



Explaining parents' school involvement: The role of ethnicity and gender in the Netherlands

Fenella Fleischmann & Annabel de Haas

To cite this article: Fenella Fleischmann & Annabel de Haas (2016) Explaining parents' school involvement: The role of ethnicity and gender in the Netherlands, *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109:5, 554-565, DOI: [10.1080/00220671.2014.994196](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.994196)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2014.994196>



Published online: 25 May 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 226



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Explaining parents' school involvement: The role of ethnicity and gender in the Netherlands

Fenella Fleischmann and Annabel de Haas

ERCOMER, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Ethnic minority parents are often less involved with their children's schooling, and this may hamper their children's academic success, thus contributing to ethnic educational inequality. The authors aim to explain differences in parental involvement, using nationally representative survey data from the Netherlands of parents of primary school-aged children of Dutch, Turkish, and Moroccan origin. Descriptive findings show lower levels of parental involvement across several domains among ethnic minority compared to Dutch majority parents. Moreover, mothers are significantly more involved than fathers. To explain ethnic and gender gaps in parental engagement, the authors draw on parents' skills and household resources, parenting goals, and self-efficacy as important antecedents for their motivation to become involved. The model explains substantial portions of the variance in parental involvement and succeeds in fully explaining ethnic discrepancies by parents' levels of education and language proficiency. However, the gender gap in parental involvement remains unexplained.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 21 March 2014
Revised 23 October 2014
Accepted 29 November 2014

KEYWORDS

Ethnicity; gender;
Netherlands; parental
involvement; primary school

Parental involvement with their children's schooling has been found in numerous studies to increase children's academic achievement (Fan & Chen, 2001; Jeynes, 2005; Keith et al., 1998; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996; Yan & Lin, 2005), particularly in primary school and among younger children, also in the Netherlands (Kloosterman, Notten, Tolsma, & Kraaykamp, 2011). However, ethnic minority parents are often less involved with their children's schooling than parents from the majority population (Lee & Bowen, 2006; Turney & Kao, 2009; for the Netherlands, see Pels, 2003; Smit, Driessen, Sluiter, & Slegers, 2007). Boosting ethnic minority parents' involvement may thus contribute to the reduction of ethnic educational inequality.

Lower levels of educational achievement and attainment of children of immigrants are pervasive throughout the Western world and the entire educational career (Heath & Brinbaum, 2014). The Netherlands, where the current study is situated, is no exception to this pattern. Local-born children of the two largest immigrant groups from Turkey and Morocco score particularly low on standardized tests at the end of primary school, more often attend vocational rather than academic tracks and overall achieve lower levels of educational degrees than their peers with native-born parents (Driessen & Dekkers, 1997; Van de Werfhorst & Van Tubergen, 2007). Ethnic minority background, just as social background, is assumed to affect children's education through primary effects on test scores and grades, as well as secondary effects on educational choices (cf. Boudon, 1974; Van de Werfhorst & Van Tubergen, 2007). Previous research shows that ethnic inequality in education is mainly due to large negative primary effects of ethnic minority background on educational achievement (i.e., ethnic minority children have lower test scores and grades). These ethnic

discrepancies are largest among Turkish- and Moroccan-origin children and are already apparent in primary school (Driessen & Dekkers, 1997). When it comes to educational choices, immigrant students often make more ambitious choices than nonimmigrant students with similar academic achievements, which shows that secondary effects of immigrant status on education are mostly positive (Jackson, Jonsson, & Rudolphi, 2012; Van de Werfhorst & Van Tubergen, 2007). These positive secondary effects attest to the high educational aspirations in immigrant families and their motivation to achieve (Brinbaum & Kieffer, 2009; Kao, 2004). Because achievement gaps at the end of primary education are particularly important for the further school career in tracked systems, the primary school phase is probably the most important stage during compulsory education in which ethnic educational inequalities can be alleviated.

Previous research suggests that the positive effects of parental involvement generalize across ethnic groups (Jeynes, 2005; Kim, 2002; Kloosterman et al., 2011; Lee & Bowen, 2006), though effect sizes may vary across ethnic-racial groups and socioeconomic status (Desimone, 1999; Domina, 2005; Keith et al., 1998; Yan & Lin, 2005). Nevertheless, because parental involvement has a positive effect on academic achievement also among ethnic minority children in the Netherlands (Kloosterman et al., 2011), increasing parental involvement may be one of the ways to achieve greater equality in educational outcomes.

This study therefore analyses ethnic differences in parental involvement with their children's schooling in the Netherlands. In addition, we consider how the involvement of mothers differs from that of fathers, and whether these gender differences vary across ethnic groups. We describe ethnic and gender

differences in different domains of parental involvement, both at home and in schools, among parents of primary school aged children of Turkish, Moroccan, and Dutch background using nationally representative survey data. Hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) and logistic regression models are used to assess whether parents' knowledge and skills, household conditions, and motivation to become involved can explain ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement.

What is parental involvement?

The literature on parental involvement with their children's schooling agrees that parental involvement is a multidimensional construct (e.g., Fan & Chen, 2001; García Coll et al., 2002; Keith et al., 1998; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996). Many different definitions and operationalizations of parental involvement have been used in previous research. The widely cited model of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995, 1997, 2005; see also Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 2007) emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between home- and school-based forms of involvement (see also Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996). The first includes activities such as reading to the child or monitoring his or her homework, whereas the latter refers to activities such as contacts with teachers and volunteering for school. Based on the typology of parental involvement developed by Epstein (1986), school-based involvement is sometimes further divided into parent-teacher contact (e.g., talking with the child's teacher or attending a PTA conference) and involvement in school activities (e.g., volunteering or accompanying a school trip).¹ In their comparison of Latino, African American, and European American parents, Lee and Bowen (2006) pointed out that distinguishing between different dimensions of parental involvement is important as ethnic differences may be larger on some dimensions than on others, reflecting possible cultural differences in how parents conceive of school involvement. For instance, they found that Latino and African-American parents had lower levels of school-based but not of home-based involvement than European American parents.

Our survey data capture parents' home-based involvement, as well as their contact with teachers and their participation in school activities. We examine ethnic and gender differences for each of these dimensions separately, as well as assessing whether the distinct items can be considered elements of the same underlying factor.

Explaining parental involvement

Educational psychologists emphasize the role of parents' motivation for their involvement with their children's schooling (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). In this model, the motivation to become involved includes aspects such as constructing an active role for oneself and perceiving self-efficacy ("I can contribute to the schooling of my child"), life circumstances that hamper or facilitate involvement, and the perception that the school appreciates parental involvement (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). The most important psychological antecedents of this motivation thus relate to parents' construction of the parental role and their perceived efficacy in contributing to their children's schooling. Parenting roles refer to parents' ideas

of their and the school's responsibility for their child's educational outcomes. Parents can construct their role as active and cooperative, perceiving their child's schooling as a shared responsibility of themselves and the school, or as passive, ceding responsibility and authority for their child's education to the school. In addition, parents are less likely to be involved if they feel that they lack the skills to help their children with their schoolwork. This perceived efficacy is a specific form of general self-efficacy, which reflects the belief in an individual's abilities to affect or change his or her life outcomes (Bandura, 2010). Empirical research found that parental involvement is greater among parents who construct their parental role as more active (Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 2007) and who report greater self-efficacy regarding their child's schooling (Green et al., 2007; Waanders, Mendez, & Downer, 2007). We therefore include self-efficacy and parenting goals in our analyses. We expect positive associations between general self-efficacy and parental involvement. Regarding parenting goals, our survey data allow us to distinguish between autonomy and obedience as major goals for the development of children at adolescent ages, reflecting authoritative versus authoritarian parenting styles, respectively (Kao, 2004). Parents who value obedience in their children are likely to expect their children to obey teachers as well. Moreover, they are more likely to be more susceptible to authority and therefore to cede responsibility for their children's education to the school, resulting in lower levels of parental involvement. In contrast, the more parents strive for autonomy in their children, the more they are expected to be involved to facilitate their children's flourishing in cooperation with their teachers. We therefore expect parental involvement to be positively related to the parenting goal autonomy and negatively to obedience as parenting goal.

Despite the central importance of the psychological antecedents of motivation for parental involvement, parents additionally need skills and knowledge to engage with their children's education (Green et al., 2007). In the case of immigrant parents, proficiency in the school language is a crucial resource, the lack of which may pose a severe barrier to parental involvement (García Coll et al., 2002; Kim, 2002; Turney & Kao, 2009). Immigrant parents with low levels of language proficiency are less likely to maintain contact with the school and engage in school activities, but they are also less well equipped to help their children with their schoolwork. In addition to language proficiency, parents' level of education is the most widely used indicator for their skills and knowledge and has been found to be reliably related to parental involvement (e.g., Kohl, Lengua, & McMahan, 2000; but for divergent findings relating to socioeconomic status, see Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996). We assess parents' knowledge and skills with the highest level of education they have attended and their proficiency in the Dutch language, and we expect both to be positively related to parental involvement.

Finally, the motivation for parental involvement may be restricted by the time and energy that is available to parents. Single-parent status is known to be a risk factor for lower parental involvement (Kohl et al., 2000; Waanders et al., 2007), as single parents need to attend to work, household chores and their children's education without being able to share the workload with a partner. Similarly, we reason following resource

delusion theory (Downey, 2001) that parents are less likely to be involved in the schooling of a specific child the more children there are in the household. Finally, long work hours may limit parents' involvement with their child's schooling. We therefore consider the presence of a partner and the number of children in the household, as well as the number of hours worked by the parent, in our explanation of parental involvement. We expect the first to be positively and the latter two to be negatively related to parents' involvement.

Ethnic differences in parental involvement

Despite the emphasis on motivation in theoretical models of parental involvement, we first consider skills and resources as potential explanations for ethnic differences in parental involvement. Although the construction of parenting roles as well as the self-efficacy regarding their ability to help their children with their schooling may differ between immigrant and nonimmigrant parents (Pels, 2003), previous research has made clear that Turkish and Moroccan minorities in the Netherlands possess fewer of the skills and resources required for parental involvement than the Dutch majority. The reasons for these discrepancies lie in the history of guest worker migration, which is therefore briefly described here.

Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands initially arrived as guest workers (i.e., they were specifically recruited for low-skilled jobs in mining and industrial production). Most hailed from rural and most deprived areas in their origin countries, such as Central and Eastern Anatolia in Turkey, and the Rif mountains in the North of Morocco. After the initial phase of guest worker migration, the two ethnic communities grew through ensuing family migration and formation (Castles & Miller, 2009; Vermeulen & Penninx, 2000). Many immigrants arrived with no more than primary schooling, and particularly among first-generation Moroccan mothers, illiteracy is not uncommon (Driessen & Dekkers, 1997). Moreover, Turkish and particularly Moroccan minorities have larger families than the Dutch majority population: the average number of children was 2.5 among Turkish and 3.4 among Moroccan women, compared to 1.5 among Dutch majority women (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2010). It is thus clear from previous research that parents of Turkish and Moroccan origin in the Netherlands differ substantially from Dutch majority parents in terms of their level of education, language proficiency and number of children in the household, which shape the skills and resources that are expected to drive parental involvement, on top of the psychological antecedents of motivation. Regarding school-related motivation, on the other hand, research among Moroccan parents shows that achievement in school is the most highly valued parenting goal (Pels, 2003). Research among primary school students additionally shows that achievement motivation is higher among children of Turkish and Moroccan background compared to their Dutch majority peers (Thijs & Fleischmann, 2015). This suggests that a lack of achievement motivation is unlikely to be the primary cause for ethnic minorities' lower levels of parental involvement. To our knowledge, however, there is no evidence about ethnic differences in parents' motivation regarding their involvement in their children's schooling so far.

In our analyses, the first explanation for ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement that we consider therefore refers to parents' highest level of education and their language proficiency as indicators of knowledge and skills. Ethnicity and gender will be indicated by dummy variables for Moroccan and Turkish ethnicity as well as for female gender (cf. *infra*), with Dutch men functioning as reference group. In the next step, we add household resources, namely the presence of a partner, the number of children in the household and working hours as indicators of time and energy available for parental involvement, because these are additionally known to differ across ethnic groups and gender and therefore may contribute to explaining ethnic and gender differences. In the last step, we enter self-efficacy and parenting goals as antecedents of the motivation for parental involvement. This approach allows us to assess which set of variables contributes most to the explanation of ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement by observing when ethnic and gender differences are reduced or become nonsignificant.

Gender differences in parental involvement

Although ethnic differences in parental involvement have been addressed in a number of studies (though previous research is almost exclusively conducted in the United States), the literature on parental involvement has not previously problematized gender differences regarding this important outcome. Nevertheless, it is clear that most parental involvement comes from mothers rather than fathers. Some studies therefore focus exclusively on mothers to measure parental involvement (e.g., Waanders et al., 2007). Others do not specify which parent or adult household member engages in the activities described as parental involvement (e.g., Turney & Kao, 2009). If the focus is on children's outcomes, the level of parental engagement may indeed be more relevant than knowing which parent or household member is involved with the child's schooling. However, gender differences in parental involvement are relevant for gender equality within households, as activities related to children's education are one of the tasks that, like other household chores, adult household members need to coordinate and distribute (cf. Treas & Drobnic, 2010).

In the Netherlands, attitudes toward gender roles are perceived as a major cultural difference between Turkish and Moroccan minorities, who are commonly portrayed as subscribing to more traditional attitudes and roles, and the Dutch majority, which is perceived to subscribe to (if not practice) egalitarian gender roles (Roggeband & Verloo, 2007; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Indeed, a nationally representative survey found that participants of Turkish and Moroccan background held more traditional views about gender roles than nonimmigrant Dutch (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007). Moreover, due to greater female disadvantages in educational attainment in Turkey and Morocco as compared to the Netherlands (Fleischmann & Kristen, 2014), Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch mothers may be less well equipped to help their children with their school work, and a greater maternal involvement in immigrant families could therefore limit the effectiveness of parental involvement for minority children's outcomes. Based on these considerations, we include gender as

a predictor in our first model and we expect mothers to show higher levels of parental involvement than fathers. Moreover, due to an allegedly greater emphasis on traditional task distributions in Turkish and Moroccan families (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007), we expect this gender difference to be larger among Turkish and Moroccan minorities as compared to the Dutch majority reference group. We further explore whether gender differences in parental involvement can be explained by the same factors that we expect to account for ethnic differences.

Method

Data

Our empirical analyses are based on the first wave of the Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS; De Graaf, Kalmijn, Kraaykamp, & Monden, 2010a). This survey was conducted among the Dutch population, with an oversampling of persons of Turkish and Moroccan background between December 2008 and May 2010. The initial sample contained 5,312 participants. From this sample, we selected participants based on three criteria: Participants had to be of Moroccan, Turkish, or Dutch origin, thus excluding participants from the miscellaneous other Western and non-Western minority groups; they had to be parents of children of primary school age (5–12 years old in the Netherlands), because otherwise they did not receive the questions about parental involvement; and they had to have completed both the face-to-face and the self-completion part of the questionnaire, as crucial independent variables were measured only in the self-completion part (for a full description of sampling and survey modes, see De Graaf et al., 2010b). As a result, our final analytical sample contained 1,471 cases, with the following ethnic and gender breakdown: 24.4% Moroccans ($n = 359$), 26.1% Turkish ($n = 384$), 49.5% Dutch ($n = 728$), 57.4% female ($n = 845$). The gender distribution was uneven across groups, $\chi^2(2, N = 1,471) = 12.771, p < .01$: the Moroccan and Dutch samples were female dominated, whereas the Turkish sample was evenly split between men and women.

Measures

Four items were available to assess our dependent variable, parental involvement. Participants indicated how often they engage in each of the following activities: (a) talking with their child about school, (b) attending a parent–teacher conference, (c) talking to teachers or school mentors, and (d) helping out with activities in school. For each of these questions, answer options were on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*). After limiting our sample as described previously, there were no missing values on these four items. Factor analysis with oblimin rotation extracted a single factor with an eigenvalue larger than 1 and which accounted for 58.0% of the total variance in involvement, thus not supporting the conceptual distinction between various dimensions of parental involvement, such as parental engagement and participation (cf. supra). The four items formed a reliable scale with a Cronbach's alpha value of .72.² We decided to compute an overall measure of parental involvement that averages across

the four items and provides an omnibus test of ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement. Because the distribution of this average score was skewed, with a median of 3.25 of the 1–4 scale, we used a median split to create a dichotomous indicator of overall parental engagement. To examine the robustness of our findings, however, we conducted the analyses both with this dichotomous and the continuous measure of overall parental involvement.

In addition, we analyzed separate measures of parental involvement based on the conceptual differences between parental engagement, contact with schools and participation in school activities, as well as their frequency distributions. Of the four parental activities inquired, the first reflects home-based parental engagement, and it is widely practiced among the parents in our sample: 84.0% indicated to talk often to their child about school. Due to the skewed distribution, we dichotomized this item, contrasting parents who engage in this behavior often with those who reported lower frequencies. The three remaining indicators reflect parental participation rather than engagement, but they can be further distinguished into contact with the school and participation in school activities, as well as by the time investment required for them. The contact indicators (visiting parent–teacher conferences and talking to teachers or mentors) usually cost less time and energy than helping out with activities in school; this is reflected in the frequency distributions of these items. Although 75.7% of the participants indicated to visit parent–teacher conferences often, and 60.3% said they often talk to teachers or mentors, only 23.3% chose this answer option for helping with school activities. Thus, in additional analyses, we considered the three indicators parental engagement, contact with school, and participation in school activities. With the exception of participation in school activities, the answer distributions of all items were highly skewed, and we therefore dichotomized these items using median splits.

To assess ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement, and their interactions, we created dummy variables for the Turkish and Moroccan minorities (Dutch = 0) and for female gender (men = 0). Ethnic origin was measured based on participants' or their parents' country of birth, in line with the classification used by Statistics Netherlands (CBS, 2016).

To explain differences in parental involvement, we studied the role of parents' skills and resources, as well as self-efficacy and parenting goals. To capture parents' skills, we included measures of their level of education and their language proficiency. Information about the highest level of education ever attended by participants was recoded into a distinction between participants who had maximally followed primary or lower secondary education (reference category), those who had followed upper secondary education (including vocational as well as academic tracks), and those who followed tertiary education at institutes of higher vocational education or universities.

Self-reported proficiency in the Dutch language was measured with four items, asking how well participants could understand, speak, read and write Dutch, with answer options on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*very well*) to 5 (*not at all*). Among Turkish and Moroccan participants, these four items formed a reliable scale with Cronbach's alpha value of .96. After reversing the items, the average was computed to indicate participants' proficiency in Dutch. Participants of

Dutch origin did not receive these questions and were all assigned a score of 5 on this variable.

Two indicators of the household composition are included: the number of children in the household and the presence of a partner. Because only 2.7% of the participants lived in households with more than four children, we recoded the highest category of this count variable into four or more to prevent the influence of outliers. A dummy variable is used to indicate whether participants live with a partner (0 = no partner in the household).³

To capture participants' time constraints due to their working hours, we include a continuous measure of the number of hours worked per week, using the hours reported as usual workload by participants, rather than the number of hours stated in their contract. Participants who were not working, for whatever reason, were assigned a score of zero on this variable.

Self-efficacy is a scale comprising five items (e.g., "I have little control about what happens to me in life."). Answer options on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranged from 1 (*applies very much to me*) to 4 (*does not apply to me at all*). Factor analysis with oblimin rotation extracted one factor with an eigenvalue larger than 1 which accounted for 67.8% of the variance in self-efficacy. The reliability was high ($\alpha = .88$). We computed the mean of the items, with higher values indicating greater self-efficacy.

Finally, we include two measures of parenting goals. These were assessed based on ten characteristics of which participants indicated how important they would find them for a child aged 12–15, using a 5-point Likert-type answer scale ranging from 1 (*very important*) to 5 (*not important at all*). Factor analysis with varimax rotation extracted two factors with eigenvalues larger than 1, which accounted for 49.3% and 11.7% of the variance in parenting goals, respectively. We labeled the two emerging factors "autonomy" and "obedience." The first comprised the items has a sense of responsibility, is considerate of others, is tolerant, judges independently, and wants to know the reasons behind things ($\alpha = .80$). The second comprised the items is well-mannered, behaves properly, shows respect to

elders, and obeys to what parents say ($\alpha = .83$). The item is ambitious and hard-working was not used for the construction of these scales as it loaded on both factors. For autonomy and obedience, the mean across the items was computed after reversing, so that higher values indicate greater support for the respective parenting goal.

Apart from the measure of language proficiency, none of the variables had missing values in our analytical sample. The remaining missing values ($n = 16$, or 1.1% of the sample) were imputed using the expectation maximization algorithm in SPSS Version 21. All further analyses are based on this imputed dataset. Table 1 provides an overview of the descriptive statistics of the measures used for the sample as a whole, and by ethnic group.

Analyses

To examine ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement and their interaction, we conducted analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with Bonferroni post hoc tests using the continuous measures of overall parental involvement. Ethnic and gender differences in the separate dimensions of involvement, which were treated as dichotomous variables, were examined with chi-square tests.

To explain ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement, we conducted a series of hierarchical regression analyses including up to five models, as discussed previously. OLS regression was used to analyze overall involvement as well as participation in school activities, and logistic regression was applied to dependent variables that had to be dichotomized because of their skewed distribution. Where possible, we used both methods of analysis for the same underlying variable (continuous and dummy coding) to compare findings and base our substantive conclusions on more robust evidence. The comparison of results from linear models and logistic regression is particularly important because estimates in logistic regression may be biased if the residual variance differs across models or subgroups within the sample (Mood, 2010). We aim to explain away significant differences in parental involvement between

Table 1. Descriptive statistics by ethnic group: Averages or percentages.

Variable	Range	Total sample ($n = 1,471$)			Dutch participants ($n = 728$)			Turkish participants ($n = 384$)			Moroccan participants ($n = 359$)		
		%	M	SD	%	M	SD	%	M	SD	%	M	SD
Parental involvement overall	1–4		3.28	0.66		3.37	0.56		3.16	0.76		3.23	0.70
Parental engagement (talk)	0/1	84.0			89.2			79.7			78.3		
Parental contact with school	0/1	73.8			78.0			66.2			73.3		
Parental participation in school activities	0/1	23.3			25.8			20.8			20.9		
Female	0/1	57.4			59.8			49.8			61.0		
Education: Primary or lower secondary	0/1	34.3			19.4			49.5			48.2		
Education: Upper secondary	0/1	40.0			47.1			31.5			34.8		
Education: Tertiary	0/1	25.7			33.5			19.0			17.0		
Dutch proficiency	1–5		4.44	0.93		5.00	0.00		3.80	1.03		3.97	1.06
Number of children in household	0–4		2.31	0.91		2.18	0.86		2.22	0.093		2.68	0.95
Partner in household	0/1	87.6			89.4			85.4			86.1		
Hours worked per week	0–99		25.70	19.17		29.11	16.52		24.62	21.02		19.92	20.58
Self-efficacy	1–4		3.02	0.59		3.15	0.52		2.87	0.59		2.93	0.62
Parenting goal: Autonomy	1–5		4.34	0.47		4.35	0.45		4.36	0.47		4.31	0.52
Parenting goal: Obedience	1–5		4.43	0.49		4.32	0.51		4.52	0.45		4.57	0.44

members of three different ethnic groups and two genders; if the residual variances differ across these groups and/or the models of our analyses, we might incorrectly infer that the variables in our model accounted for the ethnic or gender differences. Because this problem does not apply to OLS regression, results from these analyses are more reliable regarding our ability to explain ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement.

Results

Ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement

According to a one-way ANOVA, both ethnic minorities have significantly lower levels of parental involvement than the Dutch, but they do not differ significantly from each other ($p < .01$). Female participants show significantly higher levels of involvement at $M = 3.47$ than male participants ($M = 3.03$), $F(1, 1469) = 178.184$, $p < .001$. This gender gap, however, does not vary significantly across groups ($F = 1.148$, $p > .05$).

Regarding the dichotomized items of parental engagement, contact with the school and participation, chi-square tests revealed that the distribution differed significantly across ethnic groups and gender for all measures ($p < .001$) except participation in school activities, where the ethnic differences were nonsignificant ($p = .079$).

Explaining ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement

Table 2 shows the results of OLS regression of our overall measure of parental involvement. The first model repeats the already described ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement: Turkish and Moroccan parents report significantly lower levels of involvement than the Dutch reference group, and women report much higher levels of parental involvement than men. The gender differences observed in Model 1 are of a much greater magnitude than the ethnic differences. The latter become nonsignificant in Model 2 upon the introduction of participants' level of education and language

skills, which have the expected positive effects on parental involvement. The further addition of household conditions in Model 3 shows only minor positive effects of the number of children in the household (opposite to what was expected) and of the presence of a partner (in line with expectations), but the inclusion of these variables does not affect the ethnicity and female coefficients as compared to the previous model. Self-efficacy and parenting goals, which are introduced in Model 4, show the expected significant associations with parental involvement. Parents who report higher levels of self-efficacy and who endorse autonomy as a parenting goal more strongly, have higher levels of involvement; moreover, higher levels of the parenting goal obedience go together with lower levels of parental involvement.

The four models succeed in fully explaining ethnic differences in parental involvement, but the gender difference that we find in the first model is only slightly reduced in the subsequent models. To better understand under what conditions these gender differences are larger or smaller, we therefore estimated a Model 5 that includes interactions between female gender and all explanatory variables in a stepwise procedure. This way, only the most significant interaction will show up in the estimates, whereas nonsignificant interactions are excluded from the model. We find a significant negative interaction with having a partner; when this interaction is included, the main effect of living with a partner is still positive and significant and the main effect of female gender becomes much larger. The interaction shows that gender differences in parental involvement are largest for parents who live without a partner in the household and smaller in households where both parents are present. Thus, women in single-parent families show the highest levels of parental involvement and men in single-parent families the lowest; men in families with a partner report more involvement than men without a partner, but they still are less involved than women in a household with a partner, even though the latter are less involved than women without a partner in the home. The final model accounts for a sizable portion (over 20%) of the variance in our overall measures of parental involvement.

To examine the robustness of these results, we repeated the analyses using a dichotomous measure of overall involvement

Table 2. OLS regression of parental involvement (overall; $N = 1,471$).

Predictors	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Constant	3.117 (0.030) ***	2.365 (0.110) ***	2.030 (0.125) ***	1.498 (0.197) ***	1.275 (0.201) ***
Turkish	-0.166 (0.039) ***	0.032 (0.046) <i>ns</i>	0.045 (0.045) <i>ns</i>	0.069 (0.046) <i>ns</i>	0.063 (0.045) <i>ns</i>
Moroccan	-0.152 (0.040) ***	0.025 (0.045) <i>ns</i>	-0.010 (0.045) <i>ns</i>	0.031 (0.046) <i>ns</i>	0.028 (0.045) <i>ns</i>
Female	0.429 (0.033) ***	0.442 (0.032) ***	0.409 (0.040) ***	0.396 (0.039) ***	0.814 (0.100) ***
Education: Upper secondary		0.128 (0.040) **	0.128 (0.040) **	0.109 (0.039) **	0.106 (0.039) **
Education: Tertiary		0.203 (0.045) ***	0.206 (0.045) ***	0.143 (0.046) **	0.143 (0.046) **
Dutch proficiency		0.123 (0.023) ***	0.139 (0.023) ***	0.127 (0.023) ***	0.122 (0.023) ***
Number of children in household			0.095 (0.018) ***	0.089 (0.018) ***	0.432 (0.090) ***
Partner in household			0.103 (0.050) *	0.091 (0.049) <i>ns</i>	0.066 (0.019) ***
Hours worked per week			-0.001 (0.001) <i>ns</i>	-0.001 (0.001) <i>ns</i>	-0.002 (0.001) <i>ns</i>
Self-efficacy				0.095 (0.028) **	0.096 (0.027) **
Parenting goal: Autonomy				0.232 (0.044) ***	0.227 (0.044) ***
Parenting goal: Obedience				-0.149 (0.043) **	-0.144 (0.043) **
Female \times Partner					-0.471 (0.104) ***
Adjusted R^2	0.121	0.163	0.185	0.206	0.217

Note. Standard errors are listed in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3. Logistic regression of parental involvement (overall; $N = 1,471$).

Predictors	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Constant	−0.736 (0.104) ***	−2.772 (0.411) ***	−0.3227 (0.478) ***	−4.852 (0.760) ***	−6.495 (1.005) ***
Turkish	0.146 (0.135) <i>ns</i>	0.406 (0.167) *	0.433(0.168) *	0.523(0.173) **	0.534 (0.174) **
Moroccan	−0.300 (0.137) *	0.195 (0.161) <i>ns</i>	0.147 (0.165) <i>ns</i>	0.267 (0.171) <i>ns</i>	0.292 (0.171) <i>ns</i>
Female	1.441 (0.114) ***	1.553 (0.118) ***	1.400 (0.146) ***	1.390 (0.148) ***	4.293 (1.100) ***
Education: Upper secondary		0.482 (0.145) **	0.494 (0.197) **	0.447 (0.148) **	0.427 (0.149) **
Education: Tertiary		0.865 (0.164) ***	0.901 (0.167) ***	0.737 (0.173) ***	0.731 (0.145) ***
Dutch proficiency		0.290 (0.082) ***	0.345 (0.085) ***	0.318 (0.086) ***	0.317 (0.086) ***
Number of children in household			0.103 (0.067) <i>ns</i>	0.086 (0.068) <i>ns</i>	0.264 (0.104) **
Partner in household			0.277 (0.180) <i>ns</i>	0.246 (0.183) <i>ns</i>	0.196 (0.187) <i>ns</i>
Hours worked per week			−0.007 (0.004) <i>ns</i>	−0.009 (0.004) *	−0.010 (0.004) *
Self-efficacy				0.325 (0.105) **	0.338 (0.105) **
Parenting goal: Autonomy				0.598 (0.167) ***	0.637 (0.169) ***
Parenting goal: Obedience				−0.398 (0.164) *	−0.128 (0.214) <i>ns</i>
Female × Children in household					−0.317 (0.133) *
Female × Parenting goal: Obedience					−0.498 (0.241) *
Cox & Snell R^2	0.114	0.150	0.155	0.169	0.175

Note. Standard errors are listed in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

and logistic regression, shown in Table 3. Moreover, we conducted logistic regression of parental engagement, contact with the school and participation in school activities, shown in Appendix Tables A1–A3. Because the last measure had a less skewed distribution, we also analyzed the continuous measure using OLS regression, as shown in Table A3a. When comparing the findings across the different dimensions of parental involvement, one notable difference is that language proficiency is highly predictive of overall involvement, home-based engagement, and contact with the school, but unrelated to participation in school activities. The ethnic differences in the latter variable are moreover smaller and even nonsignificant in logistic regression models. In addition, the number of hours worked per week is a stronger predictor than in other models. This indicates that participation in school activities is more driven by parents' available time and energy, and less by their skills and resources, than other forms of parental involvement, which is not surprising given the greater time investment required for this form of involvement. However, self-efficacy and parenting goals affect participation in school activities in a similar way as they affect the other involvement outcomes.

Despite some deviations,⁴ the substantive findings converge across the different analyses. Significant ethnic differences in parental involvement are fully accounted for by ethnic minority parents' lower levels of education and language skills. Time and resources, as reflected in household composition and work hours, as well as motivation, as assessed with parents' self-efficacy and their parenting goals, contribute to the explanation of parental involvement, but not to the explanation of ethnic differences therein, once skills and knowledge are controlled for. Finally, the large gender difference in parental involvement cannot be explained with our models, regardless of the specific dimension of involvement under study and despite the many significant relations of the independent variables and the interactions that we found.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to understand ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement in light of the benefits of

parental involvement for children's academic outcomes (e.g., Fan & Chen, 2001; Jeynes, 2005; Keith et al., 1998) and of the marked ethnic differences in educational achievement and attainment in many Western countries (Heath & Brinbaum, 2014). We studied this question based on nationally representative survey data from the Netherlands including parents of primary-school-aged children of Dutch, Turkish and Moroccan background.

We discuss the findings from our analyses with regard to the expectations that we formulated in the introduction. Our hypothesis that ethnic minority parents and fathers would show lower parental involvement than Dutch majority parents and mothers was confirmed in bivariate analyses and in the first model of OLS and logistic regressions. This hypothesis was derived from previous work on ethnic minorities' parental involvement in the United States (Lee & Bowen, 2006; Turney & Kao, 2009) as well as from previous work in the Netherlands, where schools and teachers are frequently worried about a lack of parental involvement among ethnic minority parents (Pels, 2003). Because of the more traditional gender roles among Turkish and Moroccan minorities in the Netherlands (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007) we also expected an interaction between gender and ethnicity, such that greater female than male involvement would be stronger among ethnic minorities. However, no such interaction was found such that the gender gap in involvement does not vary across ethnic groups. We found support for the positive role of education, language proficiency, self-efficacy, and the parenting goal autonomy for parental involvement, as well as for the negative role of the parenting goal obedience. These expectations were based on the role of parental skills (indicated by education and language proficiency) as well as self-efficacy and parenting goals as important psychological antecedents for the motivation to become involved with the schooling of one's children (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). This theoretical model additionally highlights contextual characteristics that facilitate or hamper parental engagement, and we therefore studied the role of the presence of a partner, the number of children in the household and the number of hours worked per week. We expected that these characteristics shape the available time and energy that parents

can invest in involvement with their children's schooling and we hypothesized that the number of children and the number of hours worked would both be related to lower parental involvement. These expectations were, however, not supported with regard to overall engagement, home-based engagement and contacts with schools. Regarding participation in school activities, however, we found that this was indeed lower if parents worked more hours, which reflects the greater time commitment inherent in this specific form of parental involvement. We expected that participants who live with a partner in the household show higher levels of parental involvement, because parental involvement, like other household tasks can be distributed among partners, rather than having to be addressed by a single adult. We found that this was true for fathers, but not for mothers.

Regarding the goal of our study, the explanation of ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement, we found that parents' skills and knowledge, as assessed with their level of education and language proficiency, fully accounted for ethnic differences, regardless of the specific definition of the outcome variable. Available resources and the psychological antecedents of motivation had additional significant associations with parental involvement, but these indicators did not contribute to the explanation of ethnic differences in parental involvement.

These findings provide a starting point for schools and policy makers to increase parental involvement among ethnic minority parents. Parents' levels of education are hard to change, yet language proficiency can be increased, and their children's first school enrolment is a good opportunity to reach parents who would profit from additional language training. One practical implication resulting from the findings of this study therefore is the suggestion for schools to screen the Dutch language proficiency of the parents of new pupils who start primary school, and to organize remedial Dutch classes for parents in cooperation with local organizations offering such courses. Moreover, schools could target their efforts of involving parents more specifically at parents with language difficulties, for instance through the use of invitations in parents' native language. Information in parents' native language about what the school expects from them in terms of supporting their children's education at home and in contact with the school could also be distributed when children first enroll. Importantly, our results do not suggest that the lower levels of parental involvement among ethnic minorities are due to a lower motivation to be involved. Therefore, schools and policy makers need not invest in measures to increase parental motivation to become involved. Though some ethnic differences in self-efficacy and parenting goals were observed in our data, these did not affect the ethnic differences in involvement, once education and language knowledge were taken into account.

In addition to ethnic differences, we explored gender differences in parental involvement. Although previous research had already found greater levels of involvement among mothers than fathers, and some studies even exclude fathers from their samples, no study to our knowledge has addressed the reasons for this gender difference. We argued that involvement with children's schooling is one of the tasks that adult household members need to distribute among each other, and the greater involvement of mothers as compared to fathers contributes to

gender inequality within households (cf. Treas & Drobic, 2010). Indeed, our findings show that gender differences in parental involvement are much larger than ethnic differences. However, this gender difference did not vary across groups; thus relatively low levels of fathers' involvement apply to ethnic minorities as well as the Dutch majority. Moreover, none of the explanatory factors for parental involvement was able to explain why mothers are so much more involved in their children's schooling than fathers. Future research is needed to understand this gender difference and how it affects children's outcomes.

Limitations and strengths

Before drawing conclusions based on our findings, we need to acknowledge the limitations of our study, which relate mainly to our use of existing survey data, but should be evaluated in light of the strengths that result from this approach. One strength is that we had information about different aspects of parental involvement; however, our assessment of home-based involvement was limited to the question of how often parents talked with their child about school. Not surprisingly, a large majority of parents indicated to do this often. More extensive measures of home-based involvement, such as helping with homework, studying for tests, or home rules that facilitate a climate for learning, would probably yield more discrimination and provide a better insight into what parents do at home to enhance their children's schooling experience. We were also limited in the measures of parental motivation for involvement. We used parenting goals to proxy the construction of parenting roles, but a more direct measure assessing how parents envision their role in relation to the school would have been preferable. In addition, Epstein (1986) and Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995, 1997, 2005) included invitations to get involved from the school and the child in their models of parental involvement, but no such information was available in our data. Therefore, the available measures fall short of offering information about the full range of activities and psychological antecedents of parental involvement. Moreover, the use of a standardized measure does not allow for possibly ethnically variant understandings of what constitutes parental involvement. On the other hand, it offers a basis for comparisons across ethnic groups. Furthermore, our measure of self-efficacy reflects general efficacy instead of the efficacy that parents experience when helping their children with their schoolwork. We do not consider this a major limitation, however, because we believe that this general measure most likely provides a more conservative estimate of the role of this motivational factor for parental involvement. Moreover, because skills and resources turned out to be the crucial explanations for ethnic differences in parental involvement, we do not believe that the fact that our measures of the antecedents of parental motivation were not ideal strongly affects our outcomes. Another limitation is that we rely exclusively on parents' self-reports of their involvement as well as their motivation. We have no information about schools and teachers, and thus no means to cross-validate parents' reports about the frequency of their involvement with those of their children or their teachers. Our measures are thus susceptible to social desirability bias and may be upwardly

biased. However, as we are primarily concerned with ethnic and gender differences in parental involvement, monomethod bias and social desirability are only problematic to the extent that they have differential effects on the three ethnic groups under study, as well as on men and women. Although we cannot rule out that this is the case, we believe that this is rather unlikely. A final limitation is that the survey was administered in Dutch only, such that potential participants who were not sufficiently proficient in the Dutch language were excluded. Moreover, participants of Dutch background were not asked about their proficiency in Dutch, which may have led to an overestimation of their language skills in our analysis. This potential source of selectivity and of measurement bias among native Dutch would suggest that our estimates of the role of language proficiency are conservative, since those with the lowest scores on language proficiency are not or underrepresented in the data.

These limitations are outweighed in our view by a number of advantages that come with the use of existing survey data. These advantages include large representative samples with nation-wide coverage. More specifically and in contrast to the more common approach of sampling parents through schools, the sampling procedure used in this survey ensured that we included roughly equal numbers of mother and fathers. Because of the large gender differences in parental involvement, school-based samples are less likely to catch sufficient numbers of fathers to compare their involvement to that of mothers (or other adult caretakers).

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study among large representative samples of male and female parents from Turkish and Moroccan minorities and the Dutch majority shows that ethnic differences in parental involvement are fully explained by ethnic minorities' lower levels of education and language skills, and cannot be attributed to differences in household composition and motivation. While skills, resources, and motivation were successful in explaining differential forms of parental involvement, these factors were unable to explain the large gender differences in parental involvement.

Notes

- In Dutch research, a somewhat different terminology is often used, distinguishing parents' involvement from parental participation. The first aggregates across home- and school-based involvement and is reflected in activities such as talking to the child or to teachers. The second refers to parents' engagement in activities organized by the school (Smit et al., 2007), mirroring Epstein's dimension of involvement in school activities.
- To investigate possible ethnic differences in factor structure and reliability, the factor and reliability analyses were repeated separately for Moroccan, Turkish, and Dutch participants. The factor structure was found to be the same across groups, but the reliability, which was larger than .70 for Moroccan and Turkish participants, was only .62 for Dutch participants, but increased to .67 if the last item (helping out with school activities) was removed from the scale. This supports our strategy of analyzing the separate parental engagement items in addition to the scale based on the four items (cf. infra).
- Because our main interest here is to capture the time constraints faced by parents in single-parent households, we have refrained from considering participants' marital status. However, most of the participants who live with their partner in the household (87.6% of the total sample) are also married to that partner (79.9% of the total sample).
- The findings from the logistic regression of overall involvement (Table 3) differ from those of the OLS regression in that the Turkish coefficient is nonsignificant in Model 1 and becomes significant and positive from Model 2 onwards. Moreover, the results regarding the household composition variables and interactions are different. The number of children and the presence of a partner in the household are not significantly related, but number of hours worked shows the expected negative association once parenting goals and self-efficacy are included. The number of children in the household and the parenting goal obedience show significant negative interactions with female gender. For parental engagement (Table A1) the results are the same as those presented in Table 2, regarding ethnic and gender differences and the positive role of language proficiency, self-efficacy and the presence of a partner for men. All other relations are nonsignificant. Regarding parental contact with the school (Table A2), we find no difference between Moroccan and Dutch parents in Model 1. Proficiency in Dutch, the number of children in the household and the parenting goal autonomy are significantly positively associated, as in Table 2. All other variables are nonsignificant. Finally, with regard to parental participation in school activities, we find no significant ethnic differences in Model 1 when using logistic regression (but a negative significant coefficient for Moroccan ethnicity when using OLS regression), and we find that language proficiency is not significantly associated with involvement. There are no significant interactions between gender and any of the independent variables. Apart from that, the results are similar to those in Table 2.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Jochem Thijs for thoughtful comments on a previous version of this paper.

References

- Arends-Tóth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). Cultural and gender differences in gender-role beliefs, sharing household task and child-care responsibilities, and well-being among immigrants and majority members in The Netherlands. *Sex Roles, 57*, 813–824.
- Bandura, A. (2010). Self-efficacy. In *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*, pp. 1–3. New York, NY: Wiley. doi:10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0836
- Boudon, R. (1974). *Education, opportunity, and social inequality. Changing perspectives in Western Society*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Brinbaum, Y., & Kieffer, A. (2009). Trajectories of immigrants' children in secondary education in France: Differentiation and polarization. *Population-E, 64*, 507–554.
- Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (2009). *The Age of Migration. International population movements in the modern world* (4th ed.). London, England: Macmillan.
- CBS (Central Bureau of Statistics). (2016). Retrieved on 8 April 2016 from <http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/search/?Q=ethnicity&LA=EN>
- De Graaf, P. M., Kalmijn, M., Kraaykamp, G., & Monden, C. W. S. (2010a). *The Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study* (NELLS Wave 1). Dataset. Nijmegen, the Netherlands: Tilburg University & Radboud University Nijmegen.
- De Graaf, P. M., Kalmijn, M., Kraaykamp, G., & Monden, C. W. S. (2010b). *Design and content of the Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study* (NELLS). Nijmegen, the Netherlands: Tilburg University & Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Desimone, L. (1999). Linking parent involvement with student achievement: Do race and income matter? *The Journal of Educational Research, 93*, 11–30.
- Domina, T. (2005). Leveling the home advantage: Assessing the effectiveness of parental involvement in elementary school. *Sociology of Education, 78*, 233–249.

- Downey, D. B. (2001). Number of siblings and intellectual development: The resource dilution explanation. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 497–504.
- Driessen, G., & Dekkers, H. (1997). Educational opportunities in the Netherlands: Policy, students' performance and issues. *International Review of Education*, *43*, 299–315. doi:10.1023/A:1003071705614
- Epstein, J. L. (1986). Parents' reactions to teacher practices of parent involvement. *The Elementary School Journal*, *56*, 271–294.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, *13*, 1–22.
- Fleischmann, F., & Kristen, C. (2014). Gender inequalities in the education of the second generation in western countries. *Sociology of Education*, *87*, 143–170.
- García Coll, C., Akiba, D., Palacios, N., Bailey, B., Silver, R., DiMartino, L., & Chin, C. (2002). Parental involvement in children's education: Lessons from three immigrant groups. *Parenting*, *2*, 303–324.
- Gijsberts, M., & Dagevos, J. (2010). *At home in the Netherlands. Trends in integration of non-Western migrants. Annual report on integration 2009*. The Hague: Netherlands Institute for Social Research.
- Green, C. L., Walker, J. M. T., Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2007). Parents' motivations for involvement in children's education: An empirical test of a theoretical model of parental involvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*, 532–544.
- Heath, A. F., & Brinbaum, Y. (Eds.). (2014). *Unequal attainments. Ethnic educational inequality in ten Western societies*. Oxford: Proceedings of the British Academy.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference? *Teachers College Record*, *97*, 310–331.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? *Review of Educational Research*, *67*, 3–42.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, J. M. T., 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*, 105–130.
- Jackson, M., Jonsson, J. O., & Rudolphi, F. (2012). Ethnic inequality in choice-driven education systems a longitudinal study of performance and choice in England and Sweden. *Sociology of Education*, *85*, 158–178.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to Urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, *40*, 237–269.
- Kao, G. (2004). Parental influences on the educational outcomes of immigrant youth. *International Migration Review*, *38*, 427–449.
- Keith, T. Z., Keith, P. B., Quirk, K. J., Spurduto, J., Santillo, S., & Killings, S. (1998). Longitudinal effects of parent involvement on high school grades: Similarities and differences across gender and ethnic groups. *Journal of School Psychology*, *36*, 335–363.
- Kim, E. (2002). The relationship between parental involvement and children's educational achievement in the Korean immigrant family. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *33*, 529–540.
- Kloosterman, R., Notten, N., Tolsma, J., & Kraaykamp, G. (2011). The effects of parental reading socialization and early school involvement on children's academic performance: A panel study of primary school pupils in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, *27*, 291–306.
- Kohl, G. O., Lengua, L. J., & McMahon, R. J. (2000). Parent involvement in school conceptualizing multiple dimensions and their relations with family and demographic risk factors. *Journal of School Psychology*, *38*, 501–523.
- Lee, J.-S., & Bowen, N. K. (2006). Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary school children. *American Educational Research Journal*, *43*, 193–218.
- Mood, C. (2010). Logistic regression: Why we cannot do what we think we can do and what we can do about it. *European Sociological Review*, *26*, 67–82.
- Pels, T. V. M. (2003). Educational strategies of Moroccan mothers in the Netherlands. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *11*, 63–76.
- Roggeband, C., & Verloo, M. (2007). Dutch women are liberated, migrant women are a problem: The evolution of policy frames on gender and migration in the Netherlands, 1995–2005. *Social Policy & Administration*, *41*, 271–288.
- Smit, F., Driessen, G. W. J. M., Sluiter, R., & Slegers, P. (2007). Types of parents and school strategies aimed at the creation of effective partnerships. *International Journal of Parents in Education*, *1*, 45–52.
- Sniderman, P. M., & Hagendoorn, L. (2007). *When ways of life collide. Multiculturalism and its discontents in the Netherlands*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sui-Chu, E. H., & Willms, J. D. (1996). Effects of parental involvement on eighth-grade achievement. *Sociology of Education*, *69*, 126–141.
- Thijs, J., & Fleischmann, F. (2015). Student-teacher relationships and achievement goal orientations: Examining student perceptions in an ethnically diverse sample. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *42*, 53–63. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2015.08.014.
- Treas, J., & Drobnic, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Dividing the domestic: Men, women, and household work in cross-national perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Turney, K., & Kao, G. (2009). Barriers to school involvement: Are immigrant parents disadvantaged? *The Journal of Educational Research*, *102*, 257–271.
- Van de Werfhorst, H. G., & Van Tubergen, F. (2007). Ethnicity, schooling, and merit in the Netherlands. *Ethnicities*, *7*, 416–444.
- Vermeulen, H., & Penninx, R. (2000). *Immigrant integration: The Dutch case*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Spinhuis.
- Waanders, C., Mendez, J. L., & Downer, J. T. (2007). Parent characteristics, economic stress and neighborhood context as predictors of parent involvement in preschool children's education. *Journal of School Psychology*, *45*, 619–636.
- Yan, W., & Lin, Q. (2005). Parent involvement and mathematics achievement: Contrast across racial and ethnic groups. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *99*, 116–127.

Appendix

Table A1. Logistic regression of parental engagement (talking; $N = 1,471$).

Predictors	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Constant	1.645 (0.136) ***	-1.163 (0.479) *	-1.988 (0.557) ***	-3.799 (0.967) ***	-4.133 (0.977) ***
Turkish	-0.666 (0.177) ***	0.134 (0.226) <i>ns</i>	0.188 (0.228) <i>ns</i>	0.264 (0.235) <i>ns</i>	0.237 (0.236) <i>ns</i>
Moroccan	-0.859 (0.178) ***	-0.154 (0.218) <i>ns</i>	-0.164 (0.222) <i>ns</i>	-0.081 (0.230) <i>ns</i>	-0.087 (0.232) <i>ns</i>
Female	0.903 (0.148) ***	1.000 (0.153) ***	1.122 (0.195) ***	1.063 (0.096) ***	2.167 (0.463) ***
Education: Upper secondary		0.360 (0.186) <i>ns</i>	0.326 (0.188) <i>ns</i>	0.283 (0.189) <i>ns</i>	0.271 (0.190) <i>ns</i>
Education: Tertiary		0.443 (0.217) *	0.396 (0.219) <i>ns</i>	0.252 (0.226) <i>ns</i>	0.250 (0.227) <i>ns</i>
Dutch proficiency		0.492 (0.096) ***	0.497 (0.099) ***	0.477 (0.100) ***	0.464 (0.101) ***
Number of children in household			0.121 (0.085) <i>ns</i>	0.105 (0.086) <i>ns</i>	0.026 (0.092) <i>ns</i>
Partner in household			0.382 (0.231) <i>ns</i>	0.298 (0.237) <i>ns</i>	1.024 (0.355) **
Hours worked per week			0.006 (0.005) <i>ns</i>	0.003 (0.005) <i>ns</i>	0.002 (0.005) <i>ns</i>
Self-efficacy				0.468 (0.134) ***	0.474 (0.134) ***
Parenting goal: Autonomy				0.360 (0.260) <i>ns</i>	0.335 (0.208) <i>ns</i>
Parenting goal: Obedience				-0.185 (0.211) <i>ns</i>	-0.171 (0.213) <i>ns</i>
Female × Partner					-1.279 (0.480) **
Cox & Snell R^2	0.045	0.075	0.081	0.091	0.095

Note. Standard errors are listed in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table A2. Logistic regression of parental contact with school ($N = 1,471$).

Predictors	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Constant	0.733 (0.108)	-1.679 (0.426) ***	-2.535 (0.498) ***	-3.815 (0.817) ***	-4.173 (0.837) ***
Turkish	-0.523 (0.144) ***	0.122 (0.182) <i>ns</i>	0.156 (0.185) <i>ns</i>	0.179 (0.189) <i>ns</i>	0.164 (0.190) <i>ns</i>
Moroccan	-0.285 (0.153) <i>ns</i>	0.303 (0.186) <i>ns</i>	0.204 (0.189) <i>ns</i>	0.246 (0.195) <i>ns</i>	0.242 (0.196) <i>ns</i>
Female	1.007 (0.123) ***	1.084 (0.127) ***	1.042 (0.160) ***	1.014 (0.161) ***	1.866 (0.411) ***
Education: Upper secondary		0.265 (0.155) <i>ns</i>	0.271 (0.157) <i>ns</i>	0.240 (0.158) <i>ns</i>	0.234 (0.159) <i>ns</i>
Education: Tertiary		0.438 (0.179) *	0.444 (0.181) *	0.348 (0.187) <i>ns</i>	0.349 (0.188) <i>ns</i>
Dutch proficiency		0.422 (0.086) ***	0.457 (0.089) ***	0.434 (0.090) ***	0.425 (0.090) ***
Number of children in household			0.295 (0.074) ***	0.287 (0.074) ***	0.237 (0.078) **
Partner in household			0.062 (0.204) <i>ns</i>	0.032 (0.207) <i>ns</i>	0.632 (0.337) <i>ns</i>
Hours worked per week			0.001 (0.004) <i>ns</i>	0.000 (0.004) <i>ns</i>	-0.001 (0.004) <i>ns</i>
Self-efficacy				0.192 (0.114) <i>ns</i>	0.196 (0.115) <i>ns</i>
Parenting goal: Autonomy				0.380 (0.177) *	0.369 (0.178) *
Parenting goal: Obedience				-0.166 (0.176) <i>ns</i>	-0.159 (0.178) <i>ns</i>
Female × Partner					-0.967 (0.426) *
Cox & Snell R^2	0.057	0.086	0.098	0.103	0.106

Note. Standard errors are listed in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table A3. Logistic regression of parental participation in school activities ($N = 1,471$).

Predictors	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Constant	-1.957 (0.142) ***	-3.072 (0.482) ***	-3.247 (0.556) ***	-6.009 (0.883) ***
Turkish	-0.170 (0.157) <i>ns</i>	0.133 (0.187) <i>ns</i>	0.147 (0.188) <i>ns</i>	0.244 (0.194) <i>ns</i>
Moroccan	-0.308 (0.159) <i>ns</i>	-0.034 (0.181) <i>ns</i>	-0.095 (0.186) <i>ns</i>	0.051 (0.195) <i>ns</i>
Female	1.332 (0.147) ***	1.374 (0.149) ***	1.189 (0.177) ***	1.181 (0.180) ***
Education: Upper secondary		0.367 (0.170) *	0.400 (0.172) *	0.333 (0.176) <i>ns</i>
Education: Tertiary		0.571 (0.187) **	0.646 (0.193) **	0.450 (0.201) *
Dutch proficiency		0.142 (0.098) <i>ns</i>	0.190 (0.101) <i>ns</i>	0.144 (0.102) <i>ns</i>
Number of children in household			0.098 (0.078) <i>ns</i>	0.065 (0.079) <i>ns</i>
Partner in household			0.025 (0.199) <i>ns</i>	-0.011 (0.202) <i>ns</i>
Hours worked per week			-0.008 (0.005) <i>ns</i>	-0.009 (0.005) *
Self-efficacy				0.445 (0.120) ***
Parenting goal: Autonomy				0.824 (0.200) ***
Parenting goal: Obedience				-0.413 (0.190) *
Cox & Snell R^2	0.066	0.076	0.080	0.101

Note. Standard errors are listed in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table A3a. OLS Regression of parental participation in school activities ($N = 1,471$).

Predictors	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Constant	2.007 (0.054) ***	1.424 (0.202) ***	1.272 (0.230) ***	0.501 (0.326) <i>ns</i>
Turkish	-0.112 (0.070) <i>ns</i>	0.063 (0.084) <i>ns</i>	0.072 (0.084) <i>ns</i>	0.128 (0.084) <i>ns</i>
Moroccan	-0.240 (0.072) **	-0.079 (0.081) <i>ns</i>	-0.115 (0.083) <i>ns</i>	-0.026 (0.084) <i>ns</i>
Female	0.798 (0.059) ***	0.817 (0.058) ***	0.676 (0.073) ***	0.655 (0.072) ***
Education: Upper secondary		0.249 (0.073) **	0.259 (0.073) ***	0.226 (0.073) **
Education: Tertiary		0.385 (0.082) ***	0.416 (0.083) ***	0.292 (0.084) **
Dutch proficiency		0.065 (0.041) <i>ns</i>	0.101 (0.042) *	0.081 (0.042) <i>ns</i>
Number of children in household			0.058 (0.034) <i>ns</i>	0.047 (0.033) <i>ns</i>
Partner in household			0.105 (0.091) <i>ns</i>	0.082 (0.091) <i>ns</i>
Hours worked per week			-0.006 (0.002) **	-0.007 (0.002) **
Self-efficacy				0.180 (0.051) ***
Parenting goal: Autonomy				0.418 (0.081) ***
Parenting goal: Obedience				-0.320 (0.080) ***
Adjusted R^2	0.117	0.135	0.143	0.165

Note. Standard errors are listed in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.