

EFFECT OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN GOMOA EAST, GHANA

Mark Quansah

University of Education, Winneba

quansahmark@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study was designed to examine the effect of parental involvement on the academic performance of private and public junior high schools in the Gomoa East district in Ghana. The sequential explanatory mixed-method design was employed for the study. A sample size of 256 was selected from a population of 698 parents, students and headteachers in the selected schools. Simple random sampling, cluster sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used to select the participants for the study. Questionnaires and interview guides were the instruments for data collection. Analyses were done using percentages, multiple regression and Independent samples t-test. Though the study showed a significant difference in the parental involvement levels of parents, there was no significant difference in academic performance levels of students in public and private junior high schools. Regression analysis indicated that parental involvement did not affect academic performance in the selected schools. The study concluded that parental involvement challenges in the district should be tackled together with other factors affecting academic performance in the district. It is recommended that awareness of parental role in the education of children should be created through PTA meetings and the establishment of annual PTA week.

Keywords: Parental involvement, Academic performance, Junior high schools, Gomoa East district

Introduction

There is much interest in the differences in academic outcomes of public and private school students. A lot of factors underlie these differences. Many attributes the differences to characteristics of students and their families as well as the schools they attend.

For the school to achieve its aim, it needs families and communities to co-partner with (Ballantine, 1997; Hoy & Miskel, 2005). Quality of schools, teachers and parents or families collectively determine students' performance but parental involvement plays a major role (Tehsin, Rafiq, Sohail, Saleem & Khan, 2013). There appears to be a one-sided dimension to discussions on students' performance in Ghana. The blame is always put on the school and teachers when students perform abysmally in the BECE leaving the parents out.

There appears to be a lack of consensus regarding the exact meaning of the concept of parental involvement as various writers provide their own operational definitions (McNeal, 2014). El Nokali, Bachman, and Votruba-Drzal (2010) defined parental involvement as parents' behaviours in home and school setting meant to support their children's educational progress. Epstein (1995) has developed a frame work for defining six different types of parental involvement based on the relationships between the family, school, and community: parenting (skills), communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community. This framework formed the basis of the instruments developed for this study. The researcher perceives parental involvement as all the activities of parents both at home and school regarding the education of their wards which are geared toward the improvement of the academic performance of their wards. There are several parental involvement practices but Ghanaian parents mostly rely on PTA meetings as a major means of getting involved in the school. This level of partnership is not integral since it plays down on other parental involvement practices. Many Ghanaian parents do not get involved because they think it is the business of government and teachers to provide education to children and this explains why there is little baseline information on parental involvement practices in Ghanaian basic schools.

Statement of the problem

Statistics at the Gomoa East District Education Directorate from 2010 to 2015 indicate that academic performance in the Gomoa East district junior high Schools have not been the best. Though performance is generally abysmal in the district, private JHSs have comparatively performed better than public JHSs. Among the factors responsible for the trend of performance in the district are poor parental care and supervision of students at home. Research conducted in the district attests to a weaker educational background of the majority of parents in the district (Quansah, 2014). These have impacted on parents' involvement in the education of their wards in the district. Parents in the district are not complementing the efforts of teachers in improving academic performance in the district. The extent to which parental involvement affected students' performance in the district was investigated in the study.

Parental involvement has been studied with several variables to establish a link between them. Henderson and Mapp (2002) for instance note that in general, parental involvement is associated with children's higher achievements in language and Mathematics. It also affects enrollment in more challenging programmes, greater academic persistence, better behaviour, better social skills and adaptation to school, better attendance and lower drop-out rates. The focus of this current study was to offer a further explanation to the effect of parental involvement on the academic performance of public and private basic school students in the Gomoa. The researcher chose this dimension because there appears to be a gap in available literature since most studies did not address the issue of the

achievement gap in public and private basic schools. Attention had not been directed to the extent to which achievement gap in public and private schools could be explained in relation to parental involvement in public and private schools, especially in Ghana.

Nyarko (2011) carried out a study to analyse the link between parental school involvement and the academic achievement of young students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds between the ages of (15 and 20 years). The results indicate a positive and significant correlation between mothers' school involvement and the academic achievement of the students. Chowa, Masa and Tucker (2013) also state that children are more likely to apply themselves and perform better in school when their parents show an interest in their school work, are willing to assist them with homework, and are willing to hold their children accountable for completion of school assignments. Similarly, in a study to investigate the association between parental involvement and academic achievement among elementary and middle school students, Otani (2019) found that parental involvement is associated with academic achievement of students. For him, the frequency with which parents inquire about what their children studied in school positively influences their interest in that particular subject. Moreover, he said strict monitoring of students' homework usually led to higher academic achievement.

Desforges and Abouchar (2003) note that early research on parental involvement showed a variety of inconsistent and conflicting findings. According to them, some studies found that parental involvement had no effect whatsoever on pupils' achievement or adjustment; others found striking positive effects whilst other studies found a negative relationship. Parental involvement, it seemed, diminished pupil achievement under some circumstances. These inconsistencies, for them, are relatively easy to explain. First, different researchers used different definitions of parental involvement. Some explained it as 'good parenting' which went on in the home. Others also explained it as 'talking to teachers' whilst yet others defined parental involvement as an effective participation in school functions and school governance. Izzo, Weissberg, Kaspro and Fendrich (1999) on their part speculate that non-significant and sometimes negative results could be caused by parents becoming more involved when children are not performing well in school. While much research support the claim that parental involvement leads to improved academic achievement (e.g. Burcu & Sungur, 2009; Coleman, 1991; Lee & Bowen, 2006; Patel, 2006), other studies indicate that parental involvement is associated with lower levels of achievement (e.g. Domina, 2005) or has no effect on achievement (e.g. Domina, 2005; El Nokali, Bachman & Votruba-Drzal, 2010).

Given the current literature, the most logical conclusion is that some elements of parental involvement affect some types of achievement for some students sometimes. It is also possible that some forms of parental involvement beneficially affect other student outcomes that might be associated with academic achievement such as educational expectations, absenteeism, and truancy. This degree of inconsistency, and lack of clarity on which elements of parental involvement affect which outcomes, is especially troublesome for policy makers and educational practitioners. On the other hand, nobody is clear on which component(s) of parental involvement these partnerships should focus, nor on which student outcomes these partnerships are likely to have the greatest effect (McNeal, 2014). Chowa et al. (2013) are of the view that the kind of effect parental involvement has on students' performance depends on the type of involvement adopted, be it home- based involvement or school-based involvement. They stated that the effect of parental involvement on youth academic performance appears to be a function of the type of involvement. Home-based parental involvement is associated positively with academic performance, while school-based parental involvement has a negative association. This is in line with the view of Desforges and Abouchar (2003) when they stated that parental involvement in the form of 'at-home good parenting' had a significant positive

effect on children's achievement and adjustment even after all other factors shaping attainment have been taken out of the equation.

Osei-Akoto, Chowa and Ansong (2012) investigated the extent of parental involvement in academic performance in Ghana using randomised cluster sampling of 100 schools from eight out of ten regions. The results indicate that majority of the parents (83%) hardly assisted children in homework. The study failed to establish the effect of parental involvement on academic performance though a section of the study revealed that only one measure of parental involvement—talking to children about what they learn in school—is significantly and positively associated with academic performance. Lesanjju (2013) explored the effect of parental involvement on academic performance of girl child in public primary schools in Samburu County Kenya. The results indicated that a unit increase in parental involvement predicts 0.787 increases in academic performance scores. Assefa and Sintayehu (2019) examined the relationship between parental involvement and students' academic achievement in Model Primary and Secondary School of Haramaya University, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia. They found parental involvement to be generally moderate. However, the few parents whose involvement level was high had their children scoring higher marks in tests. They therefore concluded that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between parental involvement and students' academic achievement.

Wilder (2014) conducted a study to synthesise the results of nine meta-analyses that examined the impact of parental involvement on students' performance. The results indicated that the impact of parental involvement on student academic achievement was weakest if parental involvement was defined as homework assistance. Ghanney (2011) holds a contrary view to the studies reviewed by Wilder (2014). Ghanney's study conducted in Apam, Ghana on parental involvement in pupils' homework came up with a finding that home supervision enhances students' performance. Some parents interviewed indicated that, the falling standard of their children's academic performance may be attributed to their own absence from home.

It is clear from the above empirical review that research is inconclusive on the effect of parental involvement on academic performance. Whilst some studies indicate a positive correlation between parental involvement and academic performance, others do not. Each study attempts an explanation for whatever result arrived at, but this researcher is of the view that results for each study in this field are determined by the diversified contexts of each of the studies and that account for the inconsistent results. The inconsistencies in literature even indicate that parental involvement and academic performance are not over-researched variables since the reasons behind such inconsistencies need further explanation and that any study on these two variables cannot be preempted. It must however, be pointed out that more studies are indicating positive correlation between parental involvement and academic performance than negative correlation between parental involvement and academic performance.

Official statistics from the Ghana Education Service (GES) in the Gomoa East district indicate that from 2013 to 2015, more public schools have recorded zero percent (8 schools in 2013, 1 school in 2014 and 1 school in 2015) than private JHS in the Gomoa East district (2 schools in 2015). Out of the 105 schools that participated in the 2013 BECE, 62 were public schools whilst 43 were private schools. Out of the 28 schools that scored 100 percent in the 2013 BECE, seven were public schools whilst 21 were private schools. Out of the 46 schools that scored less than 50 percent in the 2013 BECE, 39 were public schools whilst seven were private schools. Out of the 19 schools that scored less than 20 percent in the 2013 BECE, 16 were public schools whilst 3 were private schools. Out of the 8 schools that scored zero percent in the 2013 BECE, 5 were public schools whilst 3 were private schools. In 2014, 115 schools registered candidates for the BECE. Out of the 115 schools, 65

were public schools whilst 50 were private schools. Out of the 55 schools that scored 100 percent in the 2014 BECE in the district, 17 were public schools whilst 38 were private schools. Out of the 17 schools that scored less than 50 percent in the 2014 BECE, 15 were public schools whilst 2 were private schools. In 2014, the 2 schools that scored less than 20 percent pass in the BECE were all public schools. The data above show that from 2013 to 2015, private schools have outperformed public schools in the Gomoa East district. From 2013 to 2015, more private schools have scored 100 percent pass than public schools. The zero percent pass is a challenge to both public and private schools in the district but public schools experience it more than the private schools.

Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

H_0 : There is no statistically significant difference in the level of parental involvement in private and public junior high schools.

H_A : There is statistically significant difference in the level of parental involvement in private and public junior high schools.

Hypothesis 2

H_0 : There is statistically no significant difference in the level of academic performance in private and public junior high schools.

H_A : There is statistically significant difference in the level of academic performance in private and public junior high schools.

Hypothesis 3

H_0 : Parental involvement has statistically no significant effect on academic performance of private junior high schools.

H_A : Parental involvement has statistically significant effect on academic performance of private junior high schools.

Hypothesis 4

H_0 : Parental involvement has statistically no significant effect on academic performance of public junior high schools.

H_A : Parental involvement has statistically significant effect on academic performance of public junior high schools.

Methodology

The explanatory sequential mixed methods design was adopted in this research. In this study, quantitative data were collected and analysed and based on the findings qualitative data were gathered later to explain the findings in the quantitative data (Hanson, Creswell, Clark, Petska & Creswell, 2005). Respondents were sampled from a population of 698 parents, students, and headteachers in the Gomoa East District. A sample size of 256 was selected comprising 128 respondents each from public and private schools respectively. Cluster random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used. The simple random sampling technique was used to select 4 schools (2 private schools and 2 public schools) for the study. In sampling schools, a list of registered public and private JHSs

was collected from the Statistics Unit of the Gomoa East District Education Directorate. The schools were sorted into two categories- public and private schools. Each school was assigned a number. The lottery method was then used to select 2 numbers from two bowls containing 65 numbers (1 to 65) for public schools and 62 numbers (1 to 62) for private schools. Since each number in a bowl corresponded to a school, a number selected was matched with its corresponding school and that school was therefore selected for the study. Simple random sampling technique was used to select students from the cluster of schools. Class registers provided the list of students in the four schools. Numbers were assigned to each name in the register. The lottery method was then used to select 126 students (63 from private schools and 63 from public schools) for the study. A parent whose child was selected for the study was also accessed. In all a sum of 126 parents from both public and private schools were sampled for the study. The purposive sampling technique was used to select the four headteachers from private and public schools and four parents from private and public schools for qualitative data to support the quantitative data.

Questionnaire and interview guides were used as instruments in the study. To ensure face validity, two students of educational administration and management at University of Education, Winneba (UEW) and an expert in educational administration and management were consulted to scrutinise the items. Twenty (20) item questionnaire with a three- point response scale (Never =1, Sometimes =2 and Always =3) was used in the study. Content validity was established after the expert had gone through the 20 item questionnaires and approved of it. To establish construct validity, a factor analysis was run to determine the dimensionality of the 20-item measure of parental involvement designed by the researcher based on the parental involvement framework of Epstein (1995). The Principal Component extraction method was used to extract six factors based on the scree plot of the eigenvalues of the items. The KMO value of 0.702 for the overall analysis which exceeded the cut-off point of 0.50 and the Bartlett's Test of sphericity being significant at .000, $p < .05$ gave an assurance that the items constitute a good measure of parental involvement. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.71 was obtained which indicated that the questionnaire was internally consistent and for that matter reliable. Test of normality was done to determine whether the samples (parents and students) used in the study were normally distributed. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test run was significant at 0.200, $p > .05$ for both parents and students' samples. The Shapiro-Wilk Test run for parents' samples was significant at 0.590, $p > .05$ and that of students' samples was also significant at .521, $p > .05$. These meant that the samples used in the study were well distributed and would therefore yield good results which would constitute a good description of the population.

Four interview guides were developed to provide further explanation to the findings made from the analysis of the questionnaires. Interview guide for private school parents contained five questions whilst that of public-school parents contained six questions, though similar in content. Interview guide for private school headteachers contained six questions whilst that of public school headteachers contained eleven questions. Each group had a separate interview guide because despite the common findings made among private and public schools, some findings were peculiar to each group which required specific questions tailored to those findings to provide further explanation to them. To ensure trustworthiness of the interview guides a number of steps were taken by the researcher to ensure this: (1) an expert in educational administration and management edited the questions to avoid ambiguity (2) the expert also added his inputs to improve the items (3) the interview guides were then pilot-tested. The researcher pursued the goal of trustworthiness of qualitative data by controlling researcher bias and recounting his records to each interviewee to ensure that what is recorded really reflected the view expressed by the interviewees. The researcher had post- interview

discussions with the four headteachers in particular to ensure that the researcher's synthesis of the interview data was accurate.

As the chosen design required, the researcher employed both quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures. Descriptive statistics was used to measure the variables under study (parental involvement and academic performance). Mean scores of each parent was used to describe his/ her parental involvement level. Again, the means of students' performance in Mathematics, Science and English were computed to represent students' academic performance level and as the dependent variable. These values were used in an Independent Samples t-test to determine the differences between the parental involvement levels of public and private schools and academic performance levels of public and private schools accessed in the study. Responses of parents on Home-Based Involvement and School-Based Involvement from the same 20 items were scored and scaled to 100%. Again, the values for the independent (parental involvement) and dependent (academic performance) variables were computed using Multiple Regression to determine the respective effect of Home-Based Involvement and School-Based Involvement on academic performance. The focus- by- questions approach as described by Kusi (2012) was used to analyse the qualitative data. The researcher organised the various responses for each item across the interviewees and explored the connections and differences in the responses. In situations where responses from some of the interviewees were virtually the same, selections were made from the responses. Qualitative data were used to explain the findings made from the quantitative data.

Results and Discussions

Demographic data of parents focused on sex distribution and educational level whiles that of students focused on sex distribution, age distribution and class distribution. There were 36 (57.1%) males and 27 (42.9 %) females in private schools whiles 29 (46 %) males and 34 (54 %) females were also selected for the study in public schools. This means there was a fair representation of both male and female students in the study. In all 41 form one students, 41 form two students and 44 form three students were selected for the study indicating that there was a fair distribution of students in terms of class or forms. The age range of students selected for the study was 11 to 18 years. In this range, age 11 was 1 (0.8%), age 12 were 8 (6.3%), age 13 were 19 (15.1%), age 14 were 39 (30.9 %), age 15 were 31 (24.6%), age 16 were 18 (14.3%), age 17 were 7 (5.6 %) and age 18 were 3 (2.4 %). This means majority of the students 107 (84.9 %) were within the ages of 13 to 16. In terms of sex distribution of parents contacted in private schools, 38 of them representing 60.3% were males whilst 25 of them representing 39.7% were females. Out of the 63 parents contacted in public schools, 26 of them representing 41.3% were males whilst 37 of them representing 58.7 were females. This result means that there was fair representation of mothers and fathers in the study. Data on educational level of parents employed in the study suggests that literacy rate appears to be higher among parents in private schools than parents in public schools. In private schools, there were 11 university or tertiary graduates, 11 secondary school graduates, 28 basic education graduates, 8 partially completed basic education and 5 illiterates. In public schools, there were 7 university or tertiary graduates, 9 secondary school graduates, 29 basic education graduates, 11 partially completed basic education and 7 illiterates. Whilst private schools had 7.9% of illiterate parents, public schools had 11.1% of illiterate parents.

Testing of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

H_0 : There is statistically no significant difference in the level of parental involvement in Private and Public Junior High Schools.

H_A : There is statistically significant difference in the level of parental involvement in Private and Public Junior High Schools.

Table 1: Independent samples t-test of parental involvement in Private and Public Schools.

Parental Involvement	N	F	Mean	SD	t	df	p-value
Scores Private schools	63		66.949	7.821			
Public schools	63		59.619	7.039			
Equal variances assumed		.646	5.529	124	.000		

Source: Field Data (2017).

Data from Table 1 display the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to evaluate the hypothesis that there is statistically no significant difference in the level of parental involvement in private and public schools. The test was significant $t(124) = 5.53$, $p = .000 < 0.05$. Parents in private schools got more involved in their wards' education ($M = 66.95$, $SD = 7.82$) than parents in public schools ($M = 59.62$, $SD = 7.04$). The $t(5.53)$ being positive indicates that the mean level of parental involvement in private schools is significantly greater than the mean level of parental involvement in public schools. This means parents in the selected private schools got more involved in their children's education than parents in the selected public schools. Therefore, the study failed to accept the null hypothesis. This finding is consistent with the finding of Redford and Russell (2016) in the United States that, students in private schools have parents who are more involved in school-based activities and more satisfied with teachers, school climate, academic standards than public schools' students are. In finding out why parental involvement is low in public schools, the headteachers in the public schools were interviewed. One of them said:

" ... Most parents here do not value education, and they think it is the responsibility of the government to educate their children. They have misunderstood the free education policy in basic schools. I am sure it is because illiteracy and poverty among them are high. Let me tell you what a parent of a private school student once told me in a conversation. She said, "Madam, I am concerned about my child's education because I am paying huge sums of money and so I must ensure it does not go waste". So you see, she is serious about her child's education because she is paying huge sums of money as school fees ". (Public School Headteacher 2).

Another headteacher had this to say:

" ... In fact, what I can say is that, the majority of parents who have their wards in my school lack funds to hire private tutors to teach their wards at home. It has not even crossed the minds of some of them that home tutoring is necessary and that it is their responsibility. If we try to organise private classes for their wards, they will not pay, and they use so many arguments during PTA meetings to resist it. Also, if the parent herself or himself is not well educated, how can he effectively supervise

homework. Most of our students do their homework in school in the morning before classes begin. It is really a problem, my brother". (Public School Headteacher 1).

These responses mean that some parents in public schools are avoiding their responsibilities in their children's education because of the free education policy in public basic schools. Some of them have completely misunderstood the free education policy of the government. They understood free basic education as a policy that has shifted the burden of education from parents to the government, which is highly incorrect. Poverty and illiteracy also come up as contributing factors to the low level of involvement of public school parents in the education of their wards.

Hypothesis 2

H_0 : There is statistically no significant difference in the level of academic performance in Private and Public Junior High Schools.

H_A There is statistically significant difference in the level of academic performance in Private and Public Junior High Schools.

Table 2: Independent samples T-test of academic performance in Private and Public schools

Academic performance	N	F	Mean	SD	t	df	p-value
Scores Private Schools	63	44.763	8.226				
Public Schools	63	43.052	11.445				
Equal variances assumed							
	7.811	.964	124	.337			

Source: Field Data (2017).

Information from Table 2 display the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to compare academic performance in private and public schools. The results of the test indicated that there was no significant difference in the academic performance of private and public schools $t(124) = .96, p = .337 > 0.05$. The results suggest that academic performance in private schools ($M = 44.76, SD = 8.23$) and academic performance in public schools ($M = 43.05, SD = 11.46$) are very close. The $t(.96)$ being positive indicates some difference in the mean levels of academic performance in private and public schools just that the difference is not of any statistical value. This indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted. Moreover, analysis of students' academic records indicated average performance for both public and private schools. This result is quite strange because data from GES directorate in the Gomoa East district reviewed indicated a private school advantage over public schools in terms of the BECE performance from 2013 to 2015. For example, in 2013, whilst public schools witnessed 46.05 percent pass, private schools in the district witnessed 79.72 percent pass. In 2014, whilst public schools witnessed 74.87 percent pass, private schools in the district witnessed 95.16 percent pass. In 2015, whilst public schools witnessed 49.87 percent pass, private schools witnessed 78.33 percent pass. This finding had to be explained with qualitative data. A private school headteacher said:

"... We have our own style here. Right from form one, we ensure that the standards of end of term exams are higher than the WAEC standards. Public schools may find this quite unprofessional, but it is making the difference in our BECE results. We also intensify academic work in the final year. The high difficulty level of our end of term exam questions accounts for the low scores of our students in their internal

assessment records. We are not really bothered about the low scores because we are certain that it will enable them to find the BECE questions cheaper. We have seen the results of this strategy over the years, and I think it is not bad at all". (Private School Headteacher 2).

This response explains the average scores in private school internal exams but not in the case of public schools. Thus, private schools scored average performance in internal assessment due to the high difficulty level of the end of term exam questions. Average performance in public school internal assessment was explained by a headteacher in the following words:

"... Teachers are doing their best here, but the students are just not studios. They do not study at home, and moreover, their homes are not supportive of their academic life. Some don't have textbooks and exercise books. Absenteeism is also a factor. In fact, the attitude of our students toward schooling is just not good at all. All these are reasons for their poor performance internally and externally because for me if you don't perform in internal exams, you cannot do well in the external exams". (Public School Headteacher 2).

The finding of this study that there was no significant difference in the academic performance of the selected private and public schools in the Gomoa East district was contrary to the finding of Tooley and Dixon (2005). Tooley and Dixon conducted a two-year in-depth study in India, Ghana, Nigeria, and Kenya and found that raw scores from the student achievement tests showed considerably higher achievement in the private than in public schools. The studies reviewed present an inconsistent opinion on whether private schools outperform public schools and vice versa. Perhaps it will forever remain a debate. Whilst some studies agree that private schools outperform public schools – *Private School Advantage* (e.g. Perie, Vanneman & Goldstein, 2005; Tooley & Dixon, 2005; Baku, 2012; Hahn, Tae-Hwan & Seo, 2014; Frenette, Ching & Chan, 2015) other studies also agree that public schools outperform private schools- *Public School Advantage* (e.g. Newhouse & Beegle, 2005; Lubienski & Lubienski, 2006 and Snyder, 2013). This current study, however, did not fall within any of these two schools of thought in its finding that there was no significant difference in the level of academic performance of private and public schools. The finding was however similar to the finding of Tooley and Dixon (2005) in Kenya after a two-year in-depth study where private schools were found to perform at the same level as public schools in all subjects. Perhaps this would constitute on its own the third school of thought thus named '*Equal Performance Scenario*', defined in this study as a situation where irrespective of the specific academic environments of private and public schools, they are rated on the same level of academic performance.

Hypothesis 3

H_0 : Parental involvement has statistically no significant effect on the academic performance of private junior high schools.

H_A : Parental involvement has statistically significant effect on the academic performance of private junior high schools.

Table 1.3: Multiple Regression on parental involvement and academic performance in Private Schools

Variable	b	Beta	R	R ²	t	Sig(t)	df	F	Sig(F)
Constant	43.789				4.827	.000			

School-based involvement -.119 -.125 -.951 .345
 Home based involvement .139 .154 1.083 .283
 Regression 2 .727 .487
 Residual 60

.154 .024

Source: Field Data (2017).

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of parental involvement on academic performance in private schools. The predictor variables were the school-based involvement (SBI) and home-based involvement (HBI) while the criterion variable was academic performance. The result indicated that the linear combination of parental involvement was not significantly related to the academic performance $F(2, 60) = .727, P = .487, P > 0.05$. The R-value of .154 indicates a less than perfect linear relationship between the predicted and criterion scores. This implies that the predictor variables showed a weak prediction of the criterion variable. The R^2 of .024 indicates that only 2.4% of the criterion variance is accounted for by its linear relationship with the predictor variables. The results (HBI: $\beta = .154, t = 1.083, p = .283$) also indicate that home-based involvement explained the bulk of the 2.4% variance in the criterion variable (academic performance) than the school-based involvement (SBI: $\beta = -.125, t = -.951, p = .345$). This means though both school-based involvement and home-based involvement could not perfectly predict the criterion variable (academic performance), comparatively home-based involvement appears to be a better predictor of academic performance than school-based involvement. The multiple regression results suggest that parental involvement practices in the selected private schools are not necessarily having an effect on students' academic performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted whilst the alternative hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 4

H_0 : Parental involvement has statistically no significant effect on the academic performance of public junior high schools.

H_A : Parental involvement has statistically significant effect on the academic performance of public junior high schools.

Table 1.4: Multiple Regression on parental involvement in Public Schools

Variable	b	Beta	R	R ²	t	Sig(t)	df	F	Sig(F)
Constant	45.932		3.617		.001				

School-based involvement -.012 -.009 -.064 .950
 Home-based involvement -.036 -.024 -.162 .872
 Regression 2 .026 .974
 Residual 60

.030 .001

Source: Field Data (2017).

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of parental involvement on academic performance in public schools. The predictor variables were the school-based involvement

(SBI) and home-based involvement (HBI) while the criterion variable was academic performance. The result indicated that the linear combination of parental involvement was not significantly related to the academic performance $F(2, 60)=.026, P=.974, P>0.05$. The R-value of .030 indicates a less than perfect linear relationship between the predicted and criterion scores. This implies that the predictor variables showed a weak prediction of the criterion variable. The R^2 of .001 indicates that only 0.09% of the criterion variance is accounted for by its linear relationship with the predictor variables. The results (HBI: $\beta=.024, t= -.162, p=.872$) also indicate that home-based involvement explained the bulk of the 0.09% variance in the criterion variable (academic performance) than the school-based involvement (SBI: $\beta= -.009, t= -.064, p=.950$). This means though both school-based involvement and academic performance could not perfectly predict the criterion variable, comparatively home-based involvement appears to be a better predictor of academic performance than school-based involvement. The multiple regression results suggest that parental involvement practices in the selected public schools are not necessarily having an effect on students' academic performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted whilst the alternative hypothesis is rejected. While much research supports the claim that parental involvement leads to improved academic achievement (e.g. Coleman, 1991; Lee & Bowen, 2006; Patel, 2006; Burcu & Sungur, 2009; Assefa & Sintayehu, 2019; Otani, 2019), other studies indicate that parental involvement is associated with lower levels of achievement or has no effect on academic achievement (e.g. Domina, 2005; El Nokali, et al., 2010). The finding of this study that parental involvement has no effect on academic performance of private and public school students in the Gomoa East district is in line with the school of thought of Domina, (2005) and El Nokali, et al., (2010) that parental involvement has no effect on students' achievement. This finding needed a further probe because academic performance is affected by a lot of factors, among which is parental involvement. It is the belief of the researcher that if parental involvement level is quite high as in the case of private schools in this study but does not yield a corresponding performance, then the reasons might be found in other factors. Some of these reasons were explored qualitatively and are presented below to explain the finding. A private school parent said:

" ... My son does not study at home, all he knows is to do his homework and after that nothing again. I don't see him read any book on vacation so kindly help us. Even with the homework, he does it because he fears he will be punished if he fails to complete it". (Private School parent 2).

Another parent also said:

" ... My son spends most of his time at home watching TV. I am mostly not at home due to the nature of my job. It is only in examination times that I see him reading his books. We have tried our best to get him to study but he would not. But we are not giving up". (Public School parent 1).

This parent had this to say:

" ... Where to study is a problem for my daughter. She is serious with her studies but we have not been able to provide her a permanent place of study. But she is managing. Sometimes she studies on the centre table, sometimes on her bed or the bench... Though she does not have a private time table, she studies most of the time at home". (Private School parent 1).

The responses from the parents mean that the home environment and study habits of the pupils were major factors affecting their performance in school. If school factors are quite effective but the home factors are unsupportive, it will not be surprising if parental involvement is found as not having an effect on academic performance as is the case in this study. The unsupportive home environment is a confirmation of the finding in the quantitative data in relation to hypothesis 4 that home-based involvement explained the bulk of the 0.09% variance in the criterion variable (academic performance) (HBI: $\beta = .024$, $t = -.162$, $p = .872$), than the school-based involvement (SBI: $\beta = -.009$, $t = -.064$, $p = .950$). This means if home-based involvement is a better predictor of academic performance but is found to be weak, then better performance must not be expected from pupils from such unsupportive homes. The finding that home-based involvement is a better predictor of academic performance as compared to school-based involvement is consistent with the view of Chowa et al. (2013) that home-based parental involvement is associated positively with academic performance, while school-based parental involvement has a negative association. The finding again gets support in the position of Desforges and Abouchaar (2003) when they stated that parental involvement in the form of 'at-home good parenting' has a significant positive effect on children's achievement and adjustment even after all other factors shaping attainment have been taken out of the equation.

A private school headteacher commented that:

"... Our teachers here I must say are very competent though qualification of some of them are on the low side. We train them here, so they are not deficient at all in terms of giving their best to our students. We are really doing well in managing the less endowed teachers because it is not easy to get the best to teach for long in private schools". (Private School Headteacher 1).

Another also said:

"... I must admit our environment here is not wholly conducive because we have some challenges. For instance, we do not have fans in the classrooms, and the rooms become quite warm in the afternoon. As you can also see, we don't have a soccer field, and so our students play on our assembly ground during break time". (Private School Headteacher 2).

He added that:

"... Our community members here have not been supportive. They have been suspicious of small levies we charge just to improve the situation here. Am sure they are doing this because they think this is somebody's business, but they don't know that if they help improve the situation here, it goes a long way to help their children". (Private School Headteacher 2).

The responses above indicate that low qualification of teachers, unconducive school environment and unsupportive community members are among the factors that could reduce the efficacy of parental involvement in yielding good academic achievement in private schools.

Conclusions

The specifics of parental involvement in the Gomoa East district indicate that there are serious challenges in terms of parental involvement, especially in public schools. Parental involvement

is not having an effect on the academic performance of private and public school students in the Gomoa East district because other factors affecting academic performance are perhaps so robust rendering parental involvement dormant. This result calls for a critical reflection because it has a serious implication on the cause (s) of poor academic performance in the Gomoa East district. What factors are responsible for the poor academic performance if parental involvement is not a factor? The researcher, despite the finding of this study is of the view that, parental involvement has effect on academic performance. However, in a situation where parental involvement is found not to have effect on academic performance as in the case of this study, the reasons are to be looked for in the other factors that influence academic performance. In view of this, the researcher therefore, concludes that parental involvement challenges in the Gomoa East district should be tackled together with the other factors affecting academic performance in the district.

Recommendations

The researcher recommends that the district education directorate and headteachers of the Gomoa East District should create awareness among parents to know and accept their responsibilities toward the education of their wards. The awareness can be created through PTA meetings, community festivals and the establishment of annual PTA week. Disciplinary measures must be taken against parents who ignore their obligations towards the education of their children. Parents in private and public schools should cultivate the habit of helping the schools of their wards with their expertise and any other resource they can offer to improve teaching and learning in their wards' schools. They should monitor the attendance and progress of their wards to help improve academic performance of their wards.



REFERENCES

- ▶ Assefa, A., & Sintayehu, B. (2019). Relationship between Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement in Model Primary and Secondary School of Haramaya University, East Hararge Zone, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 7 (2), 46-56.
- ▶ Ballantine, J. H. (1997). *The sociology of education: a systematic analysis*. (4th Ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall.
- ▶ Baku, J. J. K. (2012). Participation of private schools in basic education provision in Ghana. Network for international policies and cooperation in education and training. Retrieved: 11th August, 2016. <http://www.norrag.org/ar/publications>.
- ▶ Burcu, S., & Sungur, S. (2009). Parental influences on students' self-concept, task value beliefs, and achievement in science. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 12 106-117.
- ▶ Businge, C. (2012, August 19th). It's time to revive school management committees. *New vision: Uganda's Leading Daily*. Retrieved: 11th January, 2014.
- ▶ Chowa, G. A. N., Masa, R. D., & Tucker, J. (2013). *Parental involvement's effects on academic performance: Evidence from the YouthSave Ghana experiment*. Center for social Development Working Papers No. 13-15: Washington University, St. Louis.
- ▶ Coleman, J. (1991). *Parent involvement in education. Policy perspective*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

- ▶ Desforges, C., & Abouchar, A. (2003). The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment: A literature review. *Research Report, no.433. Queen's Printer, No.33.*
- ▶ Domina, T. (2005). Levelling the home advantage: Assessing the effectiveness of parent involvement in elementary school. *Sociology of Education, 78*, 233-249.
- ▶ El Nokali, N., Bachman, H., & Votruba-Drzal, E. (2010). Parent involvement and children's academic and social development in elementary school. *Child Development, 81(3)*, 988-1005.
- ▶ Epstein, J. L. (1995). Perspectives and previews on research and policy for school, family and community partnerships. In Booth, A & Dunn, J. (eds). *Family-school links: how do they affect educational outcomes?* Hillsdal, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- ▶ Frenette, M., Ching, P., & Chan, W. (2015). Academic Outcomes of Public and Private High School Students: What Lies Behind the Differences? *Statistics Canada. (367)*. Retrieved: 24th July, 2016. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub>.
- ▶ Ghanney, R.A. (2011). Parental involvement in pupils' homework: A study of Apam community in the Gomoa West District. *Ghana Journal of Education and Teaching, 12*, 331-340.
- ▶ Hahn, S., Tae-Hwan, K., & Seo, B. (2014). Effects of public and private schools on academic achievement. *Seoul Journal of Economics, 27(2)*, 138- 146.
- ▶ Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Clark, V.L. P., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology 52 (2)*, 224- 233.
- ▶ Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). A new wave of evidence: *The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved: 5th August, 2016. www.sedl.org.
- ▶ Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (2005). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice (7th Ed.)*. New York City: McGraw-Hill.
- ▶ Izzo, C. V., Weissberg, R. P., Kasprow, W. J., & Fendrich, M. (1999). A longitudinal assessment of teacher perceptions of parent involvement in children's education and school performance. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 817-839.
- ▶ Kusi, H. (2012). *Doing qualitative research: A guide for researchers*. Accra- New Town: Emmpong Press.
- ▶ Lee, J., & Bowen, N. (2006). Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary school children. *American Educational Research Journal, 43(2)*, 193-218.
- ▶ Lesanjir, B. M. (2013). *Factors influencing academic performance of girls in public primary schools in Sereolipi Zone in Samburu County, Kenya* (Masters'thesis) University of Nairobi, Nairobi.
- ▶ Lubienski, C., & Lubienski, S. T. (2006). Charter, private, public schools and academic achievement: New evidence from NAEP mathematics data. National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education.
- ▶ McNeal, R. B. (2014). Parent involvement, academic achievement and the role of student attitudes and behaviors as mediators. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 2(8)*, 564-576.
- ▶ Newhouse, D., & Beegle, K. (2005, May). *The Effect of School Type on Academic Achievement: Evidence from Indonesia*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3604.
- ▶ Nyarko, K. (2011). Parental school involvement: The case of Ghana. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 2(5)*, 378-381.
- ▶ Osei-Akoto, I., Chowa, G. A. N., & Ansong, D. (2012). *Parental involvement and academic performance in Ghana* (YouthSave Research Brief 12-42). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- ▶ Otani, M. (2019). Parental involvement and academic achievement among elementary and middle school students. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. doi:10.1007/s12564-019-09614-z.

- ▶ Patel, N. (2006). Perceptions of student ability: Effects on parent involvement in middle school. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Science*, 67(3-A), 838.
- ▶ Perie, M., Vanneman, A., & Goldstein, A. (2005). *Student Achievement in Private Schools: Results From NAEP 2000–2005* (NCES 2006-459). Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- ▶ Quansah, M. (2014). *School community collaboration and academic performance of Junior High School students. A study of selected basic schools in the Gomoa East District*. Unpublished thesis, University of Education, Winneba.
- ▶ Redford, J., & Russell, S. (2016). Public Vs. Private: Parental Involvement in K-12 Education. African Institute for Research. Retrieved: 11th August, 2016. <http://www.air.org/resource/public-vs-private-parental-involvement>.
- ▶ Snyder, J. A. (2013). Why Public Schools Outperform Private Schools. *Boston Review*. Retrieved: 24th July, 2016. <https://bostonreview.net>.
- ▶ Tehsin, F., Rafiq, H. M. W., Sohail, M. M., Saleem, M., & Khan, M. A. (2013). Parental involvement and academic achievement. A study on secondary school students of Lahore, Pakistan. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (8), 209- 220.
- ▶ Tooley, J., & Dixon, P. (2005). *Private education is good for the poor: A Study of Private Schools Serving the Poor in Low-Income Countries*. USA: Cato Institute.
- ▶ Wilder, S. (2014). Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement: a meta-synthesis. *Educational Review*, 66(3), 377-397.