PERSPECTIVES FROM PARENT-ADOLESCENT DYADS ON PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT IN THEIR ADOLESCENTS' OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS

BY

LORRAINE MUNOZ

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in Human Development and Family Studies
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2016

Urbana, Illinois

Master's Committee:

Professor Marcela Raffaelli, Chair
Professor Reed Larson

Abstract

The current study examines how parent-adolescent dyads perceive parental involvement in adolescents' out-of-school programs. As part of a larger study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 36 adolescents in youth programs and their parents separately. Youth were 13-18 years old (M = 15.9, SD = 1.2). Also, youth were a diverse sample of 14 Latino/a (38.9%), 9 African American or Black (25.0%), and 13 European American (36.1%) and included 23 female participants (63.9%) and 13 male participants (36.1%). Qualitative methods and approaches, such as open coding, consensus, and the inductive approach were utilized to provide an understanding of how parent-adolescent dyads perceive parental involvement. Two constructs and 7 overarching categories were identified. The first construct is type of parental involvement, which includes three overarching categories: direct parental involvement, indirect parental involvement, and lack of parental involvement. The second construct is level of parental involvement, which includes four overarching categories: good amount of parental involvement, more parental involvement, less parental involvement, and reasons for lack of parental involvement. This study suggests that parent-adolescent dyads perceive parental involvement differently and that there is variation between how parents and youth perceive parental involvement by ethnic group.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank everyone who was involved in my thesis. I appreciate the guidance, encouragement, and patience of my adviser, Dr. Marcela Raffaelli and second reader Dr. Reed Larson. This research was supported by the William T. Grant Foundation (to Reed Larson and Marcela Raffaelli). Additional funding was provided by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Hatch project 600116-793000 (to M. Raffaelli). I also appreciate the hard work, time, and effort of my two research assistants: Mariana Martinez and Kristen Herdegen that served as coders on my master's thesis. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank Leann Topol and Dr. Bob Hughes for their formal assistance in the processing and formatting of my thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank my family especially my parents Jose and Lorena Munoz, as well as, my Aunt Maria Zavala and fiancé Oscar Alvarado for offering me words of encouragement, emotional support, faith, and humor during the tough times, thank you for believing in me.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction 1
Chapter Two: Literature Review 3
Chapter Three: Methodology 9
Chapter Four: Findings 19
Chapter Five: Discussion 30
References 36

Chapter One: Introduction

Youth programs are defined as structured leisure activities: organized and headed by adults, involving commitment and frequent participation, and motivate skill-focused activities (Fawcett, Garton, & Dandy, 2009). School is best known as the location where learning and skill building takes place, but youth are not always given the opportunity to apply what they learn hands-on. Youth programs such as after-school, out-of-school, and summer programs provide a bridge that naturally integrates school and home contexts, which is essential to youth's positive development (Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, & Holbein, 2005; Little, Wimer, & Weiss, 2008; Riggs & Medina, 2005). Out-of-school programs allow for youth to spend time in a safe, structured, and supervised environment. This gives youth the opportunity to develop skills and interests in areas such as sports, art, media, and music. It also allows youth the chance to apply knowledge in an out-of–school context (Pittman, Irby, Yohalem, & Wilson-Ahlstrom, 2004). Research also suggests that youth that participated in structured activities were more likely to develop positively in terms of academic achievement, attendance in school, personal improvements and prosocial behavior, also showing declines in discipline problems (Pittman et al., 2004). This indicates that by being involved in structured activities there is less of a chance for youth to get involved in risky behavior, such as substance use (Pittman et al., 2004).

Previous studies have suggested that family engagement in afterschool programs could positively impact youth by fostering involvement in activities, better attendance, achievement, behavior and an improved parent-child relationship at home (Coulton & Irwin, 2007; Little et al., 2008; Riggs & Medina, 2005). In addition, parental support and encouragement influences youth's motivation and participation in organized activities (Anderson, Funk, Elliott, & Smith, 2003; Simpkins, Vest, & Price, 2011). Previous studies have reported various ways parents might be directly or indirectly involved in their youth's activities. Examples of direct involvement would be parents contributing resources such as equipment and money, monitoring their youth's activities by accompanying their child (Outley & Floyd, 2002), driving youth to their activities, and attending or volunteering in activities (Dunn, Kinney, & Hofferth, 2003). On the other hand, parents can indirectly encourage and support their youth's participation in activities through various means (Dunn et al., 2003; Fletcher, Elder, & Mekos, 2000). This study aims to explore how parents are involved in their adolescents' participation in organized youth programs. There are three main gaps in the literature on parental involvement that this study attempts to address. These gaps include the following: examining differences and similarities in perspectives on parental involvement in terms of ethnic diversity, parent-adolescent individual and dyadic report, as well as, specifically within the context of out-of-school programs. This study provides the opportunity for understanding how ethnically diverse parent-adolescent dyads perceive parental involvement in their youth's programs.

We utilized qualitative data from a diverse sample of parent-adolescent dyads in order to gain unique information about how the dyads perceive the types of parental involvement in out-of-school programs. We asked the following questions: How are parents engaged in their adolescents' participation in youth programs? How do parent-adolescent dyads conceptualize parental involvement? How do parent-adolescent dyads perceive parental involvement differently? Does ethnicity influence how parental involvement is perceived by parent-adolescent dyads?

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Parental Involvement in Youth Programs

Parental support and encouragement influence youth's motivation and participation in organized activities (Anderson et al., 2003; Persson, Kerr, & Stattin, 2007; Simpkins et al., 2011). Additionally, positive parent-child interactions at home can help influence youth to stay involved in structured activities (Persson et al., 2007). Previous studies have reported that even if parents are not actively participating in youth's activities, they still provide support and permission to participate, as well as money for fees (Dunn et al., 2003; Fletcher et al., 2000; Outley & Floyd, 2002; Simpkins et al., 2011). According to Anderson and colleagues, youth perceived two different types of parental involvement: one is a parent that facilitates their youth's participation in the activity, which allows for the youth to make choices; and the other is a parent that is in control of youth's participation and has performance expectations (Anderson et al., 2003). Moreover, a qualitative study that followed adolescents in youth programs found that parents provided autonomy support by limiting their involvement and only coming to special events and activities, therefore they were only as involved as the youth wanted them to be (Larson, Pearce, Sullivan, & Jarett, 2007). Some youth clearly stated the limited level of involvement they wanted from their parents, reporting that they wanted to be left alone or that they were okay with infrequent visits (Larson et al., 2007).

In a slightly different context, Kanters, Bocarro, and Casper (2008) found that parents and children disagreed on measures of parental support and parental pressure in their child's sports. Other literature on parental involvement focuses on parental involvement within the context of sports, reporting differences in perception due to youth's gender, as well as differences in expectations to be actively involved based on the parents' gender (Coakley, 2006; Knight, Neely, & Holt, 2011; Leff & Hoyle, 1995). Since there is limited literature pertaining to parental involvement within the context of youth programs, the scope was extended to include literature on parental involvement within the context of education and learning.

Theoretical Foundation

In order to conceptualize parental involvement in their adolescents' out-of-school programs, we draw on Mapp (2003), who described how parents are engaged in their children's learning. Parents describe being involved in two types of ways: at-home involvement and at-school involvement. First, at-home involvement included these themes: verbal support and encouragement to do well in school/to do homework; one-on-one help with homework; involvement in outside activities; and role of extended family in at-home activities. At-school involvement consisted of different themes: attending school events; informal visits to the school; communication with teachers; visits to the family center; volunteering; and participation in school committees. Previous studies have typically examined the types

of parental involvement and how parents get involved within the context of school and education (Altschul, 2011; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Mapp, 2003; Zarate, 2007). I am interested in applying this framework to the context of youth programs, which will provide insight on how parents and adolescents perceive parental involvement in youth programs.

Types of Support and Involvement

There are various ways parents can be involved in their adolescents' youth programs. Some are more evident, while other types of involvement are less obvious, such as the different kinds of social support. Social support can be defined in more than one way because of its multiple aspects (Dunkel Schetter & Brooks, 2009). One type of support is emotional support, which is shown through listening to a person's problems and being understanding of the situation they find themselves in, basically being able to put yourself in another person's situation (Dunkel Schetter & Brooks, 2009). Emotional support is intangible but nonetheless helpful and important. Emotional support would be considered part of indirect involvement due to the fact that it is considered intangible. Intangible means not being physically present it's more of a thought or an idea, untouchable. Another type of support is instrumental support, which is considered tangible support because it is direct help with a task or a resource/material being given (Dunkel Schetter & Brooks, 2009). Tangible means being physically present, it's touchable and reachable. The next type of support is informational support, also falling under intangible support. Informational support includes giving out information, advice, and guidance (Dunkel Schetter & Brooks, 2009). This type of support would also be considered indirect support.

In addition to social support, education literature describes two types of parental involvement. Through the introduction of different types of parental involvement from different contexts, it aids in showing the similarities and differences among them. School-based involvement is being involved within the context of the school for example, attending parent teacher conferences and partaking in school events such as school dances (Altschul, 2011; Hill & Tyson, 2009). Also, parents are involved in their children's activities through direct involvement at their child's school. Parental school involvement was demonstrated through volunteering, participation, and attendance at school events, such as meetings, conferences, and open houses (Mapp, 2003). On the other hand, home-based involvement pertains to helping with homework and asking how school is going and what is being learned. This involves a parent taking a genuine interest in what is going on in their child's academic life. Furthermore, parents are involved in their children's learning at home through various ways. Means of this support comprise providing them with verbal support, encouragement to excel and meet their full potential by constantly mentioning the importance of being well educated, showing interest in and asking what the child is learning, and generally how things are going in school (Mapp, 2003). In addition, parents reported

praising their child's successes and accomplishments, assisting with homework, ensuring it is completed, and motivating their children to not give up (Mapp, 2003).

Overall, various ways exist for parents to remain involved in their children's education and learning, with some ways appearing more obvious and receiving recognition by teachers than others. However, all different types of parental support and involvement should be taken into account. The current study examines how parent-adolescent dyads perceive parental involvement in the context of organized programs. Note that just like there are many ways parents are involved, there are also various barriers that hinder parental involvement.

Barriers for Parental Involvement

There are many factors that hinder parental involvement in their child's school activities. A study that interviewed parents about how and why they are involved in their child's learning found some of the main external constraints. Restrictors included work schedules; lack of transportation; and other responsibilities and obligations, such as childcare, caring for elderly parents, and parents going back to school (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Mapp, 2003; Zarate, 2007). Additionally, other barriers to involvement include the following: lack of resources, low socio economic status, parents working various jobs, lack of parental education, and lack of understanding of expectations (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). Also, parents would not partake in academic activities and tasks because they felt it was too challenging because they did not know English well enough to communicate with faculty and staff (Carreón, Drake, & Barton, 2005; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Zarate, 2007). Evidently, language barrier and lack of communication between the parents and the school's faculty was a major obstacle for Latino parents. According to Hornby and Lafaele (2011), barriers to parental involvement can be explained through a model including the succeeding: individual parent and family factors (e.g. class ethnicity, and gender), child factors (e.g. age), parent-teacher factors (e.g. differing goals, agendas, and attitude), and societal factors (e.g. demographic and economic). Even though there are barriers to parental support hindering involvement, parents try with great effort to be involved in their children's academic activities.

Reasons for Parental Involvement

Parents reported motivation to play a role in their children's academic success because they understood their involvement would assist their children's educational development (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Mapp, 2003). Additionally, parents feel motivated to become involved through their beliefs of self-efficacy, which means believing taking action and making positive decisions will reinforce and help their children effectively and positively succeed academically (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). Evidently, parents hold expectations and goals for their children to do better in life and most parents expressed their interest in being a key part of that success. Not only does high family involvement encourage favorable

behavior, but it also prevents negative behavior from occurring. A previous study indicated that high levels of families being connected and monitoring can lead children to be less at risk of partaking in risky behavior, such as drugs, partying, alcohol, sex, and violence (Kerr, Beck, Downs Shattuck, Kattar, & Uriburu, 2003). Previous literature shows that most parents know their behavior and support really impacts their youth's behavior and success, which lies as one of the main reason parents work hard to get involved in a child's life.

Besides wanting to be a part of their child's success there are other reasons why parents become involved in their child's activities, such as being invited to become involved, setting a good example of participation, and encouraging their youth to be productive with their time in a safe environment. Previous studies show that when parents are encouraged by teachers or their children to participate they are more likely to be involved in extracurricular activities (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Kerr et al., 2003; Mapp, 2003). Conceptually, parents receiving an invitation to be a part of their children's activities tend to feel more inclined to partake because they feel their presence is welcomed. Moreover, parents knowledgeable about their adolescents' activities are more supportive and encourage their participation (Anderson et al., 2003; Simpkins et al., 2011). Also, children with parents who were active in the community, tend to take part in out-of-school activities (Coulton & Irwin, 2007). Hence, parents actively involved in their community encouraged and set an example for their youth to actively participate in activities. Parents tend to support their child's involvement in out-of-school activities as a way to get them to do something productive with their time and away from the streets (Mapp, 2003). This suggests that parents want their children to be actively involved in activities so that they can positively develop and be less likely to partake in risky behavior.

Ethnic Differences in Perceptions of Parental Involvement

Parents provide support and engagement in regards to their children's activities in different ways. In a qualitative study of nine African American parents, eight White parents, and one Latino parent describes how and why they are involved in their children's education (Mapp, 2003). The mothers in the study that reported volunteering and participating in school committees were ethnically diverse; however more African American mothers described this type of at school involvement than White and Hispanic American mothers (Mapp, 2003). At-school involvement is seen as parents taking an active interest in what their child is learning, as well as areas in need of improvement. An additional way parents display involvement in their child's academics is by visiting the school informally after classes during pick-up time to talk with teachers (Mapp, 2003). During this time, parents show teachers their interest and concern for their child's success in the classroom.

In another qualitative study, Latino parents and their youth describe their perceptions on parental involvement in education. In this study, involvement in academics meant that parents were directly and

indirectly involved with all things having to do with school, such as attending parent-teacher conferences and listening to their child read (Zarate, 2007). Additionally, life participation was described as parents being aware of their child's life, providing advice on life issues, general encouragement, and teaching good morals (Zarate, 2007). However, Latino youth described what they perceived to be beneficial parental involvement, such as success and failure stories, general encouragement, providing transportation, and their parents asking questions about their day (Zarate, 2007). These findings suggest Latino youth perceive support at home or outside the context of school as most valuable to their academic achievement. Too much direct parental involvement was seen by the youth as their parents trying to intrude on their personal space (Zarate, 2007). This implies that Latino adolescents do value their parents' indirect involvement, but at the same time feel they need their own space to grow and develop independently.

Although Latino parents are involved in their child's academics, how they are involved is influenced by their perception of roles and cultural beliefs. Latino parents' perception of the role they play in their child's education is a more indirect approach. Latino parents believe they hold the responsibility of teaching a strong work ethic and respect, as well as ensuring the completion of homework, good behavior, and attendance (Smith, Stern, & Shatrova, 2008; Zarate, 2007). Additionally, Latino parents that were born and raised in their country of origin perceived that it is the teachers' responsibility to teach their children to learn at school. This belief stems from the idea of the teacher as an authority figure in academic learning and contrasts with school lessons becoming disrespectful due to the questioning of a teacher's authority (Mapp, 2003; Smith et al., 2008). It is clear that Latino parents have their own ideas of what being involved means but their perceptions may not be in line with what teachers and faculty consider effective parental involvement. Thus, Mexican American parents may be perceived as uninvolved in their adolescents' education by teachers because they see that they are not involved in school-based activities. However, the line of thought does not acknowledge that Mexican American parents are more likely to be involved in their child's education outside of school, which are not so frequently considered (Altschul, 2011). Additionally, Black mothers have high rates of involvement for helping their children with homework (Hartlep & Ellis, 2010). Teachers and staff do not typically recognize indirect support, but parents perceive this type of support to be beneficial to their children's motivation and success.

Unfortunately, how parents are involved in their child's activities is socially constructed by teachers and school officials. Indications for direct parental involvement or adequate participation in their children's activities at school do not receive legitimate recognition as a result of mostly or only at home parental assistance (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Mapp, 2003; Zarate, 2007). In studies on parental involvement, teacher and Latino parents' expectations and perceptions differed and clashed because

Latino parents had a different understanding of what was expected of them (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Zarate, 2007). Clearly, parents are involved in their child's education one way or another; however, teachers and staff do not recognize other types of support as being as effective as direct involvement.

Overview of Current Study

Overall, the literature on parents covers various aspects, such as types of parental support and involvement, barriers to parental involvement, reasons behind why parents choose to get involved, and youth and parent conceptualization of involvement. One gap is that literature on parental involvement is mainly in the context of school and education. Therefore, at-home and at-school involvement is mainly examined for the impact it has on adolescents' academic achievement (Altschul, 2011; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Mapp, 2003; Zarate, 2007). Additionally, most of these studies focus on one perspective of perceived parental involvement, which is typically from the parents' perspective. There is minimal literature on parental involvement in the context of out-of-school programs (Anderson et al., 2003; Dunn et al., 2003; Fletcher et al., 2000; Outley & Floyd, 2002; Persson et al., 2007; Simpkins et al., 2011). Also absent from the literature are studies regarding parent-adolescent dyad perception on parental engagement in their adolescents' out-of-school programs. Therefore, this work will elucidate different types of parental involvement in youth programs, as well as reveal how parent-adolescents dyads perceive and conceptualize support in out-of-school programs.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Procedure

This study uses data from the Pathways Project, a mixed method, multi-informant study of positive youth development. Youth were participants in 13 out of school and after-school programs; all were involved in individual or joint projects. To obtain geographical diversity, programs were recruited in three study sites (two Midwestern cities and one non-metropolitan area in a Midwestern state). In keeping with the study's larger goals, programs served mainly Latino, European American, and African American youth, with an attempt to balance project content (e.g., arts, technology, leadership, service) across these groups. The larger study followed youth, parents, and program leaders across a single program cycle and involved various forms of data collection. The current analysis focuses on qualitative data obtained from 36 parent-adolescent dyads.

Following IRB-approved procedures, a member of the research team presented information to the youth about the study and gave interested youth a parent information letter that described the study and gave instructions on opting out of the study. These documents were given in both English and Spanish at sites serving Latinos. During the first data collection session, a researcher went over the assent form and answered questions before youth gave written assent. Youth in the interview samples had to complete an additional assent process. During the first data collection session, youth were asked to give parental contact information and (with their permission) one of their parents was asked to participate in the study. Youth all spoke English; parents were given the option of completing the study in either English or Spanish. Youth and parents were interviewed individually by different interviewers and at different times. Participants received modest monetary incentives for each part of the study they completed. Interviews were carried out by graduate students, staff, and faculty members from various disciplines (majority social science) and ethnic backgrounds. All interviewers participated in group trainings on the protocols. Those who interviewed Latino parents were bilingual.

Sample

The current analysis focuses on 36 parent-adolescent dyads: 14 Latino/a (38.9%), 9 African American or Black (25.0%), and 13 European American (36.1%). These dyads were included because both members participated in interviews at the relevant time points and answered the questions of interest.

Youth were 13-18 years old (M = 15.9, SD = 1.2). On average, youth had been in the program for about two years (M = 1.9, SD =1.7). The majority of youth were U.S. born (75%), but about (44.4%) had one or two parents born outside the U.S. The sample of youth included more female participants (n =23, 63.9%) than male participants (n = 13, 36.1%). Originally almost equal numbers of boys (30) and girls (32) were recruited for the interview sample but more boys than girls dropped out of the program before

the second interview, and fewer parents of boys were interviewed, reducing the number of parent-son dyads.

Parents who completed interviews were predominantly females (72.2%) and biological or adoptive parents (97.3%). Two fifths reported being separated, divorced, or single (41.7%). Twelve parents (33.2%) chose to be interviewed in Spanish. Based on parent reports of family income, 30.3% of families earned under $25,000 a year, 24.2% earned between $25,000 and $49,999 and 45.5% earned over $60,000.

Interview Protocols

Interviews consisted of structured open-ended questions designed to encourage interviewers to probe and follow up on experiences described by interviewees. The current study draws on data collected during the second interview for the youth and the first and third interview for the parents, when relevant questions were administered. Parents and youth were individually asked about ways parents are involved in the program and how they feel about the level of parental involvement (See Table 1 for interview questions). Interviews were tape recorded, transcribed, and checked by the original interviewer.

Table 1.

Interview Questions & Probes

Parent Questions	Youth Questions
Time 1	Time 2
Have you participated in activities or events at the program? [If yes] a. What are some of the ways in which you participated? Do you think it's important? How does your child feel about your participation? [If no] b. Is there a reason you haven't participated? Can you tell me about it?	Some parents help youth with ideas or work for program activities and some don't. What has your experience been? How do you feel about the level of your parents' involvement and support? Would you like your parents to be more or less involved than they are? ▪ [If more or less]: Can you tell me why that is? ▪ [If neither]: It sounds like your parents have just the right amount of involvement. How did that come about?
Time 3	
Are there ways you've been involved in child's program activities? Tell me about it. [IF PARENT HAS NOT PARTICIPATED IN PROGRAM ACTIVITIES:] • We're interested in learning why parents might not participate in their children's program activities. Can you tell me some of the reasons you haven't participated? How do you feel about the level of your involvement in your child's program? Would you like to be more or less involved than you are? • [IF MORE OR LESS]: Can you tell me why that is? • [IF NEITHER]: It sounds like you have just the right amount of involvement. How did that come about?	

Analyses

Initially my analyses focused on Latino parents. Then I expanded my analyses to include Latino youth to examine the consistency and/or discrepancy among Latino parent-adolescent dyads. Then I expanded my analyses again to include African American and European American parent-adolescent dyads to examine differences in perceived parental involvement across ethnic groups.

Preliminary Analysis: Latino Parents and Youth

Initially exploratory analysis included broadly coding 7 Latino parent participants' set of interviews for two overarching parental support categories. These categories were identified prior to coding data because they were based around the questions themselves. The first category was parental support at stage of joining the program, which identified how parents did or did not provide support for their youth in joining the program and any limits or conditions set by the parents for their youth joining the program. The second category was parental support and involvement after initial stage of joining. This code identified family support or lack of support since joining the program. This code also includes: What are the different ways of parental support (i.e., encouragement, practical help, etc.) since joining? What is the youth's autonomy vs. dependence on parents on program tasks? What is the parent's involvement or lack of involvement and participation: How do parents get involved? Why parents don't get involved? (Work conflicts/ programs not relevant to them). Passages from youth and parent interviews identified as fitting into these two overarching dimensions were marked in NVivo 9, a qualitative data management program, and extracted into a compiled document (i.e., a data sort).

For the next stage of analysis, I used education literature on different types of parental involvement (at school involvement and at home involvement) to inform my coding, which sensitized my interpretation of the data (Altschul, 2011; Mapp, 2003). Two additional codes were created based on the literature: direct and indirect support. Direct support included involvement at the program site, such as attending meetings, events, and talking to program leaders. On the other hand, indirect support included program involvement at home, such as financial support, asking questions, and driving their child to program activities. These categories were then applied to the 7 parent interviews. An initial codebook was established that includes the codes, definitions, and examples. This analysis revealed that although parents discussed the type of support identified in the literature, most parents did not perceive themselves as providing support to their youth. Therefore, I wanted youth's perspective on parental support in their programs as a way to obtain a holistic understanding of how parental involvement is conceptualized by parents and youth. As a result, I decided to expand my analysis to include adolescents.

For the next stage of analysis, I identified 14 Latino parent-adolescent dyads. Parental involvement described by parents and youth fell into two overarching categories: direct and indirect. These category definitions have been refined from the initial version mentioned earlier. Direct parental involvement was defined as more "hands on" and includes taking part in program activities or being at the program site. This involvement is more evident because the parent is physically present. Indirect parental involvement occurs "behind the scenes" (primarily at home) and includes facilitating the youth's program involvement in verbal, emotional, or instrumental ways. Perceived level of parental involvement was also

examined when youth were asked how they felt about their parents' involvement in their program, the three responses were either good amount, more, or less involvement in the program.

I was interested in examining if the findings from Latino parent-adolescent dyads data applied exclusively to this ethnic group or if similar findings would appear for different ethnic groups. In the Latino sample it was evident that parents and adolescents perceived parental support differently since parents typically reported either being directly involved in the program or not involved in the program, while almost all Latino youth reported experiencing indirect involvement. Therefore, I was interested in exploring if parents and youth from different ethnic backgrounds also reported the same parental involvement discrepancies or if differences existed among ethnic groups.

Current Analysis

For my master's thesis I expanded upon the preliminary analysis to include two other ethnic groups: African Americans and European Americans. At the first stage, the two questions of interest within the youth and parent interviews shown in Table 1 were extracted from NVivo and analyzed. NVivo extracts were coded for the overarching categories (direct, indirect, lack of involvement, good amount, more, less, and reasons for lack of involvement) based mainly off of the two interview questions of interest, prior themes of interest, and preliminary analyses. Open coding was utilized to establish initial coding, which aids in breaking down data so that themes within the overarching categories can be identified and examined (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The interviews were coded in the language they were completed in (English or Spanish) and, the codebook included examples in both languages.

During the second stage of coding, to provide a check on the coding, a bilingual undergraduate second coder was trained and coded for youth and parent transcripts independently under my supervision with the graduate advisor serving as a senior member in case questions arose. The first and second coder met weekly to compare codes, establish consensus, and refine definitions of the categories (Hill et al., 2005), therefore coding was an iterative process. Through this process, the categories developed in the preliminary analysis were refined and operationalized (refer to Table 2 for examples). Sections of the transcripts fitting the identified overarching categories were coded in NVivo, and sorts under each category were created.

Table 2.

Ways Parents Are Involved in their Adolescents' Out-of-School Programs

Types of Parental Involvement	Examples
Direct	Volunteer to help set-up during a program event Attend meeting or events Bring food to meetings Stop by the program site and observe what youth are doing Drive youth to program activities (on-site of the program or sponsored by the program
Indirect	Talk about the program at home Ask questions about the program Give ideas for program projects Give encouraging feedback on program projects Encourage youth's participation in the program/stay in the program Drive youth to complete tasks for program projects (off-site)

At the next stage of analysis an inductive approach was utilized in order to establish emergent patterns within the identified constructs and categories (Braun & Clarke, 2006). One construct is type of parental involvement and its categories include: direct, indirect, lack of involvement (refer to Table 3 for illustrative examples).

Table 3.

Examples of Types of Parental Involvement Sub Codes

Overarching categories	Sub Codes
Direct Parental Involvement	*Active Participator* They always, they're always interested in what I do and what I wanna do so I think they just kinda accepted. and they love coming to everything that happens and even when I was selling tickets I think they came.(Nick, 15, M, White) *Checker* Previously I attended more stuff like that. And I even try to accompany my daughter almost always where I can. Well although sometimes she tells me 'mom but I need to go alone, I'm already old enough no'. I say, ' oh sweetie yes, but it's just that I want to see. Because I want to be with you' … Some occasions it's like very young children it's like they become independent. And Latino parents, we are, as they say, like very overprotective. [Translated] (Juanita, 44, F, Latina) *Contributor* Well, I came with her like I said when they were still in school last year. I came in both some. I got some greens one time, I got some green tomato and uh, I have some coupon and uh, I get some coupon to buy me some if I don't come over she'll get it for me with the coupon and she loves cucumber, so then she come get her cucumber. (Mia, 71, Female, Black)
Indirect Parental Involvement	*Verbal Supporter* Well, if I have ideas I wanna tell the staff about, my mom always encourages me to do it, because she's like go ahead, if no one else does it, you can be the first one to try it out and see if it works. She's always saying, you can never lose anything. At least you know that the 'no' you have it already secured, but what if they say yes. You never know. She's always encouraging me to say what I think will work out. (Isabella, 18, F, Latina) *Emotional Supporter* I found that most of the parents are really supportive in one way or another. Some of them are silent supporters...But they're the ones that just- they're there for encouraging you and pushing you to keep going. (Liliana, 16, F, Latina) *Instrumental Supporter* Well nothing more like I was saying taking her to take her photos. We took her there. She had to go with some of her friends, I do not know where, and also we took her over there. For when she is going to take her things, they give her the camera that's when we take her. [Translated] (Ana, 40, F, Latina) *Informational Supporter* They can tell me what they think about it. Of how - other ways we can reach out to people. And what we can do to make the event better. (Sofia, 14, F, Latina)
Lack of Parental Involvement	N/A

The second construct is level of parental involvement and its categories good amount, more, less, and reasons for lack of parental involvement (refer to Table 4 for illustrative examples). Through this approach sub codes for each overarching category were identified and given descriptive labels. Again, the same bilingual second coder coded youth and parent data for sub categories and a consensus approach was utilized. To maintain confidentiality, youth and parents were given pseudonyms.

Table 4.

Examples of Level of Parental Involvement Sub Codes

Overarching categories	Sub Codes
Good Amount of Parental Involvement	*Autonomy Supporter* It's not a contentious point in the household for sure. You know as long as I keep my step back and she knows it's more about her than about me, we're good. (Annalise, 36, F, Black) *Appreciation for Supporter* My parents are really really really supportive and I you know, I'm really thankful for that.(Alexis, 16, F, Latina) *Good Amount* I think it is fine the way they are doing things. I mean, I think they should stay the exact way, so no change. (Steven, 17, M, White)
More Parental Involvement	*More Directly Involved* I guess I would like them to be more involved in like coming to more events, but, at the same time, I realize that for what they do -like how much they work and stuff- I realize that they're actually really good about it- being supportive. (Liliana, 16, F, Latina) *More Indirectly Involved* She isn't really like involved as I want her to be. She doesn't really give like ideas or anything 'cause whenever I do talk to her about things it's basically about the different things that we've accomplished and not the things that we are basically trying to achieve. (Sidney, 16, M, Black) *More Involved in General* So far I am satisfied. I wish I could be more involved, but I'm just like, my life is so busy right now. (Areli, 40, F, Latina)
Less	*Autonomy* As long as I can do it, I feel like that's enough. There used to be a time where she didn't think I should do it, I wasn't going to do it, but now that I can do mostly what I want, it's fine...Less (Ryan, 16, M, Black)

Table 4 (cont.)

Overarching categories	Sub Codes
Reasons for Lack of Parental Involvement	*Parental Autonomy Building* Well, it's only been a few weeks, so I was letting him get a feel of things. (Abbey, Parent, F, Black) *Program Autonomy Building* Yea, I mean think that they have it well set up. They have been doing it for a long time they have their organization they have who does the set. They engage the kids in either making the set, making the different things. So, I think they primarily put the responsibility on the kids or if there are other staff members or other pupils that help with the plays. They have been in it, in such a long standing role that there hasn't been the necessity to bring others in. (Diana, 46, F, White) *Lack of Information* Because I haven't had any information or anything from my daughter to participate in it yet. Once she finds or once she has something going on, then I would participate in it. (Jan, 47, F, Black) *Lack of Communication* The reason that I have not asked the question nor have they asked that's why (participant laughs)...Lack of communication (participant laughs). [Translated] (Rosa, Parent, F, Latina) *Other Obligations* No because of my busy schedule, I haven't been able to be involved (Dameka, 39, F, Black) *Work conflict* Well maybe yes work especially the schedule that I have from work [Translated] (Pablo, 45, M, Latino) *Lack of Opportunity* Not really any opportunity. Like I say, if opportunity were given, it would largely depend on timing. Like I said, the church nights, if there's ballgame or a swim meet, or something, but I wouldn't be reluctant to doing if there was a good opportunity. (Gregory, 49, M, White) *Lack of Transportation* And with me, it's like harder for transportation right now for me. (Katerina, 37, F, Black)

At the last stage of analysis, another bilingual undergraduate (third coder) was brought on to establish kappa reliability with the overarching coding conducted by the other two coders. During this stage, the third coder and I utilized focused coding by using the already established overarching categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These categories were applied independently by the third coder and me. According to Landis and Koch (1977), interrater reliabilities revealed almost perfect (parent data)

consistency and substantial (youth data) consistency between coders; kappas were: 1.00 (parent, type of parental involvement), .80 (youth, type of parental involvement), .96 (parent, level of parental involvement), and .79 (youth, level of parental involvement). Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved, but when needed I consulted my graduate advisor. Through carrying out this process, different perspectives were taken into account during the analytic process.

Chapter Four: Findings

We examined how parents and their youth described perceiving parental involvement. The results identify two overarching categories type and level of parental involvement. We examine discrepancies and consistencies in parent and adolescent perspectives of parental involvement in the program, as well as differences across ethnic groups.

Perceived Types of Parental Involvement

Direct and indirect involvement. Parents and their adolescents described two main types of parental involvement: direct parental involvement and indirect parental involvement. *Direct parental involvement* is more "hands on" and includes parents taking part in program activities or being at the program site. This involvement is more evident because the parent is physically present. Within direct parental involvement parents and their youth described three sub categories of direct parental involvement: *active participator, checker, and contributor*. *Active participator* describes a parent that is actively involved in their adolescents' out of school program by participating in activities, attending meetings, attending events, and hands on volunteering. *Checker* describes a parent that shows up to the program site to check on their adolescent some of the reasons include: to just observe program activities, to make sure the youth is where they say they are, or to see if their youth needs anything. *Contributor* is a parent that provides time, money, or resources pertaining to the program this includes: transportation to program activities, bringing food or other items to the program, and providing financial support to the program or program products.

Indirect involvement on the other hand occurs "behind the scenes" (primarily at home) and includes facilitating the youth's program involvement in verbal, emotional, or instrumental ways. Within indirect parental involvement, parents and their youth described four sub categories of indirect parental involvement: *verbal supporter, emotional supporter, instrumental supporter,* and *informational supporter*. *Verbal supporter* includes parents that are verbal encouragers and motivate their youth to continue to participate in the program. *Emotional Supporter* is a helpful parent that is described as being encouraging through being supportive of the program, as well as listening to their adolescent talk about the program. *Instrumental supporter* is described as a parent that helps with program related needs such as driving youth around to work on program project off-site and helping their youth at home work on skills they are learning in the program. Finally, an *informational supporter* is described a parent that wants know what is going on in the program; these parents ask their youth questions about the program, as well as, give their youth ideas, opinions, feedback, and advice on the program.

When parents were asked about their involvement in their youth's program the majority described being directly involved (50%), other parents described indirect involvement (8.3%), being both directly and indirectly involved (8.3%), and neither (33.3%). On the other hand, when youth were asked about

how their parents were involved in their youth program the majority of youth described indirect parental involvement (47.2%), other youth reported direct involvement (11.1%), both direct and indirect involvement (16.7%), and neither (25%).

Parent vs. adolescent. The percentages of parents and youth reporting each type of parental involvement is displayed in Table 5. Overall, most participants (66.7% of parents, 75% of youth) reported parental involvement in the program. However, parental involvement was perceived differently by the parents and their youth. Most parents (50%) reported demonstrating direct involvement in the program. On the other hand, most youth (47.2%) reported their parents demonstrating indirect involvement.

Table 5.

Types of Parental Involvement by Ethnic Group

	Youth				Parents			
	Latino	European American	African American	Total	Latino	European American	African American	Total
	n = 14	*n* =13	*n* = 9	*n* = 36	*n* = 14	*n* = 13	*n* = 9	*n* = 36
Direct	0 (0.0%)	3 (23.1%)	1 (11.1%)	4 (11.1%)	5 (35.7%)	9 (69.2%)	4 (44.4%)	18 (50%)
Indirect	7 (50.0%)	4 (30.8%)	6 (66.7%)	17 (47.2%)	2 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (11.1%)	3 (8.3%)
Both	4 (28.6%)	2 (15.4%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (16.7%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (8.3%)
Neither	3 (21.4%)	4 (30.8%)	2 (22.2%)	9 (25%)	5 (35.7%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (44.4%)	12 (33.3%)

There are 5 parent-adolescent mismatch cases where parents reported demonstrating direct parental involvement and their youth reported experiencing indirect parental involvement. For example, some parents discussed how they go to the program site to observe what is going on in the program or go to volunteer at the program whereas the youth described how their parents are involved in their program activities at home or outside of the program site. This pattern is illustrated by Steven's father Ken (46, M, White), who said:

> Yeah, I've been, like I said, I'm a screened adult volunteer so I can be the second set of eyes or the third set of eyes if they have, if one of the instructors, typically they like to have at least two adults be there, or two instructors or and adult and an instructor and they screen volunteer on every line so there's, one of them can be the range officer, one of them can just observe for additional safety and so I routinely am involved in that.

On the other hand, Steven (17, M, White) reported practicing program shooting skills with his parents at their farm.

> They can't do much where we live, but when we go down to our farm, we bought a clay target thrower, I don't know what they call that thing, a launcher for the clay pigeons. And we go down to our farm and practice shooting down there for shotgun. If we have .22 ammo I use that and set up clay targets down by our fire pile place. And then I come back to the house, which is 50 yards, 25 maybe I am not sure. I practice with that.

Additionally, more parents (33.3%) than youth (25%) reported lack of involvement. In this case there are 7 parent-adolescent mismatch cases where parents reported not being involved in the program and their youth reported experiencing some type of parental involvement either directly, indirectly, or both. Typically, when parents perceive they are not involved they simply respond "no" when asked if they are involved in their children's program activities. However, Ryan's mother LaDonna (34, F, Black) went on to further explain that she knew about the activities and events going in the program, but just never participated in them.

> Um, I've never participated in any of the events. They have gone on like trips at the end of the year...They've gone to Six Flags. Um… Ryan went on a trip with them with like 2 other students to Ohio….Um…but I've never gone anywhere with Nutrition Rocks before.

On the other hand, Ryan (16, M, Black) describes his mother as being the type of parent that just shows up randomly at the program site to check up on her son.

> Uhh, I am one of those guys who's always embarrassed when his mom comes. So…yeah. Sometimes she'll happen to just show up or she'll drop my sister off for some reason. She's not even in the program, but she'll be there with the kids. So—...Just to see if I'm actually there. She's one of those always in your face type of moms. She thinks I'm never where I say I am so she finds, she feels the need to follow me and see where I am.

Through these examples it becomes evident that parents and their youth perceive parental involvement in the program differently. In the first case, Steven's father reports he is directly involved in the program as a volunteer, while Steven reports how his parents indirectly help him practice his shooting at their farm away from the program. Therefore, in these cases it seems like parents only report their direct active involvement at the program site because that is what seems to matter. However, even though Steven's father is actively involved at the program the type of involvement that Steven reports on is practicing program skills with parents at home. At the same time, if a parent does not feel they have actively been involved (e.g. volunteering like Steven's father) then they report that they are not involved in the program like Ryan's mother. However, Ryan perceives his mother's physical presence of just showing up at the program to check up on him as involvement.

Ethnic differences. The most reported type of involvement by parents was direct parental involvement, either alone (*n* = 18, 50%) or in combination with indirect involvement (*n* = 3, 8.3%). More European American parents (*n* = 10, 76.9%) reported being directly involved in their adolescents' program than Latino (*n* = 7, 50%) and African American (*n* = 4, 44.4%) parents. The most frequently reported sub category by parents was active participator (*n* = 14, 66.7%). Latino and European American parents were more likely to report being active participators than African American parents (see Table 6). For example, William's (16, M, White) mother Stacy (36, F, White) demonstrates how actively involved she is in attending all her son's program performances.

> Every play. We go to at least one performance. If I am off I go to every performance. So, even if it's played three nights in a row, I'll go to all three. ---But, last year whenever he was in a different play, I did go four nights.

Table 6.

Direct Parental Involvement Sub Categories by Ethnic Group

	Parents			
	Latino	European American	African American	Total
	n = 7	*n* = 10	*n* = 4	*n* = 21
Active Participator	6 (85.7%)	6 (60%)	2 (50%)	14 (66.7%)
Checker	1 (14.3%)	2 (20%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (14.3%)
Contributor	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (50%)	2 (9.5%)
More than one	0 (0.0%)	2 (20%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (9.5%)

On the other hand, the most reported type of involvement by youth was indirect parental involvement either alone (*n* = 17, 47.2%) or in combination with direct involvement (*n* = 6, 16.7%). Almost all of Latino youth (*n* = 11, 71.4%) and African American youth (*n* = 6, 66.7%), as well as, about half of European American youth (*n* = 6, 46.2%) described their parents being indirectly involved in their youth programs. Youth (*n* = 7, 30.4%) most frequently described their parents being emotional supporters. In terms of ethnic differences, Latino youth were more likely to describe their parents as informational supporters by giving their children ideas, advice, and feedback on things related to the program, as well as asking about what is going on in the program (see Table 7). For example, Valeria (15,

F, Latina) describes how her parents attempted to give her an idea for a project she working on in the program.

> I told them we were doing neighborhoods in Chicago and they gave me the idea, 'you should go to Pilsen, they have a lot of murals you can take pictures of that'. I'm like, that's a good idea but I'm already working on something else.

Table 7.

Indirect Parental Involvement Sub Categories by Ethnic Group

	Youth			
	Latino	European American	African American	Total
	n = 11	*n* = 6	*n* = 6	*n* = 23
Verbal Supporter	2 (18.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (33.3%)	4 (17.4%)
Informational Supporter	5 (45.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (21.7%)
Emotional Supporter	1 (9.1%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	7 (30.4%)
Instrumental Supporter	1 (9.1%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (13%)
More than one	2 (18.2%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (17.4%)

Perceived Level of Involvement

Good, more, or less. When youth and parents were asked how they felt about level of parental involvement in the program they were suggested two responses: more or less involved and if they responded neither of those responses they were probed about the parent having just the right amount of involvement. Within each level of parental involvement sub categories were identified. *More parental involvement* included youth or parent describing wanting more direct parental involvement in the program (e.g. volunteering, coming to events, participating in activities), more indirect parental involvement (e.g. giving ideas and being more informed), and more involvement in general. For *good amount of parental involvement*, parents and youth described parents as being an autonomy supporter and youth as having appreciation for support, as well as good amount of involvement in general. *Less parental involvement* was described by a parent as wanting to be less involved to give their adolescent their own space and by

two adolescents as wanting less parental involvement because they wanted to things on their own and the program was their space.

When parents were asked about perceived level of involvement in their youth's programs the majority of parents described having a good amount of involvement (*n* =12, 33.3%) or parents were not asked the question (*n* =12, 33.3%). Other parents described wanting to be more involved (*n* = 8, 22.2%), one (2.8%) reported wanting to be less involved, and three parents (8.3%) provided uncodable data. Similarly, when youth were asked about how they felt about the level of their parents involvement, the majority of youth described their parents as having a good amount of involvement (*n* = 23, 63.9%), other youth described wanting more parental involvement (*n* = 9, 25%), two youth (5.6%) reported wanting less parental involvement, and two other youth (5.6%) reported uncodable data (refer to Table 8).

Table 8.

Level of Parental Involvement by Ethnic Group

	Youth				Parents			
	Latino	European American	African American	Total	Latino	European American	African American	Total
	n = 14	*n* = 13	*n* = 9	*n* = 36	*n* = 14	*n* = 13	*n* = 9	*n* = 36
Good Amount	7 (50.0%)	12 (92.3%)	4 (44.4%)	23 (63.9%)	3 (21.4%)	7 (53.8%)	2 (22.2%)	12 (33.3%)
More	5 (35.7%)	1 (7.7%)	3 (33.3%)	9 (25%)	6 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (22.2%)	8 (22.2%)
Less	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (22.2%)	2 (5.6%)	1 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.8%)
Uncodable	2 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.6%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (11.1%)	3 (8.3%)
Question Not Asked	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (21.4%)	5 (38.5%)	4 (44.4%)	12 (33.3%)

Parent vs. adolescent. Most participants (58.3% of parents, 94.4% of youth) reported perceived level of parental involvement. The most frequently reported level of parental involvement by parents and their adolescents was good amount of involvement (33.3% of parents, 59% of youth). The most reported sub category by parents (66.7%) and youth (47.8%) was appreciation for support (refer to Table 9). This indicates that youth do seem to appreciate the level of involvement their parents demonstrate in the program and their parents notice it too. For example, Amanda's mother Diana (46, F, White) describes

attending her daughter's practice and how she felt her daughter really enjoyed her presence at the program.

> [Amanda] and I have a very good relationship and she, I did actually come to their practices a couple of times and she loved it. It was very welcoming, come meet my friends come see what I am doing. And so I felt very welcomed.

Similarly, Amanda (16, F, White) describes that her mother has the perfect level of involvement. What is interesting about this case is that mother and daughter both perceive the same level of parental involvement but are describing two different types of involvement: the parent is describing direct involvement and the youth is describing indirect involvement. Amanda (16, F, White) says "my mom's involvement is just a perfect level to me. She doesn't have to ask about how the play was. I just tell her, but she'll ask if there's anything that she can do to help."

Table 9.

Good Amount of Parental Involvement sub Categories by Ethnic Group

	Youth				Parents			
	Latino	European American	African American	Total	Latino	European American	African American	Total
	n = 7	*n* = 12	*n* = 4	*n* = 23	*n* = 3	*n* = 7	*n* = 2	*n* = 12
Autonomy Supporter	2 (28.6%)	1 (8.3%)	3 (75%)	6 (26.1%)	1 (7.7%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (50%)	4 (33.3%)
Appreciation for Supporter	4 (57.1%)	7 (58.3%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (47.8%)	2 (15.4%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (50%)	8 (66.7%)
Good Amount	1 (14.3%)	4 (33.3%)	1 (25%)	6 (26.1)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

The second most reported level of parental involvement by parents and their adolescents was more involvement (22.2% of parents, 25% of youth). There were five cases in which parents and youth agreed on wanting more parental involvement in the program. When comparing the sub categories for consistency or discrepancy, it was seen that among those five cases only two of the dyads agreed on wanting more direct parental involvement in the program. These parents and youth described wanting more of a physical parent presence at the program site. For example, Juanita (44, F, Latina) explains that if there were an opportunity, she would like to participate and work with her daughter. Similarly, her daughter Eloisa (15, F, Latina) describes wanting her mother to volunteer more at the program.

> More…I don't know, I feel like she should volunteer and come and be in the events because she's so like friendly and she's always so positive about things. She has a really strong positive energy

and I feel like she would be a great volunteer here. Not only because she's my mom, but she's a great person and she brings a lot to people.

The other three cases were mismatches between sub categories. In two cases, parents described wanting to be more directly involved in the program, while their youth reported wanting more indirect involvement. For instance, Adriana's mother Rosa (F, Latina) explains that she would like to participate in her daughter's program. On the other hand, Adriana (15, F, Latina) explains that she would like more involvement, so that her mother would know what she is doing.

Ethnic differences. African American youth (*n* = 2, 22.2%) are the only ethnic group among adolescents that reported wanting less parental involvement because they wanted to do things on their own. For example, Jaimin (16, Male, African American) says:

> Probably less involved because I like going through things by myself. I mean like something, if it's too much I'm like, "yo can you help me out." Other than that usually if it's stuff I can handle I rather go through it myself.

More European American (*n* =7, 53.8%) parents reported good amount of involvement than African American (*n* = 2, 22.2%) and Latino (*n* = 3, 21.4%) parents. European American parents tend to report how much their youth appreciates their good level of involvement in the program. For example, Victoria's (15, F, White) mother Amber (39, F, White) says:

> I think she appreciates it. She might get tired of it once in a while if we're reminding her of something over and over again but I think for the most part she appreciates our participation and she's glad we're there.

On the other hand, more Latino (*n* = 6, 42.9%) parents reported wanting to be more involved in their youth's program if possible than African American (*n* = 2, 22.2%) and European American parents (*n* = 0.0%). Latino parents report that if they had the opportunity to be more involved they would want to be. For example, Ava (42, F, Latina) says "so yes I would like to do it, I would like to do it, but I cannot. Unfortunately, that is why I cannot participate" *[Translated]*. Similarly, Areli (40, F, Latina) explains that she wishes she could be more involved, but cannot because her life is so busy right now.

Reasons for lack of parental involvement. A little more than half of parents (52.8%) reported a reason for lack of involvement in the program because they reported not being involved in the program. The answer led to a follow up question concerning a reason behind why they were not involved in the program. Some parents reported a reason for lack of involvement even though they reported being involved in the program either directly, indirectly, or both. The other 47.2% (*n* =17) of parents were not asked the follow-up question because they reported being involved in the program. Additionally, Latino parents (*n* = 10, 71.4%) were more likely to report a reason for not being involved in their youth's out-of-school programs than African American (*n* = 6, 66.7%) and European American (*n* =3, 23.1%) (refer to

Table 10).

Table 10.

Reasons for Lack of Parental Involvement by Ethnic Group

	Parents			
	Latino	European American	African American	Total
	n = 14	*n* = 13	*n* = 9	*n* = 36
Reported Reason	10 (71.4%)	3 (23.1%)	6 (66.7%)	19 (52.8%)
Question Not Asked	4 (28.6%)	10 (76.9%)	3 (33.3%)	17 (47.2%)

There were eight reported reasons for lack of parental involvement in the program: *parental autonomy building, program autonomy building, lack of information, lack of communication, other obligations, work conflict, lack of opportunity, and lack of transportation*. In terms of program opportunities for participation, youth leaders were asked if parents are allowed to observe a program session and more than half of the leaders (66.7%) responded yes. Additionally, when asked if the program has opportunities for parents to volunteer or participate, more than half of the leaders (58.3%) responded yes. As shown in Table 11, the two most reported reasons for lack of parental involvement are *other obligations* (*n* = 4, 21.1%) and *work conflict* (*n* = 4, 21.1%).

Table 11.

Reasons for Lack of Parental Involvement Sub Categories by Ethnic Group

	Parents			
	Latino	European American	African American	Total
	n = 10	*n* = 2	*n* = 6	*n* = 19
Other Obligations	2 (20%)	1 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (21.1%)
Work Conflict	4 (26.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (21.1%)
Parental Autonomy Building	1 (10%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (15.8%)
More than one Reason Reported	1 (10%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (15.8%)
Lack of Communication	2 (20%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (10.5%)
Program Autonomy Building	0 (0.0%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.3%)
Lack of Information	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (5.3%)
Lack of Opportunity	0 (0.0%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.3%)

Ten out of fourteen Latino parents reported a reason for lack of participation. Latino parents reported work conflict, other obligations, lack of communication and trying to give youth their space (parental autonomy building) as reasons for lack of participation in the program. Additionally, Latino parents reported work conflict (*n* = 4, 26.7%) as a reason for lack of involvement more frequently than African American (*n* = 0, 0.0%) and European American (*n* = 0, 0.0%) parents. Pablo (45, M, Latino) describes having a very hectic daily schedule that prevents him from being more involved in activities and events happening in his youth's program.

> Well, maybe it is work more than anything the scheduling that I have for work because sometimes I just started taking English classes but since I have a schedule of 11 to 7:30 or 8 at night then I find it a little difficult because the classes are regularly in the evening.

Six out of nine African American parents reported reasons for lack of participation; they reported that the program was mainly for the youth (parental autonomy building), other obligations, work conflict, not being informed of participation opportunities, and lack of transportation. Elissia (38, F, Black) describes her conflicting hectic schedule that includes her attending school, working, being a single parent, and having two other children that have their own activities. This mother makes it clear on the difficulty in attempting to find a balance and make time to attend program events.

> No, sometimes, as I said, with me being in school too, then I have, I have two other sons so it's like, honestly, and I'm a single parent because me and the kids' dad, we divorced back in 2002. So it's a juggling act! And sometimes, I hate to say it, but if I have somebody that has something going on over here and somebody over here I literally have to bounce back and forth and at the time with one vehicle…. I know he might really want me to be at some things, but 1. I have to make a living and keep a roof over our head. He knows I have to like—if I could clone myself it'd probably be an excellent thing, but I can't. And he knows he has to split that time because I have another son—well I have an older son and then I have a younger son. So he knows it's a balancing act, so he's okay with it, but I know some times it's more like "Oh I wish you could make it." But when duty calls, he understands. Work or school conflict for me.

In comparison to the other two ethnic groups, European American parents were less likely to report reasons for lack of parental involvement than Latino and African American parents. Three out of thirteen European American parents reported reasons for lack of parental involvement in the program, these parents reported other obligations, lack of opportunity, and the program clearly stating the purpose lying mainly for the youth (program autonomy building). Jordan (50, F, White) describes how there really hasn't been a lot of opportunities to participate in the program. When there has been an opportunity the parent was at work, so she sent another family member in her place.

> Yeah, I just don't think there is a lot of opportunities in [program], you know…Yeah, I was at work I remember, or had something to do that day. So, and my mom has always taken a very active role in her grandkids' lives. So, jumps at any opportunity to do things like that, which is great.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Parents motivate, and encourage their youth in various ways to participate in out-of-school programs. The current study explored adolescents' and parents' perceptions of type of parental involvement and level of parental involvement in the programs. This study's findings contribute to the literature on parent-adolescent dyads' perceptions of types of parental involvement within the context of youth programs.

Consistent with Mapp's (2003) conceptualization of parental engagement in children's learning, the majority of parents in the current study participated in their youth's out-of-school programs. I identified two types of parental involvement: direct parental involvement (parental involvement at the program site) and indirect parental involvement (parental involvement at home or off program site). These types of involvement in youth programs are consistent with those described in prior research on parental involvement in youth's learning at-school and at-home involvement. However, it is not an exact comparison because previous studies have typically examined types of parental involvement within the context of school and education (Altschul, 2011; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Mapp, 2003; Zarate, 2007). The current study applies this framework to the context of youth programs instead. Previous studies that focused on parental involvement in the program reported on parental action in these cases. If parents are not actively participating in youth's activities, they still provide support and permission to participate, as well as encouragement and support for their youth's participation in activities (Dunn et al., 2003; Fletcher et al., 2000; Outley & Floyd, 2002; Simpkins et al., 2011). In the current study, these action run similar to what youth described as indirect parental involvement. The majority of youth reported experiencing emotional (e.g. encouragement, listening) or informational support (e.g. advice, feedback) from their parents. Direct and indirect parental involvement are both important types of involvement. While direct involvement is the more obvious and tangible type of involvement to teachers and youth leaders, indirect involvement is less obvious and intangible to those (teachers and leaders) that socially construct what it means to be an involved parent. However, indirect parental involvement seems to be apparent enough to the youth that receive this type of support.

In the current study, sub categories were identified for the two overarching categories of direct and indirect parental involvement. For direct parental involvement three subcategories were identified: active participator, checker, and contributor. However, it is important to remember that some programs had little to no opportunities for direct involvement in the program. The subcategories found in the current study are consistent with how previous studies have described direct parental involvement. For example, the subcategory active participator is consistent with how Dunn and colleagues described parents being actively involved through driving youth to their activities, and attending or volunteering in activities (Dunn et al., 2003). Additionally, Outley and Floyd (2002) described parental involvement as

parents contributing resources such as equipment and money, monitoring their youth's activities by accompanying their child, which are consistent examples of the two sub categories contributor and checker, respectively. My findings extended on this literature because I examined a diverse sample. I was able to identify ethnic differences in reported direct parental involvement. For example, I found that more European American parents reported being directly involved in their adolescents' program than Latino and African American parents. Additionally, Latino and European American parents were more likely to report being active participators than African American parents. This suggests that parents, especially European American parents, are more likely to report being directly involved in their adolescents' youth programs. As mentioned previously, direct involvement is the more obvious type of involvement that parents felt they are expected to engage in, which may explain why it is the most frequently reported type of involvement. Parents tend to either report that they are actively involved or not involved; there does not seem to be an intermediate when it comes to parents' parental involvement report.

For indirect parental involvement, four sub categories were identified: verbal supporter, emotional supporter, informational supporter, and instrumental supporter. These subcategories are consistent with the different types of social support (emotional support, instrumental support, and informational support) described by Dunkel Schetter and Brooks (2009). For example, emotional support is described as listening to a person and being understanding. This type of support is intangible but helpful and important. This is consistent with the way an emotional supporter is described in the current study. The current description involves a helpful parent that is described as being encouraging through support of the program and listening to their adolescent talk about the program. Another type of support described is instrumental support, which is considered tangible because the support comprises direct help with a task or a resource/material being given (Dunkel Schetter & Brooks, 2009). Similarly in the current study, an instrumental supporter is described as a parent that helps with program-related needs. These needs include driving youth around to work on an off-site program project and helping their youth outside the program work on skills they are learning in the program. The last type of support is informational support which includes giving out information, advice, and guidance (Dunkel Schetter & Brooks, 2009). This support type runs in line with how an informational supporter is described. This supporter attempts the following: knowing what is going on in the program; asking youth questions about the program; and giving youth ideas, opinions, feedback, and/or advice on the program. Furthermore, previous studies suggest parental support and encouragement influences youth's motivation and participation in organized activities (Anderson et al., 2003; Persson et al., 2007; Simpkins et al., 2011). Youth also reported verbal support, in addition to the previously mentioned emotional support for the program. Verbal support concerns parents that are verbal encouragers and motivate their youth to continue to participate in the program. This suggests that parental involvement can positively influence youth to actively participate in

youth programs. Although direct and indirect involvement are two different types of parental involvement, this does not suggest one type exists superior to the other.

Findings indicated discrepancies in how parents and adolescents perceived types of parental involvement in youth programs. This is in line with Kanters, Bocarro, and Casper's (2008) dyadic study showing the parent and their child disagreed on measures of parental support and parental pressure in their child's sports. The study reported parents perceiving significantly less pressure than reported by their child. Additionally, parents disagreed on general feelings about hockey skills; children reported slightly lower scores than their parents (Kanters, Bocarro, & Casper, 2008). This indicates that parents and their children tend to perceive situations and experiences differently. In this case, parents tended to report in favor of the more positive response. For example, parents perceived less pressure on youth and perceived their youth to be more skilled than their youth perceived themselves to be. In the current analysis, the majority of parents reported being directly involved, while the majority of adolescents reported that their parents were indirectly involved in their youth programs. As previously mentioned, parents seem to report direct involvement more because they feel that is the type of involvement expected of them by the youth leaders, a result of being the most evident type of involvement to public eyes. On the other hand, youth seem to value indirect involvement over direct involvement. This is consistent with Zarate (2007), students reported placing more importance on the motivation and emotional support their parents provided them. Furthermore, these students reported that they felt at-home involvement was more important than their parents being physically involved by volunteering at school because they viewed at-school involvement as their parents intruding in the youth's space (Zarate, 2007).

There was more consistency with how parents and adolescents perceived level of parental involvement. This exhibits more agreement between the youth and their parents about the level of parental involvement; parent-adolescent dyads for the most part reported the same level of parental involvement. The youth and their parents seemingly had a good relationship and understanding about the level of parental involvement appropriate for the program. For the most part, parents remained as involved as the youth wanted. Parents were careful not to overstep their boundaries and remember that it is about the youth, not about them. In the current study, the majority of parents and youth both reported that parents had a good amount of involvement. However, rather than mainly reporting the need for space and autonomy, most youth and parents reported that the youth appreciated parents' level of involvement. Larson and colleagues found that youth reported wanting a limited amount of parental involvement in their youth programs. In addition, parents were autonomy supporters and respected the level of involvement the youth wanted (Larson et al., 2007). Larson and colleagues found youth reported wanting limited parental involvement, in comparison to the current study finding youth more frequently reported appreciating their parents' level of participation (Larson et al., 2007). However, the current study is in line

with Larson and colleagues in terms of an understanding between parents and youth about what level of involvement is appropriate (Larson et al., 2007). This indicates that parents and youth do agree with each other on some level. Seemingly, this stems from good parent-adolescent relationships and respect for autonomy. By utilizing parent-adolescent dyadic data it was easier to see where youth and parents were agreeing and disagreeing. The data therefore provided a clearer and in-depth look into the juxtaposition of parent-adolescent perspectives.

In the current study, parents from all three ethnic groups described being directly involved in their adolescents' youth programs. However, European American parents more frequently reported being directly involved compared to the other ethnic groups. European American described being active participators by participating in activities, attending meetings, attending events, and hands-on volunteering. Similarly, in Mapp's (2003) study mothers from all three ethnic groups (African American, White, and Hispanic American) reported volunteering and participating in school activities. In this study, African American mothers reported being more involved in at school activities than white and Hispanic mothers (Mapp, 2003). This indicates that parents from different ethnic groups make an effort to be directly involved in their youth's activities within the context of school and youth programs. However, it is important to note that some programs just have more opportunities available for parents to participate. In the current study, a parent mentioned that they are not very involved because they feel the program is set up for the youth to do things on their own, thus no need for parental involvement.

On the other hand, youth from all three ethnic groups described receiving indirect parental involvement in relation to their youth programs, such as emotional support (e.g. being supportive of the program) and informational support (e.g. giving advice or ideas about program projects). In addition, Latino youth more frequently described these types of indirect parental involvement than European American and African American youth. These findings are consistent with Zarate's (2007) findings on Latino youth describing at home parental involvement in relation to their education, such as general encouragement and asking questions about their day. This indicates that Latino youth seem to acknowledge, value, and appreciate parental support and involvement outside of school and youth programs. This may be because Latino youth are aware of their parents' barriers and reasons for not being able to be directly involved in their programs. Therefore, the youth are appreciative of any type of parental involvement they receive, even if not the tangible kind of involvement.

In terms of reasons for why parents are not involved or lack involvement in their youth's programs, parents reported various reasons: lack of information, lack of communication, other obligations, work conflict, lack of opportunity, and lack of transportation. These barriers to parental involvement are consistent with those mentioned in previous studies describing factors that hinder parental involvement in children's school activities (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Mapp, 2003; Zarate,

2007). Although language barriers were not reported in the current study as a reason for lack of involvement like in previous studies (Carreón et al., 2005; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Zarate, 2007), it might explain why the only two parents that reported lack of communication between them and the program were Spanish-speaking parents. This might suggest that youth programs need to do more outreach. These measures may help to ensure that parents that have less knowledge about what youth programs are and speak a different language remain well informed of what the program is about and what is going on.

Limitations

The current study had limitations such as the small sample size of 36 parent-adolescent dyads. Overall, for a qualitative study the sample size was good. Furthermore, the sample was large enough to examine how parent-adolescent dyads perceive parental involvement in youth programs. However, the sample was not large enough to examine variation between youth and parent characteristics. Thus, once I started examining ethnic differences the sample did not appear large enough. Multiple categories and subcategories while having some parents fit into more than one category affected the appearance of results. Thus the sample seemed small or as if some parents did not fit a certain subcategory, but in reality this occurred to parents reporting more than one subcategory. I was still able to identify ethnic differences within overarching categories and some subcategories. For future research, either more dyads can be included in the qualitative study or it could be a mixed methods study. If the following, only a subset of parent-adolescent dyads may be included in the qualitative portion and a much larger sample is included in the quantitative sample. Another limitation pertained to the sample not being generalizable because the study was conducted in two states in the Midwest. However, the data was collected in a range of urban, suburban, and rural programs across three communities. This sampling approach was utilized to help offset this limitation. For future research, it would be interesting to collect data from other parts of the U.S. to examine if there is any other factors, such as space, that play a role in differences or similarities in the way parents and youth perceive parental involvement. Finally, the last limitation was data corpus issues. One issue was that the analysis was limited to only two questions of interest. The second issue is that almost half of the parents were not asked the second question about how they felt about level of parental of involvement in the program; therefore parent perspectives were missing. For future research, it would be beneficial to focus on a section or subset of questions of at least three questions from the interview in case there is a lot of missing data for one question.

Implications

The current findings enhance our understanding of parent-adolescent perceptions of parental involvement in youth programs, and have implications for practice, research, and theory. Parental support and encouragement influences youth's motivation and participation in organized activities (Anderson et

al., 2003; Simpkins et al., 2011), and the current findings reveal how parents are involved in their youth's activities, as well as, how youth perceive parental involvement. Some parents are actively involved in their youth's program at the program site, while other parents are involved in their youth's activities off-site. Thus there are different ways parents are involved in their youth's activities, and both types should be acknowledged and valued by youth leaders. However, adolescents seem to describe, appreciate, and acknowledge indirect involvement more frequently than their parents. Youth programs and leaders should be clear about parental involvement expectations. Therefore, I recommend that all youth programs have a first meeting introducing parents and youth to the program. The introduction would be a good time to make expectations clear and acknowledge the different types of parental involvement. Importance lies in the ability of programs to effectively communicate with parents about expectation for parental participation (Carreón et al., 2005; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Zarate, 2007), especially in regards to parents who may be unfamiliar with youth programs (Mapp, 2003; Smith et al., 2008). When parents are aware about their adolescents' activities they are more supportive and encourage their participation (Anderson et al., 2003; Simpkins et al., 2011).

The current study also contributes to research on parent-adolescent perceptions of parental involvement in youth program. Adolescents perceive their parents as being engaged in their out-of-school program activities in various ways, both through direct program involvement and (more frequently) in indirect ways. Parental involvement is perceived differently among youth and parents, with parents discounting the indirect ways they support their children's program activities. This can be further researched to determine whether parents are less likely to report being indirectly involved because they do not perceive indirect involvement as a valid form of involvement or because parents and adolescents are trying to find a balance in parental involvement during this age period. There is a need to recognize the multiples forms parental engagement may take, and incorporate this information into future research (e.g., studies of youth program participation). Another interesting aspect that can be examined for future research is why parents think it is important or not important to get involved in their adolescents' programs.

Findings offer insight into how parent-adolescent dyads perceptions of parental involvement in the program vary by ethnic group and between the youth and their parents. This study suggests that while parents perceive that they are directly involved in their youth's programs, their youth perceive that parents are indirectly involved in their program activities. Findings highlight how parents participate in their youth's programs and what inhibits their participation. This can be used to guide future research on factors that impact youth participation in out-of-school programs.

References

Altschul, I. (2011). Parental involvement and the academic achievement of Mexican American youths: What kinds of involvement in youths' education matter most? *Social Work Research, 35*(3), 159-170. doi: 10.1093/swr/35.3.159

Anderson, J. C., Funk, J. B., Elliott, R., & Smith, P. H. (2003). Parental support and pressure and children's extracurricular activities: Relationships with amount of involvement and affective experience of participation. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 24*(2), 241. doi: 10.1016/s0193-3973(03)00046-7

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3,* 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Carreón, G. P., Drake, C., & Barton, A. C. (2005). The importance of presence: Immigrant parents' school engagement experiences. *American Educational Research Journal, 42*(3), 465-498. doi: 10.3102/00028312042003465

Coakley, J. (2006). The good father: Parental expectations and youth sports. *Leisure Studies, 25*(2), 153-163. doi: 10.1080/02614360500467735

Coulton, C., & Irwin, M. (2007). Children's participation in out-of-school activities: The impact of family and neighborhood. No. 5. Cleveland, OH: Schubert Center for Child Studies.

Dunkel Schetter, C., & Brooks, K. (2009). The nature of social support. In H. T. Reis and S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relationships* (pp. 1565-1570). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi: 10.4135/9781412958479.n515

Dunn, J. S., Kinney, D. A., & Hofferth, S. L. (2003). Parental ideologies and children's after-school activities. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46*(10), 1359–1386. doi: 10.1177/0002764203046010006

Fawcett, L. M., Garton, A. F., & Dandy, J. (2009). Role of motivation, self-efficacy and parent support in adolescent structured leisure activity participation. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 61*(3), 175-182. doi: 10.1080/00049530802326792

Fletcher, A. C., Elder, G. H. J., & Mekos, D. (2000). Parental influences on adolescent involvement in community activities. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 10*, 29-48. doi: 10.1207/sjra1001_2

Gonzalez-DeHass, A. R., Willems, P. P., & Holbein, M. F. D. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review, 17*(2), 99-123. doi: 10.1007/s10648-005-3949-7

Hartlep, N. D., & Ellis, A. L. (2010). Are household income, gender, And race important in shaping parental involvement in children's education? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Education Research Association, Rocky Hill, CT.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 196-205. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.196

Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: a meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, *45*(3), 740. doi: 10.1037/a0015362

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, J. M., Sandler, H. M., Whetsel, D., Green, C. L., Wilkins, A. S., & Closson, K. (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal*, *106*(2), 105-130. doi: 10.1086/499194

Hornby, G., & Lafaele, R. (2011). Barriers to parental involvement in education: An explanatory model. *Educational Review*, *63*(1), 37-52. doi: 10.1080/00131911.2010.488049

Kanters, M. A., Bocarro, J., & Casper, J. (2008). Supported or pressured? An examination of agreement among parent's and children on parent's role in youth sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *31*(1), 64.

Kerr, M. H., Beck, K., Downs Shattuck, T., Kattar, C., & Uriburu, D. (2003). Family involvement, problem and prosocial behavior outcomes of Latino youth. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, *27*(Supplement 1), S55-S65. doi: 10.5993/ajhb.27.1.s1.6

Knight, C. J., Neely, K. C., & Holt, N. L. (2011). Parental behaviors in team sports: how do female athletes want parents to behave?. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *23*(1), 76-92. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2010.525589

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, *33*, 159-174. doi: 10.2307/2529310

Larson, R., Pearce, N., Sullivan, P., & Jarrett, R. L. (2007). Participation in youth programs as a catalyst for negotiation of family autonomy with connection. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *36*, 31-45. doi: 10.1007/s10964-006-9133-7

Leff, S. S., & Hoyle, R. H. (1995). Young athletes' perceptions of parental support and pressure. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *24*(2), 187-203. doi: 10.1007/bf01537149

Little, P. M. D., Wimer, C., & Weiss, H. B. (2008). After school programs in the 21st century: Their potential and what it takes to achieve it. In Harvard Family Research Project (Ed.), *Issues and opportunities in out-of-school time evaluation, Vol. 10* (pp. 1–12). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Mapp, K. L. (2003). Having their say: Parents describe why and how they are engaged in their children's learning. *School Community Journal*, *13*(1), 35-64.

Outley, C. W., & Floyd, M. F. (2002). The home they live in: Inner city children's views on the influence of parenting strategies on their leisure behavior. *Leisure Sciences*, *24*, 161–179. doi:10.1080/01490400252900130

Persson, A., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2007). Staying in or moving away from structured activities: Explanations involving parents and peers. *Developmental Psychology*, *43*(1), 197. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.43.1.197

Pittman, K. J., Irby, M., Yohalem, N., & Wilson-Ahlstrom, A. (2004). Blurring the lines for learning: The role of out-of-school programs as complements to formal learning. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *2004*(101), 19-41. doi: 10.1002/yd.71

Riggs, N. R., & Medina, C. (2005). The “Generacion Diez” after-school program and Latino parent involvement with schools. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, *26*(6), 471-484. doi: 10.1007/s10935-005-0009-5

Simpkins, S. D., Vest, A. E., & Price, C. D. (2011). Intergenerational continuity and discontinuity in Mexican-origin youths' participation in organized activities: Insights from mixed-methods. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *25*(6), 814-824. doi:10.1037/a0025853

Smith, J., Stern, K., & Shatrova, Z. (2008). Factors inhibiting Hispanic parents' school involvement. *Rural Educator*, *29*(2), 8-13.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990*). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zarate, M. E. (2007). Understanding Latino parental involvement in education: Perceptions, expectations, and recommendations. *Tomas Rivera Policy Institute*. Retrieved from http://www.trpi.org/PDFs/TW%20REPORT.pdf