0.202	(0.15)	-0.293 *	(0.15)
Child not U.S. citizen ¹	-0.037	(0.10)	-0.165 †	(0.10)	-0.032	(0.12)
Number of siblings ¹	-0.061 *	(0.03)	-0.040 †	(0.02)	-0.042 †	(0.03)
Externalizing problems ¹	-0.086	(0.05)	0.041	(0.06)	0.047	(0.06)

Table 4 continued on next page

Table 4 (continued)

Approaches to learning ¹	-0.080	(0.05)	0.004	(0.05)	-0.041	(0.05)
Child does not speak English at home	-0.327 ***	(0.07)	-0.203 **	(0.08)	-0.123 †	(0.07)
Math IRT score ¹	0.008	(0.01)	0.013 *	(0.01)	0.010 *	(0.01)
Reading IRT score ¹	0.008	(0.01)	0.001	(0.00)	0.002	(0.01)
<i>Other First Grade Variables</i>						
Teacher years doing language class: ESL or BIL			-0.005	(0.01)	-0.002	(0.01)
New school in sample			-0.043	(0.07)	-0.155	(0.12)
<i>Other Third Grade variables</i>						
Does teacher have ESL certification					-0.051	(0.09)
Teacher speaks Spanish					0.091	(0.09)
Spanish instruction is used in class					0.080	(0.11)
Number of full time ESL/Bilingual teachers					-0.001	(0.00)
Number of part time ESL/Bilingual teachers					-0.083	(0.05)

† $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; RMSEA: 0.036

1 Data measured from Kindergarten only.

2 Reference category is Mother born in Mexico.

Table 5. Standardized Coefficients from Path Models Predicting Parental Involvement by Latino/a vs. White, Black, or Other

	Model 1 (n = 1,812)						Model 2 (n = 1,812)					
	K		1 st		3 rd		K		1 st		3 rd	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
<i>Teacher Race/Ethnicity</i>												
White teacher at K	-0.070	(0.08)	-0.016	(0.07)	0.078	(0.08)	-0.188 *	(0.09)	-0.047	(0.06)	0.055	(0.08)
Black teacher at K	-0.179	(0.18)	0.194	(0.13)	-0.047	(0.17)	-0.183	(0.17)	0.105	(0.14)	-0.033	(0.15)
Other teacher at K	-0.166	(0.19)	-0.115	(0.14)	0.056	(0.15)	-0.191	(0.18)	-0.144	(0.13)	0.038	(0.15)
White teacher at 1			0.116	(0.09)	-0.073	(0.07)			0.073	(0.08)	-0.056	(0.07)
Black teacher at 1			-0.133	(0.13)	0.120	(0.13)			-0.134	(0.13)	0.159	(0.12)
Other teacher at 1			-0.038	(0.11)	-0.079	(0.12)			0.044	(0.10)	-0.088	(0.10)
White teacher at 3					0.063	(0.07)					0.096	(0.08)
Black teacher at 3					-0.088	(0.13)					-0.009	(0.14)
Other teacher at 3					0.213 †	(0.12)					0.242 *	(0.12)
<i>Parents' Perspective of PI</i>												
K Parental Involvement									0.382 ***	(0.03)	0.148 ***	(0.03)
1st Parental Involvement											0.256 ***	(0.04)
3rd Parental Involvement												
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>												
Teacher's age in years							-0.003	(0.00)	-0.006 *	(0.00)		
Female							0.240	(0.17)	-0.073	(0.15)	0.252 **	(0.12)
College course in ESL							0.002	(0.02)	-0.001	(0.02)	-0.019	(0.03)
College course in development							-0.036 †	(0.02)	0.029 †	(0.02)	0.009	(0.02)
College course in early education							0.012	(0.02)	-0.014	(0.01)	-0.022	(0.02)
College course in elementary education							0.008	(0.02)	0.032	(0.02)	-0.033	(0.02)
Masters or higher (Bachelors or lower)							-0.079	(0.07)	-0.007	(0.05)	0.061	(0.07)
Class size							-0.002	(0.01)	0.004	(0.01)	-0.014 *	(0.01)

Table 5 continued on next page

Table 5 (continued)

Years at school	-0.006	(0.01)	0.000	(0.01)	0.003	(0.01)
Years teaching grade level	0.010	(0.01)	0.004	(0.01)	-0.010	(0.01)
<i>School Characteristics</i>						
Private school enrollment	0.192	(0.13)	0.223 *	(0.11)	0.061	(0.11)
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	-0.004 *	(0.00)	0.000	(0.00)	-0.001	(0.00)
Percent of Latino/a students in school	0.000	(0.00)	-0.001	(0.00)	0.005 *	(0.00)
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	0.005 *	(0.00)	0.001	(0.00)	-0.005 *	(0.00)
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>						
Maternal age ¹	0.010 †	(0.01)	0.003	(0.01)	0.014 *	(0.01)
Married to child's parent (All other family types) ¹	0.177 *	(0.08)	0.147 **	(0.06)	0.229 **	(0.07)
Family income ¹	0.004 ***	(0.00)	0.001	(0.00)	-0.001	(0.00)
Some college or higher (high school or lower) ¹	0.219 *	(0.10)	-0.033	(0.10)	0.237 *	(0.11)
Working full or part time (Mother not working or no info) ¹	0.047	(0.06)	0.380 ***	(0.05)	-0.022	(0.06)
Foreign-Born mothers	0.136	(0.12)	0.560 ***	(0.11)	0.168	(0.15)
Mother born in Cuba ²	0.196	(0.17)	-0.202 †	(0.12)	-0.447 *	(0.18)
Mother born in Puerto Rico ²	-0.235	(0.22)	-0.298	(0.20)	0.087	(0.19)
Mother born in South/Central America ²	-0.218 †	(0.11)	-0.016	(0.09)	-0.221 *	(0.11)
Mother born in other Latin American Country ²	-0.218 †	(0.11)	-0.074	(0.11)	0.073	(0.10)
Years mother in US	0.001	(0.01)	-0.005	(0.00)	-0.003	(0.01)
Years attended school outside of US	-0.029	(0.09)	-0.027	(0.08)	0.011	(0.09)
<i>Child Characteristics</i>						
Gender (female) ¹	0.060	(0.06)	0.018	(0.05)		
Child age in years ¹	0.005	(0.09)	-0.109 †	(0.07)	-0.035	(0.09)
Child race other than white ¹	-0.639 *	(0.29)	0.100	(0.27)	-0.176	(0.26)
Child identified as Hispanic ¹	0.076	(0.17)	0.207	(0.15)	-0.292 †	(0.15)

Table 5 continued on next page

Table 5 (continued)

Child not US citizen ¹	-0.034	(0.10)	-0.169 †	(0.10)	-0.036	(0.12)
Number of siblings ¹	-0.062 *	(0.03)		0.00	-0.038	(0.03)
Externalizing problems ¹	-0.077	(0.06)	0.049	(0.05)	0.049	(0.06)
Approaches to learning ¹	-0.082	(0.06)	0.010	(0.05)	-0.034	(0.05)
Child does not speak English at home	-0.329 ***	(0.07)	-0.193 **	(0.07)	-0.127 †	(0.07)
Math IRT Score ¹	0.007	(0.01)	0.014	(0.01)	0.010 *	(0.01)
Reading IRT Score ¹	0.009 †	(0.01)	0.000 **	(0.00)	0.003	(0.01)
<i>Other First Grade variables</i>						
Teacher years doing language class: ESL or BIL			-0.004	(0.01)	-0.001	(0.01)
New school in sample			-0.050	(0.07)	-0.164	(0.11)
<i>Other Third Grade variables</i>						
Does teacher have ESL certification					-0.020	(0.11)
Teacher speaks Spanish					0.074	(0.10)
Spanish instruction is used in class					0.073	(0.11)
Number of full time ESL/Bilingual teachers					0.000	(0.00)
Number of part time ESL/Bilingual teachers					-0.059	(0.06)

† $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; RMSEA: 0.04

1 Data measured from Kindergarten only.

2 Reference category is Mother born in Mexico.

Table 6. Odds from Path Models Predicting Attendance at PTA Meetings and Participation in Parent-Teacher Conferences

	Parent Teachers Association Meetings (n = 1,696)						Parent-Teacher Conferences (n = 1,696)					
	K		1 st		3 rd		K		1 st		3 rd	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
<i>Teacher Race/Ethnicity</i>												
White teacher at K	1.03	(0.22)	0.89	(0.20)	1.04	(0.21)	1.00	(0.21)	0.61	(0.31)	0.71	(0.25)
Black teacher at K	2.34**	(0.31)	1.33	(0.41)	0.76	(0.31)	0.55	(0.42)	0.76	(0.67)	0.65	(0.37)
Other teacher at K	1.09	(0.36)	0.72	(0.36)	1.15	(0.43)	0.65	(0.43)	1.09	(0.47)	0.74	(0.41)
White teacher at 1			0.81	(0.21)	0.92	(0.18)			1.72*	(0.25)	0.98	(0.23)
Black teacher at 1			0.68	(0.36)	1.76 †	(0.33)			0.78	(0.38)	1.11	(0.42)
Other teacher at 1			0.53 †	(0.38)	0.64	(0.31)			2.63	(0.63)	0.66	(0.32)
White teacher at 3					1.50*	(0.17)					1.23	(0.20)
Black teacher at 3					1.66	(0.33)					0.76	(0.41)
Other Teacher at 3					2.27*	(0.38)					0.70	(0.42)
<i>Parents' Perspective of PI</i>												
K Item Involvement			2.33***	(0.15)	2.00***	(0.16)			2.62***	(0.29)	3.14***	(0.25)
1st Item Involvement					2.21***	(0.14)					1.46 †	(0.23)
3rd Item Involvement												
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>												
Teacher's age in years	0.99	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)			1.00	(0.01)	0.98	(0.01)		
Female	2.31*	(0.39)	0.79	(0.38)	1.61 †	(0.26)	1.18	(0.49)	1.55	(0.46)	1.76 †	(0.33)
College course in ESL	0.99	(0.04)	0.97	(0.05)	1.02	(0.05)	1.02	(0.06)	0.99	(0.07)	0.96	(0.06)
College course in development	0.91 †	(0.05)	1.10 †	(0.05)	0.99	(0.06)	1.00	(0.07)	1.07	(0.06)	1.01	(0.07)
College course in early education	1.03	(0.04)	0.96	(0.04)	0.93	(0.05)	0.99	(0.07)	0.92 †	(0.05)	0.92	(0.06)

Table 6 continued on next page

Table 6 (continued)

College course in elementary education	1.02	(0.04)	1.06	(0.07)	0.95	(0.06)	0.95	(0.06)	1.04	(0.08)	0.99	(0.09)
Masters or higher (Bachelors or lower)	1.02	(0.18)	1.01	(0.16)	0.99	(0.20)	1.01	(0.36)	0.90	(0.20)	1.63 *	(0.25)
Class size	1.01	(0.02)	0.99	(0.02)	0.99	(0.02)	1.06 *	(0.03)	1.02	(0.03)	0.96 *	(0.02)
Years at school	0.97 *	(0.01)	0.99	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)	0.99	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)
Years teaching grade level	1.02	(0.02)	1.01	(0.02)	0.98	(0.02)	0.99	(0.01)	0.99	(0.02)	0.99	(0.02)
<i>School Characteristics</i>												
Private school enrollment	1.06	(0.27)	1.43	(0.30)	1.68 †	(0.31)	0.76	(0.39)	0.74	(0.31)	0.73	(0.36)
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	1.00	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)	1.00	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)
Percent of Latino/a students in school	1.01	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)	1.01 †	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.01 *	(0.01)
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	1.00	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)	0.99 *	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)	0.99 *	(0.01)
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>												
Maternal age ¹	1.01	(0.01)	1.00	(0.02)	1.02	(0.02)	0.99	(0.01)	0.98	(0.01)	1.03	(0.02)
Married to child's father (All other family types) ¹	1.11	(0.17)	1.13	(0.17)	1.35	(0.22)	1.43	(0.23)	1.87 **	(0.21)	1.79 **	(0.21)
Family income ¹	1.00	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)	1.01	(0.00)	1.01 *	(0.00)	0.99 *	(0.00)
Some college or higher (high school or lower) ¹	1.14	(0.27)	0.70	(0.33)	0.98	(0.27)	1.35	(0.37)	0.94	(0.33)	1.46	(0.38)
Working full or part time (Mother not working or no info) ¹	0.77 *	(0.13)	1.28 †	(0.15)	0.76 †	(0.16)	1.30	(0.16)	3.72 ***	(0.19)	1.30 †	(0.16)
Foreign-Born mothers	2.20 †	(0.41)	2.15	(0.50)	1.21	(0.32)	1.29	(0.41)	6.59 ***	(0.41)	1.87	(0.49)
Mother born in Cuba ²	1.85	(0.49)	1.21	(0.49)	0.63	(0.58)	0.39	(0.66)	1.45	(0.69)	0.53	(0.60)

Table 6 continued on next page

Table 6 (continued)

Mother born in Puerto Rico ²	0.48	(0.64)	0.63	(0.59)	1.64	(0.44)	3.20	(0.75)	0.13 *	(0.88)	0.45	(0.70)
Mother born in South/Central America ²	0.68	(0.31)	0.77	(0.35)	0.90	(0.29)	0.61	(0.32)	1.17	(0.46)	1.01	(0.38)
Mother born in other Latin American Country ²	1.17	(0.35)	0.72	(0.38)	0.86	(0.33)	1.27	(0.40)	1.79	(0.47)	0.86	(0.45)
Years Mother in US	0.97 †	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)	1.01	(0.01)	1.02	(0.01)	0.97 †	(0.02)	0.99	(0.02)
Years attended school outside of US	1.40	(0.30)	0.95	(0.26)	1.46	(0.25)	0.78	(0.24)	1.22	(0.29)	1.16	(0.25)
<i>Child Characteristics</i>												
Gender (female) ¹	1.03	(0.15)	0.95	(0.16)	1.08	(0.15)	0.98	(0.14)	1.08	(0.21)	0.98	(0.19)
Child Age in Years ¹	1.38	(0.20)	0.80	(0.20)	1.12	(0.25)	0.71	(0.24)	0.79	(0.29)	0.92	(0.26)
Child race other than white ¹	0.38	(0.73)	1.04	(0.64)	0.51	(0.72)	0.47	(0.74)	0.68	(0.73)	0.38	(0.88)
Child identified as Hispanic ¹	0.48*	(0.36)	1.17	(0.37)	0.74	(0.41)	1.15	(0.50)	1.99 †	(0.40)	0.35 *	(0.52)
Child not US citizen ¹	0.89	(0.31)	0.61	(0.32)	0.98	(0.30)	1.82 †	(0.33)	0.67	(0.38)	0.97	(0.37)
Number of siblings ¹	0.96	(0.09)	0.91	(0.08)	0.97	(0.07)	0.96	(0.07)	1.01	(0.08)	0.88	(0.09)
Externalizing problems ¹	0.70 **	(0.13)	1.08	(0.14)	1.21	(0.14)	0.70 *	(0.17)	0.99	(0.18)	1.28	(0.18)
Approaches to learning ¹	0.91	(0.13)	0.94	(0.12)	1.06	(0.15)	0.63 *	(0.22)	0.86	(0.22)	1.00	(0.16)
Child does not speak English at home ¹	0.82	(0.17)	0.92	(0.20)	0.77	(0.21)	0.78	(0.28)	0.56 †	(0.30)	0.56 **	(0.21)
Math IRT Score ¹	1.01	(0.02)	1.02	(0.01)	1.03 †	(0.02)	1.03	(0.02)	0.99	(0.02)	1.02	(0.02)
Reading IRT Score ¹	1.01	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.01	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)
<i>Other First grade variables</i>												
Teacher years doing language class: ESL or BIL			0.98	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)			0.99	(0.02)	0.98	(0.02)
New school in sample			0.80	(0.24)	0.72	(0.34)			1.11	(0.39)	1.66 †	(0.28)

Table 6 continued on next page

Table 6 (continued)

Other Third grade variables

Does teacher have ESL certification	0.87	(0.26)	0.78	(0.30)
Spanish instruction is used in class	1.67 †	(0.27)	0.91	(0.37)
Number of full time ESL/Bilingual teachers	1.00	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)
Number of part time ESL/Bilingual teachers	1.08	(0.18)	0.84	(0.18)

Notes: † $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; SE = Standard error; OR = Odds Ratio

1 Data measured from Kindergarten only.

2 Reference category is Mother born in Mexico.

Table 7. Odds from Path Models Predicting Attendance at School Events and Participation in Fundraising

	Attendance at School Events (n = 1,696)						Participation in Fundraising (n = 1,696)					
	K		1 st		3 rd		K		1 st		3 rd	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
<i>Teacher Race/Ethnicity</i>												
White teacher at K	0.84	(0.21)	1.12	(0.20)	1.16	(0.20)	0.81	(0.21)	0.79	(0.20)	1.38	(0.20)
Black teacher at K	0.78	(0.41)	1.53	(0.31)	1.05	(0.30)	0.63	(0.45)	1.23	(0.35)	1.36	(0.33)
Other teacher at K	1.08	(0.33)	0.85	(0.36)	1.21	(0.42)	0.41 *	(0.40)	0.33 *	(0.47)	1.64	(0.35)
White teacher at 1			0.93	(0.25)	0.67	(0.17)			1.42 †	(0.19)	1.18	(0.18)
Black teacher at 1			0.77	(0.40)	0.52	(0.31)			0.69	(0.36)	1.38	(0.35)
Other teacher at 1			1.25	(0.48)	1.08	(0.38)			1.79 †	(0.33)	0.75	(0.32)
White teacher at 3					1.13 *	(0.18)					0.90	(0.23)
Black teacher at 3					1.18 *	(0.36)					0.60	(0.41)
Other teacher at 3					1.51	(0.43)					1.08	(0.38)
<i>Parents' Perspective of PI</i>												
K Item Involvement			3.50 ***	(0.14)	1.48 *	(0.15)			4.37 *	(0.15)	2.13 ***	(0.15)
1st Item Involvement					2.43 ***	(0.20)					2.15 ***	(0.15)
3rd Item Involvement												
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>												
Teacher's age in years	1.00	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)			1.00	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)		
Female	1.77	(0.37)	1.05	(0.39)	1.33	(0.31)	1.88	(0.47)	1.22	(0.45)	1.27	(0.31)
College course in ESL	0.96	(0.04)	0.97	(0.05)	1.02	(0.07)	0.96	(0.05)	1.04	(0.04)	0.92	(0.07)
College course in development	0.92 †	(0.05)	1.09	(0.05)	1.02	(0.06)	1.01	(0.05)	1.00	(0.06)	0.96	(0.07)
College course in early education	1.05	(0.04)	1.01	(0.05)	0.95	(0.05)	1.03	(0.04)	1.04	(0.04)	1.00	(0.05)

Table 7 continued on next page

Table 7 (continued)

College course in elementary education	1.00	(0.06)	1.11	(0.08)	0.91	(0.06)	0.95	(0.05)	0.97	(0.07)	0.99	(0.07)
Masters or higher (Bachelors or lower)	0.65 *	(0.18)	1.04	(0.16)	1.12	(0.23)	1.09	(0.17)	0.77 †	(0.15)	0.90	(0.19)
Class size	0.98	(0.03)	1.01	(0.02)	0.98	(0.02)	1.03	(0.03)	1.00	(0.02)	0.97	(0.02)
Years at school	1.02	(0.02)	0.98	(0.02)	1.01	(0.02)	0.99	(0.01)	1.03	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)
Years teaching grade level	1.00	(0.01)	1.01	(0.02)	0.97	(0.02)	1.01	(0.02)	0.99	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)
<i>School Characteristics</i>												
Private school enrollment	1.26	(0.30)	0.70	(0.29)	0.50 *	(0.35)	1.42	(0.27)	3.61 ***	(0.37)	1.66	(0.35)
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	0.99 *	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)	0.99 *	(0.00)	0.99 †	(0.01)	1.00	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)
Percent of Latino/a students in school	0.99	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)	1.01 **	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	1.02 **	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.02 **	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>												
Maternal Age ¹	1.03 *	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)	1.04 *	(0.02)	1.00	(0.02)	1.03 *	(0.02)	1.02	(0.01)
Married to child's father (All other family types) ¹	1.30	(0.17)	1.07	(0.17)	1.07	(0.17)	1.57 *	(0.19)	1.23	(0.17)	1.34	(0.18)
Family income ¹	1.01 *	(0.00)	1.01 **	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)	1.01 **	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)	1.00	(0.00)
Some college or higher (high school or lower) ¹	2.03 †	(0.37)	1.39	(0.33)	1.80 †	(0.35)	1.42	(0.29)	1.08	(0.29)	1.39	(0.30)
Working full or part time (Mother not working or no info) ¹	1.27	(0.17)	1.90 ***	(0.16)	1.15	(0.14)	1.49 **	(0.15)	1.98 ***	(0.15)	0.91	(0.18)
Foreign-Born mothers	1.37	(0.31)	3.18 **	(0.41)	1.33	(0.34)	0.98	(0.39)	3.12 **	(0.39)	0.64	(0.38)
Mother born in Cuba ²	1.55	(0.57)	3.63 *	(0.55)	0.58	(0.50)	2.51	(0.59)	0.58	(0.52)	0.80	(0.57)
Mother born in Puerto Rico ²	0.37 *	(0.47)	0.43	(0.76)	1.19	(0.67)	1.08	(0.63)	0.49	(0.67)	1.07	(0.51)
Mother born in South/Central America ²	0.65	(0.28)	0.71	(0.33)	0.57 †	(0.31)	0.89	(0.39)	1.06	(0.30)	0.84	(0.30)

Table 7 continued on next page

Table 7 (continued)

Mother born in other Latin American Country ²	0.34 **	(0.39)	0.90	(0.34)	1.26	(0.39)	1.14	(0.36)	0.88	(0.39)	1.38	(0.30)
Years Mom in US	1.00	(0.01)	0.98 †	(0.02)	0.99	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)
Years attended school outside of US	0.60 *	(0.23)	0.96	(0.33)	1.03	(0.24)	1.00	(0.27)	0.80	(0.27)	1.24	(0.32)
<i>Child Characteristics</i>												
Gender (female) ¹	1.09	(0.13)	0.76 †	(0.16)	1.00	(0.17)	1.20	(0.17)	1.03	(0.15)	1.03	(0.15)
Child age in Years ¹	1.09	(0.23)	0.82	(0.20)	1.23	(0.22)	0.77	(0.20)	0.89	(0.23)	0.76	(0.22)
Child race other than white ¹	0.57	(0.63)	0.30 †	(0.69)	1.40	(0.68)	0.93	(0.62)	1.39	(0.77)	0.49	(0.66)
Child identified as Hispanic ¹	1.50	(0.42)	0.50	(0.47)	1.12	(0.41)	1.54	(0.36)	1.62	(0.42)	0.68	(0.41)
Child not US citizen ¹	0.94	(0.30)	0.74	(0.30)	1.16	(0.29)	0.47 *	(0.32)	0.85	(0.29)	0.96	(0.33)
Number of siblings ¹	0.93	(0.07)	0.85 *	(0.06)	0.97	(0.06)	0.93	(0.06)	0.94	(0.07)	0.94	(0.06)
Externalizing problems ¹	1.09	(0.14)	0.94	(0.14)	0.97	(0.14)	1.02	(0.14)	1.02	(0.14)	1.08	(0.15)
Approaches to learning ¹	0.97	(0.13)	0.88	(0.12)	0.75 *	(0.14)	0.97	(0.14)	1.19	(0.15)	0.99	(0.15)
Kid Does not Speak English at Home ¹	0.57 **	(0.18)	0.91	(0.18)	0.67 *	(0.20)	0.64 *	(0.20)	0.51 **	(0.21)	0.92	(0.25)
Math IRT Score ¹	1.00	(0.02)	1.03 *	(0.02)	1.04 *	(0.01)	1.00	(0.02)	1.03 *	(0.02)	1.00	(0.01)
Reading IRT Score ¹	1.02	(0.01)	1.01	(0.01)	1.00	(0.01)	1.02	(0.01)	0.99	(0.01)	1.03 †	(0.02)
<i>Other First grade variables</i>												
Teacher years doing language class: ESL or BIL			0.99	(0.02)	0.98	(0.02)			0.99	(0.02)	1.03 †	(0.02)
New school in sample			0.97	(0.20)	0.53 *	(0.30)			1.15	(0.24)	0.60 **	(0.19)
<i>Other Third grade variables</i>												
Does teacher have ESL certification					0.59 *	(0.26)					1.06	(0.32)
Spanish instruction is used in class					1.19	(0.33)					1.09	(0.26)
Number of full time ESL/Bilingual teachers					1.00	(0.01)					1.00	(0.01)
Number of part time ESL/Bilingual teachers					0.79	(0.18)					0.85	(0.17)

Notes: † $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; SE = Standard error; OR = Odds Ratio

¹ Data measured from Kindergarten only.

² Reference category is Mother born in Mexico.

Table 8. Odds from Path Models Predicting Attendance at School Events and Participation in Fundraising

	Volunteering at School (n = 1,696)						Attendance at Open House (n = 1,696)					
	K		1 st		3 rd		K		1 st		3 rd	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
<i>Teacher Race/Ethnicity</i>												
White teacher at K	0.47 *	0.30	1.00	0.23	0.86	0.25	0.79	0.19	0.77	0.20	0.93	0.24
Black teacher at K	0.52 †	0.37	0.79	0.36	0.91	0.35	0.58 *	0.27	0.83	0.67	0.79	0.31
Other teacher at K	0.57	0.46	1.36	0.49	0.50	0.47	0.91	0.37	0.66	0.41	0.88	0.40
White teacher at 1			0.86	0.31	0.83	0.24			1.29	0.21	0.91	0.19
Black teacher at 1			0.81	0.45	1.30	0.45			0.94	0.35	1.68	0.40
Other teacher at 1			0.43 †	0.43	0.68	0.38			1.23	0.37	1.07	0.32
White teacher at 3					1.11	0.24					1.15	0.21
Black teacher at 3					1.13	0.46					0.61	0.39
Other teacher at 3					1.85	0.45					1.27	0.42
<i>Parents' Perspective of PI</i>												
K Item Involvement			4.48 ***	0.17	2.74 ***	0.18			2.34 ***	0.16	1.97 ***	0.17
1st Item Involvement					4.05 ***	0.17					2.70 ***	0.18
3rd Item Involvement												
<i>Teacher Characteristics</i>												
Teacher's age in years	1.00	0.01	0.98 *	0.01			0.99	0.01	0.97 *	0.01		
Female	0.87	0.41	0.55	0.38	1.19	0.37	1.76	0.35	0.84	0.45	1.49	0.33
College course in ESL	1.00	0.05	1.04	0.05	0.94	0.08	1.02	0.05	0.98	0.05	0.94	0.06
College course in development	0.93	0.06	1.08	0.05	1.08	0.07	0.99	0.06	1.04	0.06	1.09	0.07
College course in early education	1.05	0.04	0.96	0.04	1.00	0.06	0.95	0.05	0.95	0.05	0.91 †	0.06

Table 8 continued on next page

Table 8 (continued)

College course in elementary education	0.98	0.05	1.08	0.07	1.01	0.08	1.05	0.05	1.02	0.07	0.96	0.08
Masters or higher (Bachelors or lower)	0.76	0.17	1.49*	0.18	0.91	0.25	0.93	0.16	0.86	0.17	1.16	0.20
Class size	1.00	0.03	0.98	0.02	1.01	0.02	0.98	0.02	1.01	0.02	0.95*	0.02
Years at school	0.99	0.01	0.99	0.02	1.01	0.02	1.00	0.01	1.02	0.02	1.00	0.02
Years teaching grade level	1.02	0.02	1.03†	0.02	1.00	0.02	1.02	0.01	1.02	0.02	0.99	0.02
<i>School Characteristics</i>												
Private school enrollment	2.00*	0.28	2.78**	0.32	1.45	0.33	1.00	0.33	0.93	0.34	0.90	0.37
Percent of students eligible for free lunch	0.99*	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.99†	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.01
Percent of Latino/a students in school	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.01	0.01	1.01	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.01	0.01
Percent of Latino/a teachers in school	1.01	0.01	1.00	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.01	0.99	0.01
<i>Maternal Characteristics</i>												
Maternal age ¹	1.01	0.02	1.01	0.02	1.03*	0.02	1.04*	0.02	1.01	0.01	1.03†	0.02
Married to child's father (All other family types) ¹	1.57*	0.22	1.51*	0.18	1.27	0.20	0.90	0.17	1.60*	0.20	1.96**	0.21
Family income ¹	1.01*	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.02***	0.01	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Some college or higher (high school or lower) ¹	2.25**	0.28	1.27	0.30	2.56**	0.31	1.30	0.32	1.09	0.35	1.75	0.38
Working full or part time (Mother not working or no info) ¹	0.69*	0.15	1.11	0.16	0.79	0.17	1.18	0.17	3.34***	0.18	1.34†	0.17
Foreign-Born Mothers	1.73†	0.30	1.95†	0.41	2.06	0.51	0.99	0.36	2.04†	0.40	2.13*	0.39
Mother born in Cuba ²	1.22	0.71	0.20*	0.81	0.29*	0.60	2.13	0.56	4.39	0.96	0.88	0.57
Mother born in Puerto Rico ²	0.26*	0.59	1.10	0.67	0.93	0.67	0.56	0.60	0.63	0.79	0.87	0.63

Table 8 continued on next page

Table 8 (continued)

Mother born in South/Central America ²	0.54 †	0.34	0.70	0.31	0.45 *	0.34	0.73	0.28	1.12	0.32	0.82	0.30
Mother born in other Latin American country ²	0.28 **	0.44	0.75	0.49	1.11	0.39	0.73	0.29	0.41 *	0.45	1.40	0.42
Years mother in US	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.02	0.98	0.02	0.99	0.02	1.02	0.02	0.98	0.02
Years attended school outside of US	0.74	0.25	0.90	0.28	1.13	0.34	1.25	0.27	1.09	0.23	0.79	0.30
<i>Child Characteristics</i>												
Gender (female) ¹	0.89	0.14	0.90	0.15	0.83	0.16	0.96	0.13	1.05	0.16	1.04	0.17
Child age in years ¹	1.30	0.23	0.68 †	0.21	0.85	0.26	0.86	0.22	0.82	0.22	0.86	0.24
Child race other than white ¹	0.34	0.73	0.43	0.78	0.53	0.76	0.61	0.64	1.41	0.68	0.40	0.79
Child identified as Hispanic ¹	1.35	0.35	1.57	0.46	0.52	0.46	1.06	0.41	2.23 *	0.40	0.47	0.54
Child not US citizen ¹	0.90	0.32	0.54	0.39	0.91	0.37	1.18	0.29	0.84	0.30	0.93	0.33
Number of siblings ¹	0.84 **	0.07	1.02	0.07	0.89	0.08	1.00	0.06	0.91	0.07	0.86 †	0.08
Externalizing problems ¹	1.07	0.15	1.35 *	0.14	0.97	0.16	0.83	0.13	0.88	0.15	1.22	0.14
Approaches to learning ¹	1.03	0.16	1.29 †	0.15	0.96	0.15	0.86	0.11	1.08	0.15	1.07	0.14
Child does not speak English at home	0.46 ***	0.22	0.46 ***	0.20	0.46 ***	0.24	0.65 *	0.17	0.78	0.25	0.92	0.21
Math IRT Score ¹	1.01	0.01	1.03	0.02	1.02	0.02	1.02	0.02	1.03	0.02	1.05 **	0.02
Reading IRT Score ¹	1.01	0.01	0.99	0.01	1.01	0.02	1.02	0.01	1.01	0.02	0.98	0.01
<i>Other First grade variables</i>												
Teacher years doing language class: ESL or BIL			0.98	0.02	0.96	0.03			0.96	0.02	0.99	0.02
New school in sample			0.72	0.28	0.76	0.25			0.92	0.28	0.76	0.25
<i>Other Third grade variables</i>												
Does teacher have ESL certification					1.06	0.35					0.98	0.28

Table 8 continued on next page

Table 8 (continued)

Spanish instruction is used in class	1.57	0.32	0.97	0.33
Number of full time ESL/Bilingual teachers	1.02 [†]	0.01	1.00	0.01
Number of part time ESL/Bilingual teachers	1.19	0.22	0.89	0.21

Notes: [†] $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; SE = Standard error; OR = Odds Ratio

1 Data measured from Kindergarten only.

2 Reference category is Mother born in Mexico.

Chapter 5. Qualitative Results From SWISD

The ECLS-K analyses gave me insight into Latina mothers' assessments of how often they engaged in behaviors that tapped into conventional ideas about school-based involvement as their children moved through the primary grades of elementary school and how much the frequency of these behaviors were related to the ethnicities of their children's past and current teachers. When I turned to the mixed methods data collected in multiple elementary schools with public Pre-K programs in SWISD, I was looking at their school-based involvement from an entirely different vantage point. The perceptions and articulations of parents by teachers were paramount. How did they see, interpret, and influence Latina mothers' school-based involvement? How did Latina mothers fit, break, solidify, or reshape their pre-conceived notions about the school-based involvement among parents, the visibility of parents in school, and Latino/a families and children more broadly?

To answer these questions as part of this dissertation's second main aim, I employed a grounded theory approach (Miles and Huberman 1984) to the data that I and several others collected in Pre-K, kindergarten, first grade, and second grade classrooms in SWISD over the course of a year. This approach merged the consideration of a priori themes in the extensive teacher interview data that we collected with emergent themes that arose during my own analyses of these data (in general and when stratified by teachers' races/ethnicities, teachers' classroom quality ratings, and other factors). Going into the analyses, I was working with several concrete assumptions based on past

research and theory, including the expectations that: 1) teachers would tend to attribute the school-based involvement behavior of Latina mothers to their internal motivations and aspirations concerning their children's educational success (i.e., mothers who care about their children's schooling will be more visible in school); 2) Latino/a teachers would be more flexible and understanding in terms of how they articulated their thoughts on Latina mothers' school-based involvement behaviors and their underlying motivations; and 3) all teachers, but especially White teachers, would be more positive about individual children and parents than they would be about Latino/a families as a general category.

My coding of the qualitative materials from SWISD revealed some support for these basic assumptions, but I also saw emergent themes that made me qualify, deepen, and expand on these assumptions. This mixture of refined a priori themes and emergent themes helped me to identify three general points about how teachers of various race/ethnic backgrounds perceive the school-based involvement of Latina teachers:

- Teachers tended to view Latina mothers through their interactions and observations with their children (and vice versa) in ways that confirmed positive or negative evaluations.
- Socioeconomic disadvantage was the primary prism through which teachers discussed Latina mothers, seemingly recognizing the importance of socioeconomic inequality but—especially for White teachers—with a tendency to individualize socioeconomic experiences in ways that fuel deficit thinking.

- School-based involvement was racialized by teachers in complex ways (e.g. social class, language, immigration status), with White teachers downplaying and obscuring race/ethnicity in their discussions and Latino/a teachers more likely to see it as one part of a cluster of factors that identified Latino/a families in schools.

In the pages that follow, I will unpack each of these basic points and draw on the words of teachers themselves to explain what they mean and why they matter. In doing so, I want to acknowledge here that most of the discussions that I had with teachers about parental involvement appeared to be gender-neutral. On face value, they were typically about parents rather than mothers. Yet, the focus of teachers on mothers as their partners in children's learning (and, therefore, as the expected sources of school-based involvement) was clear to me throughout my time at SWISD.

Teachers' Interconnected Views of Latino/a Parents and Children

Over the course of the year that I spent in SWISD, I went into many classrooms with many different teachers. One day, however, I came upon a unique situation. First, the Pre-kindergarten classroom that I entered was the first that had two teachers co-teaching a large class of young, primarily Latino/a children. These two teachers were Nicole, who was White, and Marta, who was Latina. Both had an average of about 7 years teaching with Nicole being the senior teacher. I decided to interview them together, especially given that they were not of the same self-identified racial/ethnic group. Second, the classroom in which Nicole and Marta were teaching was designated as Preschool Program for Children with Disabilities (PPCD), meaning that it was a full

inclusion classroom for children of special needs that addresses the following areas: language/communication, social behavioral, gross and fine motor, daily living skills, pre-academic and academic concepts.

This classroom had a lot of content, pictures, and things you would find in almost any classroom, PPCD or not. We sat down and had a long conversation, but there was one point in which I was struck by the teachers' related but different takes on parental involvement within diverse classrooms and across diverse populations of children.

Specifically, I want to highlight and discuss the following exchange:

Claude: Would your answer to these questions [about parent involvement, definition of a classroom, and how they evaluated success at the end of the year] be different if you had students from different backgrounds in your class?

Nicole: Yes and no. For parts of it it's going to be the same. If you don't have parent involvement and it's a high social economic group you're still going to have the same problem, umm, but as far as where they come in at it, it is a lot easier. And with the economy we know this for a fact, in our classroom, with the economy being the way it is and you have to apply for Pre-K this year, we've been getting more higher socioeconomic kids and it does make a huge [emphasis added] difference. Because when these kids come in basically they're ranked about a nine month old or maybe a two year old, maybe a two year old developmentally. And you know these other kids that have had all these experiences, and mom and dad have been talking to them and what not, but they lost their jobs, therefore they qualify now. They come in and there's just loads of language. I mean, so much language going on, umm, so it does make a difference because for those kids I don't have to say "This means cat. This means stop. This means..." They know what those words mean. We are really able to build on different skills sets, but, umm, you know parts of it, no. If clear high expectations even if you're working with a high social economic group you'll still need to have that.

Marta: I would, I agree. Also though, with that I think there would be other issues if you had a higher socioeconomic classroom and even just with respect...this year alone, like we have one student in particular who is very high academically. We always have to keep reminding him to be more respectful and to really listen, because you know sometimes the other students...he's not on the same level with them academically. So he might get bored, because we're going over a different word that he already knows the answer to or the definition of, and we have to kind of remind him you know, other people need to learn

too. So “We’ll hit you in a minute. We’ll get your stuff what you need to learn,” and we also need to get what they need to learn. So it just depends.

Nicole makes a point to emphasize how there are big differences between those students from higher socioeconomic statuses (SES) compared with students from lower socioeconomic statuses. The students from higher SES families, she explained, came in to the Pre-K classroom with a more developed vocabulary and more experiences with learning, presumably because of what was going on in their homes. The students from lower SES families, on the other hand, did not, presumably because they had less cognitively enriching home environments. Nicole even went so far as describing the children from lower SES families as having the development of an infant or toddler. She believed that it was much easier to work with the children from higher SES families to further develop their existing skill sets, as they already had a good foundation from home. These descriptions of the children from lower and higher SES families suggest that Nicole will have to work harder with and for the children from lower SES families, putting the burden of developing even the basic skills on her, when the higher SES parents had made her job easier by sending children who already had that base.

Marta, on the other hand, quickly agreed with Nicole’s statements, but she argued that students from higher SES families had their own challenges. She did not imply such a clean line of good and bad between the two groups. She pointed out that she and the other teachers had to remind the children from higher SES families to be respectful of the other students in terms of their pace and their academic level. Marta also made an important qualifying statement: “it just depends.” This qualifying statement indicates that she saw the issue of socioeconomic differences among children and parents with more

complexity. She was recognizing that there were other factors that complicated Nicole's somewhat simplistic schema.

Of note is that this classroom in which Nicole and Marta were teaching and the discussion with the two teachers was not representative of SWISD (and even our SWISD sample schools) because it was designated specifically for children with special needs. At the same time, the two teachers were not speaking directly about race/ethnicity, Latino/a parents and children, or related topics (e.g., immigrant families). Yet, the substance, tone, and underlying message of this exchange in this dual interview provided an excellent example of a larger trend in the SWISD qualitative interview data. In general, White teachers often discussed parental involvement in terms of how lacking it was and were particularly likely to speak about how this lack impacted their work as teachers, while Latina teachers were more likely to focus on parental involvement in a positive way, empathize with the difficulties the parents faced, and talk about how they would go out of their way to find ways to engage parents in their child's education. This theme will run throughout my discussion in this chapter.

Beyond this pattern related to teachers' race/ethnicity, I wanted to stress something else important that this exchange exemplified for me. Specifically, Marta and Nicole tended to speak directly about the children in their classroom in ways that indirectly implicated those children's parents, even when they did not actually mention the parents. In other words, they discussed their interactions and experiences with children to imply (and even state) something about how they discussed the parents—consciously, unconsciously, or both. In my interviews in SWISD, I found that both White

and Latina teachers tended to talk about the children as essentially reflections of their parents and often from a deficit perspective. In the case of Nicole and Marta, they both (but especially Nicole) frequently discussed the progression of children in ways that suggested something about the parents' involvement in school. For example:

Nicole: Well, we give them the tools that they need the very beginning of the year we basically spell out exactly what we want them to achieve by the end of Pre-K. We want them to know their letters, their colors, their shapes, you know their numbers, things like that and we give them the tools on how to do it. Now, not all the parents utilize it and we give them homework and we give them books to read, they can take home. And you know you can tell from the very beginning of the school year to the end which ones did their homework and which ones, you know, follow through at home and which ones didn't by the progression of their child.

After Nicole's comments, I asked Marta if she wanted to add anything. She responded: "No, I think she said it right, that's good (laughs)." She too saw children's learning and behavior in the classroom as a window into their parents' involvement in and management of their educational careers. Yet, another perspective emerged when Marta was asked how the involvement of parents in their classroom compares to the involvement typical of other classrooms in the school and district. Here, she took a more positive stance, saying, "I think one thing that we do that might be different from other classrooms is every month we have a parent lunch and we make a class movie of everything that the children have been learning throughout the month and so we show it up on the screen and they get to come and interact with their kids and see what's been going on." Thus, she switched from making implications based on how she discussed the children to more direct talk about parents, and, in the process, she emphasized her and Nicole's own role in facilitating that involvement.

Nicole responded to Marta's comment afterwards by agreeing that they were very good about communicating with parents through notes and phone calls, but, although she remained focused on parents directly, she also lapsed back into her more negative tone, explaining, "We're really good about trying to keep them informed, you know, then maybe some other classrooms where they would just rather not bother, you know, sometimes cause it's...sometimes a lot more difficult to get a hold of parents especially via telephone cause their phones never works." Over the course of the conversation, she made it clear that she thought that the lack of visible involvement among her largely Latino/a group of parent was more about them than about her, and she used this perception as a way of making sense of the children's progress.

There were a number of other exchanges between Nicole and Marta during our dual interview, but what I have highlighted here encapsulates the general tone. Likewise, even though I have only focused on one interview here, my discussion with Nicole and Marta illustrates far more broadly the different discourses of the many other Latina and White teachers that I interviewed—discussing children as a proxy for rendering how they discussed the parents often in a deficit way, among most teachers but especially White ones, and qualifying these articulations when they were too negative, primarily among Latino/a teachers.

Socioeconomic Explanations of Different Levels of Parental Involvement

Overwhelmingly, teachers' primary explanation for differences in parental involvement across their diverse but primarily Latino/a classroom concerned SES, which they say as the main obstacle to parents being involved in school activities. On one level,

this explanation suggested that teachers were cognizant of stratification and inequality, that they saw barriers external to families (and perhaps even within schools) that kept some parents out. On another level, however, their socioeconomic explanations tended to move from the structural realm to something more individualistic and personal, with SES almost a window into the parent.

Consider an interview that I conducted with Sarah a dual language teacher who teaches kindergarten and has also taught Pre-k. Because her school offered an innovative dual language program that attracted families from across the socioeconomic spectrum, her classrooms housed children from lower SES families alongside those from higher SES backgrounds, both Latino/a and White. Sarah clearly drew a direct line from SES to parental involvement, but her discussion also hinted at more nuance. As context, let me say more about this particular school. Before it offered its dual language program, this school was small and largely served the surrounding community, which consisted of public housing and properties sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for low-income families. Recently, however, the community was changing; specifically, it was gentrifying. Million dollar homes were appearing on the landscape, owned by families in which well-educated parents had high-level, well-paying professional jobs. Because the school served both the lower and higher SES children in the changing community, teachers were acutely aware of what they saw as socioeconomic differences among children and their families. SES was highly salient, and so, not surprisingly, it came up a lot in any discussion. Sarah seemed to view this divide as something that was unfair to children and parents, but she occasionally

appeared to see SES as something more cultural, interpersonal, or even individual rather than as a stratifying system.

Sarah: So I have kids whose parents are both lawyers and a bunch of kids who, you know, low SES. And that makes it an interesting mix and I would say that, more than culture, has an effect on the classroom. Because there's...as a teacher you don't want to let anybody down, but when there's a student who really has no self-control and is interrupting up the class all the time, you know, you have to look for strategies to deal with them, but also keep all these other kids engaged and working on something.

Claude: And do you think the level of acting up varies with SES?

Sarah: No, I mean I have one that's high SES who has low self-control, but you know having those variables, and I think that are some students who have low SES who are...that doesn't affect how their parents and their parents' culture, teaching them control and teaching them good manners and all of that. But there are some that you know...

Claude: That do feel that way, like you're saying is in both camps.

Sarah: Yeah, it's in both camps. But it makes it harder because then there's also like...well I guess like you were saying there's a cultural like...I've been exposed to the zoo and I've been exposed to you know all kinds of different places, and I go out and I hike every weekend and I - as opposed to a lot of, unfortunately, a lot the low SES students, go home and watch TV all evening or go home and play video games all weekend.

When I asked Sarah to discuss such acting up more in terms of socioeconomic status and the family/parenting context, she reflected on her own middle class experiences as a way of saying that her parents had given her more expansive experiences in and out of school than lower SES parents would have. Not only did she see such SES differences as real and concrete, she did not recognize how they might be related to socioeconomic barriers (e.g., not having the money for activities). Instead, she seemed to make more internal attributions about why higher SES parents did more than other

parents. Interestingly, Sarah did not consider the possibility that children from higher-SES families might also be playing video games and watching TV at home on the weekends, even though such children would have greater means to purchase more expensive televisions, video game consoles, and video games. If she did, she did not see those behaviors as a reflection on parenting or as an indicator of low involvement.

Like many teachers, but especially White teachers, Sarah indicated to me at length that family SES was an important factor in determining the educational environment constructed by parents for children, and, as a result, their academic and non-academic behavior in her classroom. Yet, in her view, this pathway was more about the different values and motivations of parents from diverse socioeconomic strata than about inequality in resources or power across such strata. When her attributions were outside the person, they typically were more about cultural norms and beliefs than anything structural, such as the foreclosed economic opportunities, low human capital, language barriers, work constraints on time, and often unwelcoming schools.

In contrast, one Latina teacher in the same elementary school as Sarah, a first grade dual language teacher, also emphasized the strong influence of socioeconomic status on parental involvement (and its association with children's progress) but took a more empathetic approach to the parents on the low end of the socioeconomic spectrum and why they might not be as involved at school:

Sandra: [Previously] here at our school, the level of commitment or involvement of the parents was at a minimum. It has increased because our demographic has increased. A lot of times our parents, even if they wanted to, they couldn't—they were in a survivor mode, they were too busy trying to survive. They didn't...or they were working the evenings or they were...you know it was hard for them. But now this recent rule with the

dual language program, we've had some children that come from two-parent homes, sometimes the mom is a stay home mom and so they have more support. We had, like, the mom this morning—she comes to volunteer in the classroom. I have other volunteers, you know, that come to help. I have a mother, a mom that volunteers in the green classroom, she couldn't come this morning so she sent the grandma came she was there, I don't remember if you saw her.

Claude: And these are...do you think they're mostly there's a different between the middle- and lower-class, income wise?

Sandra: Yeah, I think so it is. It's a bit...it's not an ethnic thing, I think it's more an economic thing. Because some of the other children come from single parent homes and it's hard. And so the expectations are just the reading at home and help them with their homework. I expect my students to have homework Monday thru Thursday. And they're good about returning their homework. They really are because I stay on top of them.

Unlike Sarah, this teacher at least acknowledged that the parents from lower SES households were in difficult circumstances; they were usually in what she called “survivor mode,” often unpartnered with little help with the children, and working during times where they would otherwise need to help child with homework or reading. She then compared this pattern to what she saw among the higher SES parents, who she saw coming to volunteer regularly because they had more free time. She even said that, although it might be difficult for her at times, she had to take responsibility to “stay on top of” the more socioeconomically disadvantaged parents, whom she clearly saw as disadvantaged by social forces larger than themselves.

This sentiment was echoed by another Latina second grade teacher in a different school with a socioeconomically disadvantaged, largely Latino/a population. She also empathized with the difficulties that lower SES parents faced:

Erica: Well, (sighs) unfortunately, I think a lot of our parents have two or three jobs sometimes, and they don't have a lot time at home with...they don't spend a lot of time at home with their students. And I'm speaking for most of my students, not all of them. I do have some that are very active and encourage the students to just pretty much push them a little beyond than what they are actually doing and I think that's great but a lot of them do not have the time to meet with our students because of work, or simply because they don't know how to...it's unfortunate, you know, but I think teachers in this campus have done a great job of adapting and figuring out ways to get parents involved and to accommodate the students' need. Not only getting other resources outside the classroom, but just doing whatever it takes. If it takes more tutoring, then you know that's what you have to do so we can compensate for that lack of attention at home.

When this Latina teacher recognized the bind that many lower SES Latino/a families were in, she did not just write it off as a failure of the parent. She saw it as something that was happening *to* them. Moreover, she also recognized that the school needed to make a conscious effort to find ways to get parents involved that addressed these disadvantages and barriers by going beyond their typical responsibilities to provide resources, including tutoring.

In sum, the experiences and views of the handful of teachers highlighted in this section illustrated broader themes that cut across the full SWISD sample. Namely, although all teachers tended to see low parental involvement at school as a “symptom” of low socioeconomic status, Latina teachers were much more likely than White teachers to empathize with families’ difficulties, see them as an external structural context rather than internal, interpersonal, or cultural characteristics, and recognize their own responsibility to help parents overcome these disadvantages and be more visible at school. In general, the Latina teachers seemed less afraid to admit their failures and

mistakes vis a vis lower SES parents and their children and more likely to take ownership of their responsibilities.

The Racialization of Parental Involvement

The focus of this study was parent-teacher ethnic-matching and Latino/a mothers' involvement in visible school-based activities. The qualitative data from SWISD appeared to suggest that teachers used SES rather than race/ethnicity (dissimilarity or similarity) as their dominant frame for articulating and understanding the involvement (or perceived lack thereof) of Latino/a parents. Yet, what became increasingly clear to me as I conducted this research was that just because teachers did not explicitly discuss race/ethnicity did not mean that they were not thinking about race/ethnicity. Indeed, they often were, even if they did not use a transparent vocabulary to do so—and, often, they were actually talking about race/ethnicity when they spoke about SES. This reluctance to speak directly about race/ethnicity was especially pronounced among White teachers and was less obvious among Latino/a teachers.

My reading of these data, which I will discuss in greater depth below, is in line with concept of color muteness (Pollock 2004). This concept refers to the tendency for well-meaning educational professionals to avoid racialized talk in schools because they view doing so as inappropriate, fear being viewed as racist, want to create a more inclusive atmosphere for all students and families, or simply want to avoid controversy. Although positively motivated, this avoidance tends to make racial/ethnic conflicts and inequalities worse rather than better by drawing attention away from them and avoiding active attempts to solve them.

Let me be clear that Latina teachers were not completely removed from color muteness. Yet, overall, they were far more likely than White teachers to bring up race/ethnicity when discussing parental involvement. They usually brought it up as part of a constellation of multiple socioeconomic and demographic factors, including language status and immigrant status. They also talked about culture, but they did so in a way that differed from their White counterparts. Whereas White teachers spoke about culture almost exclusively in relation to SES, Latina teachers were more likely to connect culture to race/ethnicity to associated factors.

Consider the response of Maria, a Latina Pre-K instructional specialist teacher who has taught Pre-K and is at the same campus as Nicole and Marta, when she was asked whether she thought that her answers about children's classroom success and parents' involvement would have been different if her largely Latino/a students came from different backgrounds:

I mean maybe some of them would be different, it just depends on the cultures that we, that I, would have in my classroom. 'Cause then I would have to really get to know those cultures and like, if you're talking about parent involvement I mean I'm not, I don't know how other cultures see that, like, is from their culture is it okay for them to be in the classroom or what the views are in those cultures. So maybe some of my answers would have been different but as far as the success and all of that I think and what a good classroom is I think all of that would have been the same.

Here, Maria did not quickly say that observed differences in parental involvement between Latino/a parents and other parents was not about culture. Although she was Latina herself, she appeared to recognize differences within the Latino/a community, or may have comparing what she saw among Latino/a families to cultures different than her own. Either way, she was indicating that she knew that there were differences in what to

expect from classroom behavior or how success was defined for her students that were related to Latino/a culture or to its intersection with SES. She appeared to be very willing to be adaptable to whatever came her way and not rigidly categorize parents and children according to preconceived notions.

Another Latino teacher in the same school as Maria, Alejandro a Pre-K bilingual teacher, also thought that teachers needed to approach their students with a better understanding of their cultures and more explicit focus on those cultures (vs. pretending that culture did not exist):

Well, yes, I think so because, I mean, this is my seventh year teaching with these students, and I can see other teachers that teach, like, social economically disadvantaged students not in the language, but they qualify for income and they have different issues in the classroom. It's more related to...it's not related to attention it's more... they're more defiant. Their nature is more like...they question a whole lot more anything. They're not here too much to learn. They feel unsafe because their surrounding, that's what they've been exposed to, like, I don't know they probably, they don't have enough food, so they don't feel safe, what's going to happen. They would be more defiant, they would be more aggressive sometimes. And I have had my share once or twice, but they were pretty controllable because in the Hispanic culture, so far that I've seen, parents see education as something very important and they assist the teachers. I mean not as much as I wish to, because again they're new in parenting, but they have the general concept that education is something that is going to be of benefit to the students and they try to have their kids to follow through and be good students.

Alejandro was not equating low SES or Latino/a status with low academic performance or low parental involvement. He recognized that there was a difference between Latino/a culture (which was not monolithic) and the White middle class culture dominating the school system. He also did not see the former as inferior to the latter. Instead, he saw it as a strength. Raquel, a Latina Pre-K dual language teacher in yet

another elementary school, also recognized Latino/a cultural values promoting children's success and parents' potential to partner with schools:

I do feel like some parents tend to be a little bit more involved and I don't know if it's a cultural thing. Like to me it seems like is a cultural thing, it's that whole "Respeto de la maestro," that respecting the teacher, respecting the school. It's like, you know, I'm like a mini little goddess for them and it's very nice (laughs). But at the same time, it's also very helpful to me, because they understand where I'm coming from, they understand that if they do their part their child is only going to move forward.

Latina parents, in her experience, knew that they played a part in their child's schooling, and she thought that their respect for her helped her team up with them to make that happen. Yet, this potential for respect for educators to facilitate parents' visible presence at schools was likely dependent on the school environment. In some schools, it could actually prevent parents from being involved—if, for example, Latino/a parents respected teachers so much that they did not want to overstep the boundaries of the roles of parent and teacher, and teachers and other school personnel did not work to deconstruct that perception. Although Raquel received a great deal of respect from parents, she also said that she went out of her way to capitalize on that respect by directly engaging them in activities and conversations them:

I do make a lot of effort to build relationships with parents, and I do tend to put a little bit of pressure on them, but at the same time it's not pressure that, you know, they probably don't put on themselves already. There are always one or two parents that are, you know, are and will always will be those parents that don't really seem to care, but I still try to make the effort as best I can, you know, and luckily the one that I have this year whose sometimes tends to be kind of hard to get a hold of, she has a second grade brother. And so I talk with that teacher and together we kind of try to tag-team to get a hold of that mom, and we did get her in for the fall conference but not for the spring conference, which wasn't required and...you know I kind of feel like, well, she's doing the best she can. She's got four kids. She's only twenty four! She's a single mom, so I understand. So I always, I know also where she might be coming from is a very difficult space, and so I

don't put, I don't continue to press it.... So you do have those families sometimes that you feel like I don't want to let this kid down but you can only do so much and so you just try as much as you can.

This sense of responsibility, distinction between culture as deficit to culture as strength, and effort to involve parents in any way she could was something that set Raquel and many other Latino/a teachers apart from White teachers. In most SWISD schools that I studied, White teachers take a different approach to parent involvement, in that they focused more on the parent's responsibility. Others accepted that involvement was not just the responsibility of parents but struggled figuring out how to act in support of it. Take for instance, a White Pre-K bilingual teacher named Angela said:

I think...other folks are probably more engaged or in tuned with their parents, but that's all, I think, it's a learning process. I think probably I might be middle of the road or maybe lower in parent engagement, 'cause I'm still new to the ropes and getting parents involved, and I think a lot of our parents don't know exactly, don't know how to help their students. So it's us exposing them to those options and activities, and then whether or not that happens is their kind of own doing. But I think they're all invested in the success of their students.

Another Pre-K White Teacher, Deborah, also puts more responsibility on lower SES Latino/a parents, and she had a somewhat condescending tone when she talked about how hard it was to engage them with her statement “...whether or not that happens is their own kind of doing.” and because “their phone numbers change every other week.” She went on to note that their investment was equally as important as her own and implied that they were not holding up their end. To her credit, by the end of our discussion, she did identify one aspect of difficulty for her socioeconomically disadvantaged Latino/a parents, which was that they had a lot of stress.

Parents? It's a huge, it's largely important, it's just getting that buy in and trying to communicate that to someone that you never see, you know what I mean? Parent involvement is just as important to that child as my involvement. Then, obviously they need to be learning while they're at home, too, but they need to see the congruency between me and their parents, how much water...what I say hold, how...how much water it holds with me, but also with the parent. Like we need to be on the same level, that's what's going to...to give the most success to a child. Straight up, that's all it is. But it's hard because we never see them. It's really hard. You know and their phone numbers change every other week, and you know what I mean, and it's just a very...it's just that demographic, it's tough to communicate and they have a lot of stress in their lives and, yeah.

Although Deborah recognized that the stress that Latino/a parents faced (primarily due to their socioeconomic disadvantage, not discrimination or other factors related to race/ethnicity), and how it made it hard for them to be in communication with teachers or visible at school, she still lumped all Latino/a parents together in a single group: “that demographic.” My reading of this statement was that it was a racial grouping, not a socioeconomic one.

One White second grade teacher, Lisa, took this generalization further by talking about her children (largely Latino/a and poor) as coming from rough backgrounds with lots of imprisoned fathers:

Some of them mention it like is so normal, you know. “Oh yeah my dad is in jail too. How long has your dad been in jail? When is he getting out?” You know, so it's definitely more challenging, because I feel like you do get some more, like, behavior problems, and I definitely feel like, as opposed to a school that, you know, has more like involved families and higher income. They come in more on grade level. I think at a school like ours we get a lot more of that - that's really challenging. I get a lot of kids that are very below level where they're supposed to be. But I like it, I like the challenge; it feels really good, especially when you are able to get them to where they're supposed to be. And there's always one or two that don't really make much progress but it's really awesome when you see, 'cause I always panic at the beginning of the year and I'm like “Oh, my goodness this kid is still on kindergarten reading level.” But then sometimes you work

harder with them, and you tutor them, and before you know it they're like either on grade level or almost there. It's really cool too see that.

Lisa definitely thought that her job teaching children from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds (and again largely Latino/a) was hard for her, especially relative to teaching in a higher SES (and, presumably, White) school. She claimed to like the challenge and reported that it “feels really good” when she got the children reading on grade level, but what I took away from this conversation was that she also did not think that trying to engage them in school would be all that fruitful. Later, Lisa attributed the differences to race, whereas earlier it was about SES, when she shifts to saying it would be boring for her to have rich White kids.

So there's definitely some challenging parts, but I like it. I like working with like different races and different backgrounds. I don't know, to me I think it would be boring if they were like all rich White kids, they were all like smart (laughs). You know? So it's funny because I have like one White girl in my class, she does stand out (laughs). And she's extremely intelligent and she's really funny, the things she says, the way she talks. And then so I have like her, and then I have a bunch of gifted and talented kids, probably about five that are really, really intelligent and above grade level. And then I have a bunch of you know, on level and then I have two that are like, extremely below and then a couple below. So you know, it's definitely a big range and that's probably one of my biggest challenges meeting all of their needs.

When Lisa did talk about race/ethnicity, she did so in terms of the positives of White children and families rather than the negatives of Latino/a children and families, but the latter was implied. Her focus on one super intelligent White girl and noting that she also had a group of gifted and talented students like her, exposed her silence on race for other students: she does not bring up an example of another intelligent student who was a minority. Although there were other gifted and talented students in the class, the

one White girl in the class was, in a sense, seen as the gold standard that all others should follow. Perhaps unknowingly, Lisa was equating Whiteness with intelligence and maturity, while constructing all of her minority students together as different from this girl, who “stand[s] out.”

In sum, White teachers avoided discussing children’s progress, parental involvement, and the link between the two in terms of race/ethnicity, although their discussion—and especially their focus on SES—often seemed to obliquely implicate race/ethnicity. Latin/a teachers on the other, were less color mute, and, although they were often prejudiced in some ways, they tend to take a fuller and more positive view of Latino/a culture, to correctly view Latino/a families at the intersection of race/ethnicity, SES, and other factors, and to see themselves as obligated to make schools more welcoming to Latino/a parents, regardless of SES

Chapter 6: Conclusion and Discussion

I went into this dissertation research with the goal of using mixed methods to better understand how Latino/a parents are incorporated (through their own active efforts, the elicitation of teachers, or some combination of two) into their children's elementary school in visible ways that might support their children's early educational trajectories. Based on past research and theory and drawing on major policy debates, I speculated that observed patterns of lower-than-average involvement of Latino/a parents in school-based activities, relative to other parents in the U.S. (see Crosnoe, Bonazzo, and Wu 2015), reflected a mixture of socioeconomic disadvantages, unfamiliarity with schools, and other barriers; that teachers often did not see these barriers and instead drew inferences about the internal motivations and values of Latino/a parents to assess their school-based involvement; and that conventional conceptions of school-based involvement likely obscured many of the ways that Latino/a parents would support their children's schooling. Some of these expectations were borne out by the data, although not always straightforwardly and often with considerable more nuance and complexity.

Overall, I found that parent-teacher ethnic-matching (i.e., Latino/a parents matched with Latino/a teachers) likely did create some common ground, made teachers see the involvement of parents in more realistic and comprehensive ways, and situated the involvement of parents in a larger context of culture and stratification. Yet, these benefits of ethnic-matching did not appear to consistently boost the degree to which Latino/a parents from diverse backgrounds participated in visible school activities, which

is an area of parental involvement that—despite being contested as too narrow (see Robinson & Harris 2013)—still dominates educational policy and still drives the perceptions of school personnel of how parents are supposed to be involved in their children’s early schooling.

These findings are based on quantitative and qualitative analyses that have many strengths but also limitations. They have relevance for theoretical understanding of parental involvement, Latino/a families, and the connection between the two, and can inform policies and programs in these areas. Below, I summarize the aims of this dissertation, the analyses I conducted for each, and the results of these analyses. I then discuss several of the implications of these findings across the two aims, while also discussing limitations and future directions.

Summary of Aims, Analyses, and Results

The first aim of this dissertation focused on Latina mothers and their assessments of the degree to which they engaged in conventionally defined school-based involvement activities often valued by schools, and whether such engagement was facilitated when their children’s elementary school teachers (past and present) were also Latino/a. I pursued this aim by estimating a series of path models with nationally representative data from the ECLS-K. In these models, count measures of school-based involvement activities at each grade (kindergarten, first grade, third grade) were regressed on measures of teacher’s ethnicities at the concurrent grade and each prior grade. These models moved from a binary measure of teacher ethnicity (Latino/a vs. not) to a more multi-dimensional

categorization (Latino/a, White, Black, Other), and they broke down the school involvement scale into its constituent items.

This quantitative strategy had many strengths. Its longitudinal design allowed for continuity in maternal school-based involvement to be taken into account while also allowing me to consider contemporaneous and lagged effects of parent-teaching matching. The ECLS-K Latino/a sample was internally heterogeneous, providing a fuller picture of that important population than that provided by more homogenous samples. The models that I estimated iteratively controlled for Latina mothers' socioeconomic circumstances and indicators of their ethnic origins, nativity status, and acculturative status as well as a range of maternal, teacher, child, and school characteristics. Thus, I was able to address many important sources of observable confounds.

The results of these models indicated that:

- Latina mothers reported more school-based involvement when their children had a Latina teacher, but only during the same year and only during kindergarten.
- Breaking down the teacher ethnicity (Latino/a vs. White, Black, and Other) to examine more contrasts between Latino/as and other ethnicities revealed that the apparent effect of having a Latino/a teacher was not specific to any one comparison with another group (i.e., it was about having a Latino/a teacher and not about not having a teacher of another race/ethnicity.)
- Breaking down the involvement scale into its constituent items revealed that the main finding of an association between having a Latino/a teacher and

more school-based involvement among Latina mothers during the child's kindergarten year was driven by highly visible domains of involvement not specific to the child (fundraising, volunteering, open house).

The second aim of this dissertation focused on teachers in classrooms serving Latino/a children. Specifically, I explored how these teachers perceived the involvement of Latino/a parents (primarily mothers) and how they attributed cause when they perceived this involvement to be lower than other parents. I pursued this aim by conducting grounded theory analyses of mostly qualitative data collected with interviews with both Latino/a and White teachers in grades Pre-K through 2nd grade in ten public schools in SWISD. In order to code transcripts of these interviews, I started with several a priori themes and then refined them, integrated them with some emergent themes, and distilled several basic conceptual points.

This qualitative methodology had several strengths. SWISD is a major hub for Latino/as (especially Latino/a immigrants), and it is in the midst of grappling with educational disparities related to Latino/a status and with better incorporating Latino/as into school communities, from which they often feel excluded. The interview approach allowed for rich data with a depth of nuance and description impossible with surveys, which enabled a deeper understanding of the processes by which teachers understand and interpret the parent involvement of Latino/a parents.

The qualitative analysis indicated that:

- Teachers inferred a great deal of what they thought about Latino/a parents based on their observations of and interactions with children, which in turn

were already colored by deficit perspectives, and Latino/a teachers were more likely to make these inferences in less judgmental ways (although they still could be judgmental).

- Although all teachers tended to view socioeconomic disadvantage as the main impediment to Latino/a parents' involvement in visible school-based activities, Latino/a teachers were more likely to articulate this connection in terms of stratification, barriers, and disadvantage, while White teachers were more likely to talk about it in terms of individual and interpersonal processes. White teachers avoided talking about Latino/a parents' school-based involvement in relation to race/ethnicity, while Latino/a teachers brought up race/ethnicity more often, usually in relation to positive cultural processes.

Four Take-Home Messages

Although this dissertation was divided into two aims with very different data and methodologies, I viewed each as part of a whole. Consequently, I want to draw conclusions across the two aims rather than specifically for each aim. To that end, I have four take-home messages that integrate both aims and methodologies.

First, although Latino/a teachers interviewed tended to have more welcoming views of Latino/a parents' involvement, this pattern was not consistently seen in the quantitative associations between having Latino/a teachers and parents being more involved in school-based activities. In other words, the qualitative data revealed a clear difference between Latino/a teachers and White teachers in terms of their perceptions of

Latino/a parents that I predicted would have been reflected in consistently significant coefficients for teacher Latino/a status in the quantitative models. Yet, although some of these coefficients were significant and positive, the majority were not.

What might explain this discrepancy? First, the very nature of the data in the two analyses is very different. In the interviews, teachers were asked very specifically to reflect on different aspects of parental involvement in a way that teachers are not asked to in closed-ended survey questions. For example, in the interviews, teachers were asked whether they thought the trends they saw with parental involvement in their classes would be different if they had students with different backgrounds. This may have brought conceptions of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status into these teachers' conscious or subconscious awareness, causing them to think differently about parental and child behaviors than they would for a survey. Additionally, the qualitative interview data only included the perspectives of White and Latino/a teachers, while the survey data also included Black and Other non-White teachers. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the survey asked teachers to report parental involvement at the individual level, whereas in the qualitative interviews, teachers tended to reflect about their classrooms more generally, drawing on individual examples to explain their overall impressions. The discrepancies between the qualitative and quantitative data could be due to individual-level factors that are not captured in the interview data. This highlights the importance of using multiple methods for questions such as these, as the qualitative and quantitative approaches have complementary strengths and weaknesses.

There are also theoretical reasons why this discrepancy may exist. Quantitatively, the fact that having a Latino/a teacher was important early on, in kindergarten, may indicate that kindergarten teachers helped parents to cultivate a good understanding of what is expected of parental involvement and a sense of confidence in navigating the education system. This threshold effect at kindergarten may also be a sign of resilience among Latina mothers, who may quickly adapt to the school environment for their own sake and the sake of their children. Moreover, most Latino/a communities tend to be community oriented (need citation), so once Latina mothers are situated within a specific school, they may rely on current and existing knowledge from other mothers within the school and the surrounding community to help them learn and adjust to the schools' expectations for parent involvement. Future research should examine these possible explanations for why kindergarten seems to be the key year for establishing parental involvement among Latina mothers.

A second take-away point is that family SES appeared to be more important than Latino/a status itself in the school-based involvement of Latino/a parents, but SES can be a proxy for many family characteristics and circumstances, including race/ethnicity. While family SES indicators were the strongest predictors of Latino/a parents' school-based involvement and attenuated some of the Latino/a teacher effects that we observed, they did not fully explain the findings. Moreover, race/ethnicity was an often unspoken element in how teachers—especially non-Latino/a teachers—made sense of their roles in relation to Latino/a parents. The White teachers tended to talk about SES as the primary, sometimes even the only, important factor in shaping parental involvement, and yet

research has consistently shown that people's perceptions of social class are racialized (Morris 2005; Weeks and Lupfer 2004). Thus, although the White teachers tended to avoid talking specifically about race/ethnicity and cultural factors in the parental involvement of Latino/a parents, they likely talked about SES as a way of raising the specter of race/ethnicity without explicitly naming it.

While SES may impact the involvement of Latino/a parents, most Latino/a teachers took ownership of the involvement of the parents in their classrooms. This signaled that they placed more responsibility on themselves, seeing the growth and development of their students as their own responsibility in addition to the responsibility of the parents. It may be the case that these teachers have knowledge resulting from their own involvement in Latino/a communities that allows them to be creative in the ways they engaged the parents. The White teachers, on the other hand, tended to keep the students and their families at more of a distance. Rather than seeing it as their responsibility to involve the parents, they placed responsibility for parent involvement squarely on the shoulders of the parents themselves, emphasizing the ways in which low parental involvement increased their own burden as teachers. Another possible explanation for this could be that the Latino/a teachers have greater empathy for their Latino/a students and their parents, because they are able to see them as if they are their own children, while White teachers may lack this empathy because, as members of the dominant racial group, they are not socialized to view members of minority groups as being like them (Gutsell & Inzlicht 2012; Warren 2013).

Third, although researchers and surveys tend to neatly divide school-based involvement from other types of parental involvement and educational policies often reflect this divide, the qualitative data indicates that teachers often blur the lines among different types of involvement. They do not speak of them as differing ways of being involved in their child's education, but rather see them as a part of a full package. Yet, the school-based activity is all that they have first-hand knowledge of, because they see parents' attendance at meetings and events, but not the activities that these parents do in the home. Teachers make many inferences about out-of-school involvement (or the lack thereof) based on many factors, including children's progress, stereotypes, and their own prior histories, for example, by noting that you can "just tell" what the parental involvement at home is like based on the student's performance in the classroom.

The articulation of such perceptions by teachers, however, may be as much about confirming their pre-existing biases about Latino/a parents as they are about using the child's performance to make inferences. It is likely that, at least for some teachers, a student's lack of progress is only seen as an indicator of low parental involvement at home in cases where the teacher already expects low parental involvement, such as low-income and minority households – and that for a struggling student from a family where at-home involvement is assumed, such as in White, middle-class households, a different explanation entirely would be offered. This may highlight a trend of deficit thinking teachers may have with regards to Latino/a parents. Although this deficit thinking may be unconscious and may be a reflection the ways in which the national conversation on Latino/as is portrayed in schools and in the media, it is also possible that this deficit

perspective affects the ways in which Latino/a parents can actually be involved, as teachers may be less likely to work to involve parents more when they already have low expectations of their involvement. While this research revealed that White teachers primarily carried this deficit mentality towards parents, some Latino/a teachers did show signs of this thinking as well.

The fourth and final take-home point of this research is that better incorporating Latino/a parents into elementary schools and creating home-school partnerships to promote the success of children will require more than creating opportunities for school-based activities and interactions. Instead, a culture change must happen in schools, and Latino/a teachers might play an important role in such a shift. My findings indicate that more needs to be done to recruit Latino/a teachers in early education settings in order to provide an environment in schools in which teachers help to cultivate a growing understanding of how Latino/a parents can help their children succeed. These cultural changes not only has to happen in school but also at the city, state, and federal levels in the ways in which policy makers, government officials, and communities think about the contributions of the Latino/a population to the economy and the nation as a whole.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although there are many notable strengths to this mixed-methods study, there are also limitation, which point to directions that future research may take. First, although I have been critical of the focus of research and policy on conventionally narrowed definitions of school-based parental involvement, which I and others see as culturally biased on many ways (see Adair, Tobin, & Arzubiaga 2012; Robinson & Harris, 2013;

Rist 2000; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2002), I chose to use this definition in the ECLS-K measurement and draw on it in the interviews. I did so because I wanted to study Latino/a parents in the context of expectations for behavior that, while unfair to them, also have real consequences for them and their children. I also thought that pairing a conventional measurement of an involvement in the quantitative analyses with an exploration of what the conceptualization behind that measurement meant in the qualitative analyses would be fruitful.

Second, I paired teacher perceptions in the qualitative data with parent perceptions in the qualitative analyses. Doing so was motivated by my desire to show both sides of the family-school partnership. Yet, I realize that a better way to achieve that goal would be to compare parent and teacher perceptions in both sources of data. The school-based data collection was extensive enough that expanding to families would have been challenging. I had hoped to make the comparison between parent and teacher perceptions of parent involvement using the quantitative data, as ECLS-K did measure teachers' perceptions of parents' involvement, but those data turned out to have high levels of non-random missingness, making such an analysis impossible. There is reason to believe, however, that this problem has been attenuated in the newer ECLS-K data; in the future, I will examine these newer data to explore this comparison, as well as to bring aspects of home-based involvement into the analysis.

Third, the quantitative analyses took into account the within-population diversity of Latino/as in terms of origins and acculturation. I found that nativity status, origin of Latin America, and whether the child spoke English at home predicted Latina mothers'

school-based involvement, although typically less so than socioeconomic circumstances and not in ways that accounted for associations between teachers' ethnicities and mothers' involvement. One inquiry that I did not make, but will in the future, is to consider variation in these associations across different segments of the Latino/a population. In other words, I want to go beyond controlling for factors like language use, immigrant status, and exposure to U.S. education to interact these factors with teacher ethnicity. Doing so will identify groups of Latina mothers for whom having a Latino/a teachers matters most. In the qualitative data, it was not possible to attune to internal diversity among Latino/a teachers simply because there were not enough to break down into meaningful subgroups (and most were U.S.-born, English-speaking Mexican-Americans). In the future, I will also further explore the effects particularly for immigrant families, by limiting the sample to just immigrant families, including interactions, and focusing my controls on issues that generally impact the immigrant population.

Fourth, my quantitative analyses were based on data from over a decade ago. Fortunately, ECLS-K now has a newer version, and its second grade wave was recently released. The models that I estimated here need to be redone with that newer data, considering all of the changes in the Latino/a population, the politicization of this population, and extensive school reforms that have happened in the years between the two national data collections. For example, in the newer ECLS-K data, there will likely be a higher proportion of Latino/a teachers within the sample, which may allow for greater statistical power in models that compare Latino/a and non-Latino/a teachers. When examining these newer data (and comparing across time), I will also do more to

promote causal inference. For example, I could attempt propensity score matching, which would help to adjust for any pre-existing differences in Latino/a families whose children are exposed to Latino/a teachers and those who are not.

Fifth, one possibility that I have not yet explored is that the real dividing line among teachers is how good they are as teachers, not their ethnicity. In other words, being an engaged and sensitive teacher might trump ethnicity, with good White teachers more open to and efficacious with Latino/a parents than lower-quality Latino/a teachers. The SWISD data collection included systematic classroom observations—and resulting teacher ratings—with the CLASS protocol. A follow up to this dissertation will be to organize the qualitative data from SWISD by the CLASS data. Does the comparison between White and Latino/a teachers differ across strata of teacher quality?

Final Words

Following these lines of future research and addressing the existing limitations is important because the issue of parental involvement is a divisive one in U.S. schools and educational policy, and its potential to be divisive is likely even more pronounced when dealing with the Latino/a population, which is growing, has many challenges, and is the source of much rancorous political debate. I also think that doing so is important for the simple fact that identifying factors that might facilitate the educational success of children in this population—including family-school partnerships—may be a way of supporting the social mobility of this population, which, more and more, represents the future of this country.

Appendix SWISD Interview Guide

Teacher Background

- What is your race/ethnicity?
- How far in school did you go?
- Do you have teaching certification?
- How long have you been teaching?
- How long have you been teaching in this school?
- What grade level/s do you teach?
- How long have you been teaching at this grade level/s?

Classroom Challenges

- Your class has a different makeup than some of the other classrooms we have seen in AISD.
 - Do you think that makes the day to day part of your job easier or harder?
- Walk me through your typical day as a teacher, from before kids arrive until after they leave.
 - Do you think this is different from what most teachers in this grade in AISD do?
- What do the parents of your students do to help their children learn?
 - How do you think this compares to other classrooms?
 - How important is what *they* do to what *you* do?
- Tell me, in your own words, what makes a classroom good or not?
 - What defines success to you when you evaluate your students at the end of the year?

- Would your answers to these questions be different if you had students from different backgrounds in your class?

Alignment

- Do you feel like, as a teacher, you are in it alone, or do you feel part of a larger community of teachers who work together as a team?
 - Who is your community/team?
- How self-contained is your classroom? By that, we mean how much your classroom is linked to other classrooms in the school.
 - What form do these links take?
 - Do they emerge from teachers' interactions, or are they shaped from the top-down by school administrators?
 - Is there some official policy, and, if so, does it matter?
- Thinking about these concepts of community, team, or links that we have discussed, do they apply more to [teachers' grade level] teachers in AISD or to the teachers, across grades, in your school?
 - If the latter, what grades are we talking about?
- In some schools, the pre-K program is in the school, and, in others, it is housed at Read. What are the pros and cons of each of these arrangements?
 - Which do you think works better for pre-K students in the long term?
- One buzzword in educational research and policy right now is alignment. There is talk of vertical and horizontal alignment.
 - Have you heard of these terms? If so, what do they mean to you? If not, what do you think they mean?

Alignment Experiences

- **For pre-K teachers only:**
 - Has your school brought in a pre-K consultant? If so, was it a TEEM consultant? What does that consultant do and did you find it helpful? If not, would you like to have such a consultant come to your school?
 - Do you get advice from, give advice to, or share ideas with other pre-K teachers outside your school? If so, did you do this on your own initiative or were you encouraged to do so?
- How often do you and the other teachers in your grade meet?
 - What do you discuss at these meetings?
- Is there a standardized way of leading classes and structuring the day across classrooms in your grade?
 - Are there documents that you can draw on that map out how classrooms are supposed to be run in your grade? If so, where did they come from?
- The state of Texas has a very detailed set of learning standards for pre-K (or kindergarten, first grade, etc.). Do you organize and run your class with those standards in mind?
 - Do you think that your program/grade is organized so that all classrooms are coordinated to meet those standards?
- For kindergarten-third grade teachers: How conscious are you of the pre-K teachers in the school?
 - How often do you interact with them?
- Do you feel that, in this school, pre-K is separate from the other grades?
- Do you coordinate with other teachers in the school to make sure that your learning goals match up with the learning goals of the next class your students

enter? In other words, do you know if what you are doing in your classroom helps them be ready for the next one, too ready, or not ready enough?

- Alternatively, do you take steps to ensure that the students in classrooms a year below you are going to come in prepared for your learning goals?
- Is there a systematic process for getting classes in sync, or is it something that individual teachers do?

References

- Adair, Jennifer and Joseph Tobin. 2008. "Listening to the Voices of Immigrant Parents." Pp. 137-50 in *Diversities in Early Childhood Education: Rethinking and Doing*, edited by C. Genishi and A. L. Goodwin. New York: Routledge.
- Adair, Jennifer Keys. 2012. "Discrimination as a Contextualized Obstacle to the Preschool Teaching of Young Latino Children of Immigrants." *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 13(3):163-74.
- Adair, Jennifer Keys, Joseph Tobin, and A. Arzubaiaga. 2012. The Dilemma of Cultural Responsiveness and Professionalization: Listening Closer to Immigrant Teachers Who Teach Children of Recent Immigrants. *Teachers College Record* 114(12):1-37.
- Alexander, Karl, Doris Entwisle, and Linda Olson. 2014. *The Long Shadow: Family Background, Disadvantaged Urban Youth, and the Transition to Adulthood*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Alexander, Karl L. and Doris R. Entwisle. 1988. "Achievement in the First Two Years of School: Patterns and Processes." *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 53(2):1-157.
- Autor, David H. 2014. "Skills, Education, and the Rise of Earnings Inequality among the 'Other 99 Percent'." *Science* 344(6186):843-51.
- Axinn, William G., and Lisa D. Pearce. 2006. *Mixed Method Data Collection Strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakker, Joep, Eddie Denessen, and Mariël Brus-Laeven. 2007. "Socio-Economic Background, Parental Involvement and Teacher Perceptions of These in Relation to Pupil Achievement." *Educational Studies* 33(2):177-92.
- Biddle, Bruce J. 1979. *Role Theory: Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors*. New York: Academic Press.
- Biddle, Bruce J. 1986. "Recent Development in Role Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology*:67-92.
- Capps, Randy, Michael Fix, Julie Murray, Jason Ost, Jeffrey S Passel, and Shinta Herwanto. 2005. "The New Demography of America's Schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Christenson, Sandra, and Susan M. Sheridan. 2001. *Schools and Families: Creating Essential Connections for Learning*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Crosnoe, Robert. 2005. "Double Disadvantage or Signs of Resilience? The Elementary School Contexts of Children from Mexican Immigrant Families." *American Educational Research Journal* 42(2):269-303.

- Crosnoe, Robert. 2007. "Early Child Care and the School Readiness of Children from Mexican Immigrant Families1." *International Migration Review* 41(1):152-81.
- Crosnoe, Robert. 2010. "Two-Generation Strategies and Involving Immigrant Parents in Children's Education." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Crosnoe, Robert. 2012. "Family-School Connections, Early Learning, and Socioeconomic Inequality in the US." *Multidisciplinary Journal Educational Research* 2(1):1-36.
- Crosnoe, R., T. Leventhal, R. J. Wirth, K. M. Pierce, R. C. Pianta and Nihcd Early Child Care Research Network. 2010. "Family Socioeconomic Status and Consistent Environmental Stimulation in Early Childhood." *Child Development* 81(3):972-87.
- Crosnoe, Robert, and Ruth N. Lopez Turley. 2011. "K-12 Educational Outcomes of Immigrant Youth." *Future of Children* 21(1):129-52.
- Crosnoe, Robert, Jennifer March Augustine, and Aletha C. Huston. 2012. "Children's Early Child Care and Their Mothers' Later Involvement with Schools." *Child Development* 83(2):758-72.
- Crosnoe, Robert, & Ansari, Arya. 2015. "Latin American Immigrant Parents and Their Children's Teachers in US Early Childhood Education Programmes." *International Journal of Psychology* 50:431-439.
- Crosnoe, Robert and Aprile D Benner. 2015. "Children at School." Pp. 268-304 in *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science, Ecological Settings and Processes*, Vol. 4, *Ecological Settings and Processes*, edited by M. Bornstein and T. Leventhal. New York: Wiley.
- Cutler, David M., Edward L. Glaeser, and Jacob L. Vigdor. 2008. "Is the Melting Pot Still Hot? Explaining the Resurgence of Immigrant Segregation." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 90(3):478-97.
- Dearing, Eric, Kathleen McCartney, Heather B. Weiss, Holly Kreider, and Sandra Simpkins. 2004. "The Promotive Effects of Family Educational Involvement for Low-Income Children's Literacy." *Journal of School Psychology* 42(6):445-60.
- Delpit, Lisa D. 2006. *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Domina, Thurston. 2005. "Leveling the Home Advantage: Assessing the Effectiveness of Parental Involvement in Elementary School." *Sociology of Education* 78(3): 233-249.
- Duncan, Greg J., and Katherine A Magnuson. 2005. "Can Family Socioeconomic Resources Account for Racial and Ethnic Test Score Gaps?" *Future of Children* 15(1):35-54.

- Duncan, Greg J., and Katherine Magnuson. 2013. "Investing in Preschool Programs." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27(2):109-32.
- Eccles, Jacquelynne, and Rena Harold. 1993. "Parent-School Involvement During the Early Adolescent Years." *The Teachers College Record* 94(3):568-87.
- Entwisle, Doris R., and Karl L Alexander. 1993. "Entry into School: The Beginning School Transition and Educational Stratification in the United States." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 401-23.
- Entwisle, Doris R., Karl L. Alexander, and Linda Steffel Olson. 2005. "First Grade and Educational Attainment by Age 22: A New Story." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(5):1458-502.
- Epstein, Joyce L. 2005. "Attainable Goals? The Spirit and Letter of the No Child Left Behind Act on Parental Involvement." *Sociology of Education* 78(2):179-82.
- Epstein, Joyce L. and Steven B. Sheldon. 2006. "Moving Forward: Ideas for Research on School, Family, and Community Partnerships." Pp. 117-39 in *Handbook for Research in Education: Engaging Ideas and Enriching Inquiry*, edited by C. F. Conrad and R. Serlin. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Feistritzer, C. Emily. 2011. *Profile of Teachers in the US 2011*. Washington, DC:National Center for Education Information.
- Fortuny, Karina, Randy Capps, Margaret Simms, and Ajay Chaudry. 2009. "Children of Immigrants: National and State Characteristics." Washington, DC:Urban Institute.
- Fraga, Luis, and John A. Garcia. 2010. *Latino Lives in America: Making It Home*, Temple University Press.
- Fry, Richard. 2014. "U.S. High School Dropout Rate Reaches Record Low, Driven by Improvements among Hispanics, Blacks." Washington, DC:Pew Research Center.
- Fuller, Bruce. 2007. *Standardized Childhood: The Political and Cultural Struggle over Early Education*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gandara, Patricia C., and Frances Contreras. 2009. *The Latino Education Crisis: The Consequences of Failed Social Policies*: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Garcia, Eugene, and Bryant Jensen. 2009. "Early Educational Opportunities for Children of Hispanic Origins. Social Policy Report. Volume XXIII, Number II." *Society for Research in Child Development*.
- Goldenberg, Claude. 1996. "Latin American Immigration and US Schools." Ann Arbor, MI: Society for Research in Child Development.
- Goldenberg, Claude. 2008. "Teaching English Language Learners: What the Research Does-and Does Not-Say." *American Educator* 32(2):8-23.

- Goldenberg, Lauren, and Daniel Light. 2009. "Lee Y Seras: Evaluation Report." New York: Education Development Center.
- Gonzalez-Barrera, Ana, and Mark Hugo Lopez. 2013. "A Demographic Portrait of Mexican-Origin Hispanics in the United States." Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Gutsell, Jennifer N., and Michael Inzlicht. 2012. "Intergroup differences in the sharing of emotive states: neural evidence of an empathy gap." *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* 7(5): 596-603.
- Harker, Kathryn. 2001. "Immigrant Generation, Assimilation, and Adolescent Psychological Well-Being." *Social forces* 79(3):969-1004.
- Harwood, Robin, Birgit Leyendecker, Vivian Carlson, Marysol Asencio, and Amy Miller. 2002. "Parenting among Latino Families in the US." *Handbook of Parenting* 4:21-46.
- Heckman, James J. 2006. "Skill Formation and the Economics of Investing in Disadvantaged Children." *Science* 312(5782):1900-2.
- Hemphill, Cadelle F. and Alan Vanneman. 2011. *Achievement Gaps: How Hispanic and White Students in Public Schools Perform in Mathematics and Reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Hernandez, Donald J. 2004. "Demographic Change and the Life Circumstances of Immigrant Families." *The Future of Children*:17-47.
- Hernandez, Donald J., Nancy A. Denton, and Suzanne E. Macartney. 2007. "Young Hispanic Children in the 21st Century." *Journal of Latinos and Education* 6(3):209-28.
- Hill, Nancy E. 2001. "Parenting and Academic Socialization as They Relate to School Readiness: The Roles of Ethnicity and Family Income." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 93(4):686.
- Hill, Nancy E., Domini R. Castellino, Jennifer E. Lansford, Patrick Nowlin, Kenneth A. Dodge, John E. Bates, and Gregory S. Pettit. 2004. "Parent Academic Involvement as Related to School Behavior, Achievement, and Aspirations: Demographic Variations across Adolescence." *Child Development* 75(5):1491-509.
- Hill, Nancy E., and Kathryn Torres. 2010. "Negotiating the American Dream: The Paradox of Aspirations and Achievement among Latino Students and Engagement between Their Families and Schools." *Journal of Social Issues* 66(1):95-112.

- Hoover-Dempsey, Kathleen V., and Howard M. Sandler. 1997. "Why Do Parents Become Involved in Their Children's Education?" *Review of Educational Research* 67(1):3-42.
- Hoover-Dempsey, Kathleen V., Joan M. T. Walker, Howard M. Sandler, Darlene Whetsel, Christa L. Green, Andrew S. Wilkins, and Kristen Closson. 2005. "Why Do Parents Become Involved? Research Findings and Implications." *The Elementary School Journal* 106(2):105-30.
- Hussar, William J., and Tabitha M. Bailey. 2011. "Projections of Education Statistics to 2020." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Kao, Grace. 1999. "Psychological Well-Being and Educational Achievement among Immigrant Youth." Pp. 410-477 in *Children of Immigrants: Health, Adjustment, and Public Assistance*, edited by D. J. Hernandez. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Kao, Grace, and Jennifer S. Thompson. 2003. "Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:417-42.
- Kingston, Paul W., Ryan Hubbard, Brent Lapp, Paul Schroeder, and Julia Wilson. 2003. "Why Education Matters." *Sociology of Education* 76(1):53-70.
- Leavell, Ashley, Catherine Tamis-LeMonda, Diane Ruble, Kristina Zosuls, and Natasha Cabrera. 2012. "African American, White and Latino Fathers' Activities with Their Sons and Daughters in Early Childhood." *Sex Roles* 66(1/2):53-65.
- Llagas, Charmaine, and Thomas D. Snyder. 2003. *Status and Trends in the Education of Hispanics*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Logan, John R., Elisabeta Minca, and Sinem Adar. 2012. "The Geography of Inequality Why Separate Means Unequal in American Public Schools." *Sociology of Education* 85(3):287-301.
- Logan, John R., Jacob Stowell, and Deirdre Oakley. 2002. "Choosing Segregation: Racial Imbalance in American Public Schools, 1990-2000." SUNY-Albany: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research.
- Lopez, Gerardo R., Jay D. Scribner, and Kanya Mahitivanichcha. 2001. "Redefining Parental Involvement: Lessons from High-Performing Migrant-Impacted Schools." *American Educational Research Journal* 38(2):253-88.
- Lucas, Tamara. 1997. *Into, through, and Beyond Secondary School: Critical Transitions for Immigrant Youths*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Magnuson, Katherine, and Greg J. Duncan. 2014. "Can Early Childhood Interventions Decrease Inequality of Economic Opportunity." in *Inequality of Economic Opportunity in the United States: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Conference*.

- Magnuson, Katherine A., and Jane Waldfogel. 2005. "Early Childhood Care and Education: Effects on Ethnic and Racial Gaps in School Readiness." *Future of Children* 15(1):169-96.
- Mare, Robert D. 1995. "Changes in Educational Attainment and Social Enrollment." Pp. 155–213 in *State of the Union: America in the 1990's*, edited by R. Farley. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mayer, Susan E. 1997. *What Money Can't Buy: Family Income and Children's Life Chances*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McLoyd, Vonnie C., Ana Mari Cauce, and David Takeuchi. 2000. "Marital Processes and Parental Socialization in Families of Color: A Decade Review of Research." *Journal of Marriage & Family* 62(4):1070-93.
- McLoyd, Vonnie C. 1998. "Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Child Development." *American Psychologist* 53(2):185-204.
- Miles, Mattheu B., and A. Michael Huberman. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mirowsky, John, and Catherine E. Ross. 2003. *Education, Social Status, and Health*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Morris, Edward W. 2005. "From "Middle Class" to "Trailer Trash:" Teachers' Perceptions of White Students in a Predominately Minority School." *Sociology of Education* 78(2): 99-121.
- Muthen, Linda K., and Bengt O. Muthen. 2010. *Mplus User's Guide. 6th*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Pianta, Robert C., Karen M. LaParo, , and Bridget K. Hamre. 2007. *Classroom Scoring Assessment System (CLASS)*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Pianta, Robert C., and Daniel J. Walsh. 1996. *High-Risk Children in Schools: Constructing Sustaining Relationships*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Picower, Bree. 2009. "The Unexamined Whiteness of Teaching: How White Teachers Maintain and Enact Dominant Racial Ideologies." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 12(2):197-215.
- Pomerantz, Eva M., Elizabeth A. Moorman, and Scott D. Litwack. 2007. "The How, Whom, and Why of Parents' Involvement in Children's Academic Lives: More Is Not Always Better." *Review of Educational Research* 77(3):373-410.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Quioco, Alice M. L., and Annette M. Daoud. 2006. "Dispelling Myths About Latino Parent Participation in Schools." *The Educational Forum* 70:255-267.

- Reardon, Sean F., and Claudia Galindo. 2009. "The Hispanic-White Achievement Gap in Math and Reading in the Elementary Grades." *American Educational Research Journal* 46(3):853-91.
- Reese, Leslie, Silvia Balzano, Ronald Gallimore, and Claude Goldenberg. 1995. The Concept of Educación: Latino Family Values and American Schooling. *International Journal of Educational Research* 23(1), 57-81.
- Rimm-Kaufman, Sara E., and Robert C. Pianta. 2000. "An Ecological Perspective on the Transition to Kindergarten: A Theoretical Framework to Guide Empirical Research." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 21(5):491-511.
- Rist, Ray C. 1970. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 40(3):411-51.
- Rist, Ray C. 2000. "Her Classic Reprint-Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 70(3):257-302.
- Schulting, Amy B., Patrick S. Malone, and Kenneth A. Dodge. 2005. "The Effect of School-Based Kindergarten Transition Policies and Practices on Child Academic Outcomes." *Developmental Psychology* 41(6):860.
- Souto-Manning, Mariana. 2010. "Family Involvement: Challenges to Consider, Strengths to Build On." *Young Children* 65:82-88.
- Stage, Frances K., Hasani C. Carter, and Amaury Nora. 2004. "Path Analysis: An Introduction and Analysis of a Decade of Research." *Journal of Educational Research* 98(1):5-13.
- Suárez-Orozco, Carola, and Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco. 2002. *Children of Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, Carola, Jean Rhodes, and Michael Milburn. 2009. "Unraveling the Immigrant Paradox Academic Engagement and Disengagement among Recently Arrived Immigrant Youth." *Youth & Society* 41(2):151-85.
- Tienda, Marta. 2009. "Hispanicity and Educational Inequality: Risks, Opportunities and the Nation's Future." *The 25th Tomás Rivera Lecture presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- U. S. Department of Education. 2015. "Achievement Gap Narrows as High School Graduation Rates for Minority Students Improve Faster than Rest of Nation."
<http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/achievement-gap-narrows-high-school-graduation-rates-minority-students-improve-faster-rest-nation>.
- Valencia, Richard R. 2010. *Chicano School Failure and Success: Past, Present, and Future*. New York: Routledge.

- Warren, Chezare A. 2013. "The utility of empathy for White female teachers' culturally responsive interactions with Black male students." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning* 3(3):175-200.
- Weeks, Matthew, and Michael B. Lupfer. 2004. "Complicating race: The relationship between prejudice, race, and social class categorizations." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30(8): 972-984.
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu, and Ariel Kalil. 2011. "The Effects of Parental Undocumented Status on the Developmental Contexts of Young Children in Immigrant Families." *Child Development Perspectives* 5(4):291-97.
- Yosso, Tara J. 2005. "Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8(1):69-91.