Journal of Research and Investigation in Education
https://residu.org
ISSN 2987-3851 (online)

Home Visitation and Its Effects on Learners Behavior at Mabini District, Bohol

Marilow Saavedra[1*]

[1] *Abaca Integrated School, Abaca, Mabini, Philippines*

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 20 August 24
Final Revision: 02 September 24
Accepted: 09 September 24
Online Publication: 31 December 24

KEYWORDS

Common Misbehavior of The Learners, Action Plan, Mean Percentage Score, Performance Level, Teacher.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

marilow.saavedra@deped.gov.ph

DOI

10.37034/residu.v2i3.182

A B S T R A C T

The objective of this study is to evaluate the effects of home visitation on learner's behavior in Abaca Elementary School in Mabini, Bohol. The subjects of the study were the kindergarten pupils of the said schools and evaluations focusing on the learner's manifested behaviors were collected based on their respective parent's perception and observations throughout the whole three quarters of the school year. The samples were clustered in to two groups: first group with no home visitation applied and the second group where home visitation was employed. Applying appropriate statistical treatments on the data collected, home visitation was found to have a significantly positive effect on the development and progress of the behavior of the learners as compared to the learner's where home visitation was not employed. It was recommended that a fairly adequate and regular home visitation must be executed by teachers in every alternate quarter within the school year. A firming parent behavior also is contributor to the success of the whole visit conduct and facilitates the easier flow of the planned activities. Collaborative procedures are executed to ensure that all measures taken in this research yields benefits for the improvement of the learner's behavior and greater chances of decreasing the misbehavior being exhibit by this learner. At the last part of this paper, a proposed home visitation module was also developed and formulated.

KATA KUNCI

Perilaku Buruk Umum Peserta Didik, Rencana Aksi, Persentase Skor Rata-rata, Tingkat Kinerja, Guru.

A B S T R A K

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengevaluasi pengaruh kunjungan rumah terhadap perilaku siswa di Sekolah Dasar Abaca di Mabini, Bohol. Subyek penelitian ini adalah siswa taman kanak-kanak di sekolah tersebut dan evaluasi yang berfokus pada perilaku siswa dikumpulkan berdasarkan persepsi dan pengamatan orang tua masing-masing selama tiga perempat tahun ajaran. Sampel dikelompokkan menjadi dua kelompok: kelompok pertama yang tidak melakukan kunjungan rumah dan kelompok kedua yang melakukan kunjungan rumah. Dengan menerapkan perlakuan statistik yang sesuai pada data yang dikumpulkan, kunjungan rumah ditemukan memiliki dampak positif yang signifikan terhadap perkembangan dan kemajuan perilaku peserta didik dibandingkan dengan peserta didik yang tidak melakukan kunjungan rumah. Direkomendasikan agar kunjungan rumah yang cukup memadai dan teratur harus dilaksanakan oleh para guru setiap triwulan dalam tahun ajaran. Perilaku orang tua yang tegas juga berkontribusi terhadap keberhasilan keseluruhan pelaksanaan kunjungan dan memfasilitasi kelancaran kegiatan yang direncanakan. Prosedur kolaboratif dilaksanakan untuk memastikan bahwa semua tindakan yang diambil dalam penelitian ini menghasilkan manfaat bagi peningkatan perilaku pelajar dan peluang yang lebih besar untuk mengurangi perilaku buruk yang ditunjukkan oleh pelajar tersebut. Pada bagian akhir tulisan ini, usulan modul kunjungan rumah juga dikembangkan dan dirumuskan.

1. Introduction

Kindergarten Education is the first stage of compulsory and mandatory formal education which consists of one (1) year of preparatory education for children at least five (5) years old as a prerequisite for Grade 1 [1]. Kindergarten teachers from schools usually meet with new students and their families as they shift into kindergarten [2]. Home visits are the best way to a positive communication and build relationships between teachers and their learners [3]. Creating a strong foundation through home visits is only a first step— the development of these relationships through a stable communication is crucial in maintaining them [4].

Home visits are a valuable tool for growing parents' involvement in their kids' education [5]. In order to attain a change of behavior and improve learning outcomes for students, it is often necessary to work with or meet family members outside the school environment [6]. Home visits are powerful because they put parents in the comfort zone so that they are not apprehensive by any school personnel [7].

This has the most importance where Kindergarten teachers, Launching into Learning (LIL) teachers or child and family center personnel visit families in order to know personally the child's home background [8]. It encourages building close relationships with the family

and motivates the family on how to do their roles as the first teacher of their children by sharing information at home. Because in reality, there are some families who have financial problems; thus, they do not send their kids especially at the first or primary level of school which is kindergarten. Some parents disseminate the wrong information to their child and some parents say, studies will not make people rich but it is only about working hard alone. It is indeed, a piece of wrong information and practice.

Therefore, visitation at the family's home is very essential in individual's life. It is very essential since some parents have no proper ideas on how to motivate their child; provide with the fact that they belong in poor families [9]. Poverty is not the barrier of the life of each person. Hence, it is good to bring up the parents by working in partnership with the kindergarten teacher. Kindergarten teachers must always bear in mind to make moves of sacrifices for the sake of other children's life and for the brightness of their future [10]. Information and education of the community begin at home; therefore, kindergarten teachers must always promote the family to motivate their child sincerely to go to school and to avoid absenteeism.

Visitation at home is very important among all because through it, the child could be made more familiar not only with the kindergarten teacher, but also to the other teachers in their areas where the school belongs [11]. The result of this kind of strategy could reassure the child's benefits for himself/herself as well as the parents. But before the conduct of home visitation, first, a kindergarten must be a model in the first place, living with full of ethics in all forms of worldly life to become a mirror of all children and parents [12]. If this kind of behavior is attained by the kindergarten teacher, then it will become easier for the child to follow.

Conducting home visitation must be ensured that it is in line with what the Department of Education guidelines mandated to do so. Professionalism must always be observed with integrity, discipline, knowledge, and skillfulness before the family and/or before the child. The kindergarten teacher must ensure familiarity with the procedures and guidelines associated with home visits [13]. This task is very interesting and challenging for a kindergarten teacher because he/she needs to be resourceful and knowledgeable in making a proper explanation to the family to properly build a connection to the family. At home, the teacher can observe the condition of the child, so the teacher can make some ideas on how to help the child or student develop a good manner and right conduct in school. It is in our individual homes where the understanding of how to love God commences and respect to each other of all members of the family. The teacher must relay information with full of truth.

Home visitation by the teachers is a core initiative for the attainment of the welfare of the students who lives in rural and urban areas, especially those who belong to families with lowly income and lacking any courage [14]. This is one of the strong pillars on how to succeed in life regardless of where the students come from. The teachers who made a home visit is a kind of sacrifice or effort to assist the students who are losing hopes and are already discouraged to go to school.

Some other parents utilize their children to help contribute to their additional income [15]. This is a very wrong idea since the parents only think for themselves and not the sake of their son and daughter's bright future. That is why the teacher, must promote this home visitation programs to properly explain to parents what is really important in life.

Behavior and character of the student are very applicable not only in their daily life but also to have the courage to mingle with different people within his/her surroundings [16]. Obtaining parent involvement in the education of children can be a challenge for educators. Education of the students is not only the student's responsibility but also the responsibility of both teachers and parents, since teachers and parents are direct educators of their children or student [17]. Such effects include academic success [18]. These are guidelines to promote the students, teachers, and parents in order to have good morale, attitude, and character and to achieve the vision, not only in academics across all hindrances in life but also in good relation toward people based on his integrity [19]. With the passage of the No Child Left behind Act of 2001, Federalism Government is defined for the involvement of parents to their children in education.

Yes, it is true that parents are the first teacher in the family by rendering time and teaching their children on how to read, respect, be kind and make a right decision to the people especially in school. The student in the first place must listen to what teaching is given to them by their parents because this is the exact and proper way where you supposed to go and keep it going and put it into practice at all times anywhere. This allows parents to be partners with educators and be included in making decisions, serving 2 on advisory committees when appropriate [20]. School Teachers must contribute a full effort and sacrifice and fulfill their duties and responsibilities to establish the proper way of communication and conversation with the family and school.

This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of home visitation to the level of the behaviors observed among the pre-elementary learners in Abaca Elementary for the school year 2018-2019. The findings of this study served as bases for proposing a home visitation module for pre-elementary learners.

2. Research Method

The purpose of this study is to explore the effects of one home visit on teacher-parent relationships, teacher-

student relationships, and achievement in the classroom. This research also documents the process used and the results gained by 30 kindergarten pupils or the two groups - first and second. Teachers used home visits as an outreach program for contributing a positive impact on the educational lives of problematic students and improving relationships with parents and students. The teachers describe the effectiveness of home visitation in relation to the observed behaviors of the pre-elementary learners in Abaca Elementary School, Abaca, Mabini, and Bohol for School Year 2018-2019.

The respondents were asked for their opinions of teacher home visitation effects based on children's behavior and other educational issues. Proposed respondents to provide needed data in this study are the kindergarten parents of the first and second group. The researcher would employ a descriptive-quantitative method of research with the aid of a standard research instrument. Direct observations and interviews would also be conducted.

This study will include the parents of 30 kindergarten pupils in the morning session and afternoon session in Abaca Elementary School, Abaca, Mabini, Bohol. The respondents were group according to the grouping of the learners under the first group and second group. First group of learners are not under the home visitation program while the second group were under the home visitation. First Group Learners who are not recipient of the home visitation program. Second Group. Learners who are the recipient of Home Visitation.

The study was conducted in Abaca Elementary School, Mabini, Bohol located in the Municipality of Mabini. Abaca Elementary School is a child-friendly school and a public school of the barangay. The school has a land area of 11,405 square meters. It caters Kindergarten to Grade VI and categorized as one of the biggest schools in the district of Mabini. The total enrolment of the school year 2018-2019 reached to 345 pupils. It also has fourteen (14) teachers and one (1) cluster head. It has 15 classrooms, one (1) office of the school head, one (1) clinic and one (1) computer room. Since there are many kindergarten enrollees, the school has two kindergarten sessions, the morning session and afternoon sessions. The school head, teachers, and stakeholders work together harmoniously for the betterment of the children.

3. Result and Discussion

The findings of this study served as bases for proposing a home visitation module for pre-elementary learners. Specifically, it sought to answer the following aspect of the problem:

a. Problem 1

What is the profile of the learners in terms of sex, birth order, highest educational attainment of the parents, number of siblings; and family income? The answer for profile of the learners based on sex and birth order can be seen on Table 1.

Table 1. Presents the sex and birth order profile of the learners

Items	First Group (n1 = 15)		Second Group (n2 = 15)		Total		Rank
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Sex							
Male	14	93.33	7	46.67	21	70.00	1
Female	1	6.67	8	53.33	9	30.00	2
Birth Order							
1st C	8	53.33	4	26.67	12	40.00	1
2nd C	3	20.00	7	46.67	10	33.33	2
3rd C	1	6.67	3	20.00	4	13.33	3
4th C	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8.5
5th C	1	6.67	0	0.00	1	3.33	5.5
6th C	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8.5
7th C	2	13.33	0	0.00	2	6.67	4
8th C	0	0.00	1	6.67	1	3.33	5.5
9th C	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8.5
10th C	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8.5

As reflected in Table 1 out of 30 respondents, 21 or 70% are male and 9 or 30% are female. Out of 15 respondents categorized in the first group, 14 or 93.33% are male while 1 or 6.67% are female. Moreover, the second group has 46.67% or 7 out of 15, and 53.33% or 8 out of 15 samples, are male and female, respectively.

Moreover, Table 1 presents the birth order of the learners. With respect to the learners' birth order in the family, out of 30 respondents, 12 or 40% are the eldest or firstborn, 10 or 33.33% are the second-born, 4 or 13.33% are the third-born, 2 or 6.67% are seventh, 1 or 3.33 is the fifth, and another 1 or 3.33% is the eighth-born child in the family. Categorized under first group, out of 15 samples, 8 or 53.33% are firstborn, 3 or 20% are second child, 2 or 13.33% are the seventh-child in the family, 1or 6.67% is a third child, and another 6.67% also is a fifth child. In the second group, 7 out of 15 or 46.67% are the second-born,4 or 26.67% are the eldest,

3 or 20% are the third-born, and 1 or 6.67% is the eighth child in the family.

Next, we look into profile of the learners based on parents' highest educational attainment in which can be seen on Table 2.

Table 2. Presents the parents' highest educational attainment of the learners

Items	First Group (n1 = 15)		Second Group (n2 = 15)		Total		Rank
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Father							
Elementary Level	4	26.67	3	20.00	7	23.33	2
Elementary Graduate	1	6.67	2	13.33	3	10.00	5
High School Level	4	26.67	2	13.33	6	20.00	3
High School Graduate	4	26.67	4	26.67	8	26.67	1
Collage Level	2	13.33	2	13.33	4	13.33	4
Collage Graduate	0	0.00	2	13.33	2	6.67	6
Mother							
Elementary Level	5	33.33	4	26.67	12	40.00	2
Elementary Graduate	2	13.33	7	46.67	10	33.33	4.5
High School Level	1	6.67	3	20.00	4	13.33	3
High School Graduate	6	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
Collage Level	1	6.67	0	0.00	1	3.33	4.5
Collage Graduate	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	6

Based on the highest educational attainment of learners' guardians/parents, 8 out of 30 respondents or 26.67% have fathers who are at least high school graduates, 7 or 23.33% were able to attain an elementary level, 6 or 20% acquired a high school level, 4 or 13.33% were able to undergo a college level, 3 or 10% are elementary graduates, and 2 or 6.67% are college graduates. On the mother side 12 out 30 or 40% of the mothers are high school graduates, 9 or 30% obtained an elementary level, 4 or 13.33% took a high school level, 2 or 6.67% got a college level, another 6.67% are elementary graduates, and 1 or 3.33% is a college graduate.

Next, we look into profile of the learners based on number of siblings in the family and average family income in which can be seen on Table 3.

Table 2. Presents the number of siblings in the family and average family income of the learners

Items	First Group (n1 = 15)		Second Group (n2 = 15)		Total		Rank
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Number of siblings							
1	2	13.33	1	6.67	3	10.00	3
2	5	33.33	5	33.33	10	33.33	2
3	5	33.33	7	46.67	12	40.00	1
4	0	0.00	1	6.67	1	3.33	6
5	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9
6	1	6.67	0	0.00	1	3.33	6
7	2	13.33	0	0.00	2	6.67	4
8	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9
9	0	0.00	1	6.67	1	3.33	6
10	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	6.67	6
Family Income							
3,000 a month and below	9	60.00	7	46.67	16	53.55	1
3,001-6,000 a month	5	33.33	4	26.67	9	30.00	2
6,001-9,000 a month	0	0.00	2	13.33	2	6.67	3.5
9,001-12,000 a month	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	6
12,001-15,000 a month	1	6.67	1	6.67	2	6,67	3.5
15,000 above a month	0	0.00	1	6.67	1	3.33	5

As to the learners' corresponding numbers of siblings in their family, out of 30 respondents, 12 or 40% have a total of 3 siblings in the family, 10 or 33.33% have 2 siblings, 3 or 10% have one sibling, 2 or 6.67% have seven, and 1 or 3.33% for each of the three respondents who have four, six, and nine siblings, respectively. With regard to the respondents' corresponding family income, 16 out 0f 30 or 53.33% have a family income ranging from 3,000 Php a month and below, 9 or 30% ranges from 3,001-6000 a month, 2 or 6.67% got 6,001-9,000 a month, another 6.67% obtains a monthly income of 12,001-15,000, and 1 or 3.33% has a monthly family income ranging from 15,000 and above.

b. Problem 2

What are the common misbehaviors among the learners in the first and second groups and to what extent as

observed by the parents during the? First Quarter, Second Quarter, Third Quarter. We can see the answer on Table 4.

Table 4. Common Misbehavior Practices of the Learners in the First Group as Perceived by the Parents in Three Quarters.

Common Misbehavior Practices	*First Quarter*			*Second Quarter*			*Third Quarter*		
	WM	*Interpretation*	*Rank*	*WM*	*Interpretation*	*Rank*	*WM*	*Interpretation*	*Rank*
1. Restless. Runs about or jumps up and down. Doesn't keep still (Walay pahulay, modagan ni molukso pataas ug paubos. Dili makanunayon)	2.87	OP	1	1.93	SP	5	1.87	SP	6
2. Squirmy fidgety child. (Bata nga dili mahimutang)	2.40	OP	5	1.93	SP	5	2.13	SP	1
3. Destroys own or others' belongings. (Paguba sa kaugalingon ni sa ubang mga butang o kabtangan)	2.20	SP	14	1.60	NP	27	1.73	SP	13
4. Fights with other children. (Makig-away sa ubang mga bata)	2.27	SP	11	1.73	SP	19	1.67	NP	17
5. Not much liked by other children. (Dili kaayo nagustohan. Sa ubang mga bata)	2.13	SP	19	1.73	SP	19	1.67	NP	17
6. Is worried. Worries about many things**. (Naguol. Magul-anon kabahin sa daghang mga butang)**	2.07	OP	22	2.00	SP	4	1.60	NP	22
7. Tends to do things on his own, rather solitary ***(Gustong mobuhat sa mga butang nga dayag kay sa tago)***	2.40	OP	5	1.73	SP	19	1.40	NP	28
8. Irritable, quick to "fly off the handle". (Initon ug ulo, dali moatras)	2.47	SP	2	1.87	SP	9	1.67	NP	17
9. Appears miserable, unhappy, tearful, or distressed. (Makitang luoy, dili malipayon, daling mohilak, ni magul-anon)	2.13	SP	19	1.73	SP	19	1.67	NP	17
10. Has twitches, mannerisms or tics of the face and body. (Lihokan, kinaugalingong lihok ni lihok ang nawong ug lawas.)	2.33	SP	10	1.80	SP	14	1.93	SP	4
11. Bites nails or fingers. (Pahiton o paakonang mga kuko ni mga tudlo)	1.80	OP	28	1.53	NP	28	1.60	NP	22
12. Is disobedient. (Dili mosanong o motuman).	2.40	OP	5	1.73	SP	19	1.47	NP	27
13. Has poor concentration or short attention span. (Minos o hinay ug sentido ni mubo ra ang pagpaminaw)	2.40	SP	5	2.13	SP	2	1.80	SP	9
14. Tends to be fearful or afraid of new things or new situations. (Dali rang mohilak ni mahadlok sa mga bag-ong mga butang ni sitwasyon)	2.20	SP	14	1.80	SP	14	1.73	SP	13
15. Fussy or over-particular child. (Batang sukitan ni magsigeg pangutana)	2.13	SP	19	2.13	SP	2	1.93	SP	4
16. Tells lies. (Manugilon o mosulti ug mga bakak)	2.07	OP	22	1.80	SP	14	1.67	NP	17
17. Has wet or soiled self this year. **(Basaon ni lapukong kaugalingon kining tuiga)**	2.47	SP	2	1.80	SP	14	1.73	SP	13
18. Has stuttered or stammered. (Mosultig dili tarong ni hapsay)	2.00	SP	25	1.73	SP	19	1.40	NP	28
19. Has other speech difficulties. (Maglisod ug sulti)	1.80	SP	28	1.47	NP	29	1.40	NP	28
20. Bullies other children (Sungogan sa ubang mga bata)	2.27	OP	11	1.87	SP	9	1.87	SP	6
21. Inattentive. (Lingas o dili maminaw)	2.40	SP	5	1.93	SP	5	2.00	SP	3
22. Doesn't share toys. (Dili magpahulam sa mga dulaan)	2.20	SP	14	1.87	SP	9	1.80	SP	9
23. Cries easily. ***(Daling mohilak)***	2.20	SP	14	1.80	SP	14	1.87	SP	6
24. Blames others. (Manangil sa uban)	2.07	OP	22	1.87	SP	9	1.73	SP	13
25. Gives up easily. (Daling moundang o dili molahutay)	2.47	SP	2	2.20	SP	1	2.13	OP	1
26. Inconsiderate of others. (Dili mohunahuna sa uban)	2.20	SP	14	1.87	SP	9	1.80	SP	9
27. Unusual sexual behaviour. (Dili kasagaran nga kinaiyang panghilawas)	1.87	SP	26	1.67	NP	26	1.60	NP	22
28. Kicks, bites, or hits other children. (Mamatid, mamaak, ni manapat sa ubang mga bata)	1.87	SP	26	1.73	SP	19	1.53	NP	25
29. Stares into space. (Motutok o motan-aw sa palibot)	2.27	SP	11	1.93	SP	5	1.80	SP	9
30. Do you consider this child to have behavior problems? ***(Isipon ba nimo nga kining bataa dunay mga problema sa kinaiya o batasan.***	1.67	NP	30	1.47	NP	29	1.53	NP	25

In the First Group, as indicated in Table 4, the common misbehavior practice in the First Quarter that obtains the lowest weighted mean of 1.67 (Sometimes Practiced) is item number 30, implying that the children's behavior problems are not perceptibly noticeable. On the same quarter, the common misbehavior practice that obtains the highest weighted mean of 2.87 (Often Practiced) in the First Quarter is restlessness (item number 1), wherein the learners' behavior of running about or jumping up and down and not staying is still certainly very much observed based on parents' perception.

In Quarter 2, both items number 19 and 30, which refer to speech difficulty and child behavior problems, respectively, obtained the highest rank with the lowest mean grade of 1.47 (Not Practiced). This would tell us that these corresponding misbehavior practices are not anymore manifested by the learners as perceived by their parents in the Second Quarter. Meanwhile, item 25 that refers to the common misbehavior practice of easily giving up obtained the highest weighted mean of 2.29 (Sometimes Practiced) which implies that such misbehavior practice applies sometimes.

For the Third Quarter, items 7 indicate tends to do things on his own, rather solitary and item number 18, has stuttered or stammered and item number 19, has other speech difficulties, which tied for the highest rank of obtaining the lowest weighted mean of 1.40 (Not Practiced). With this, we can conclude that the learners are found to have positively-behaved well, hence the common misbehavior practices which include doing things in solitary, stuttering and stammering and other speech difficulties are no longer observed. Item number 2 got the highest weighted mean of 2.13 (Sometimes Practiced) which specifically refers to squirming and fidgeting misbehavior practices. This would tell us that such behaviors manifested by the learners tend to be occasionally manifested in particular cases.

The computed composite means in the First, Second, and Third Quarters under the First group are 2.20 (Sometimes Practiced), 1.81 (Sometimes Practiced) and 1.72 (Sometimes Practiced), respectively. These imply that the misbehavior practices manifested by the learners as perceived by their parents are found to be observed infrequently and are only evident on certain occasions. In addition, the composite means have decreased, though in very small values, throughout the three quarters.

On the hand, Table 5 presents the results for the common misbehavior practices of the learners in the second group as perceived by the parents in the three quarters.

Table 5. Common Misbehavior Practices of the Learners in the Second Group as Perceived by the Parents in the Three Quarters

Common Misbehavior Practices	***First Quarter***			***Second Quarter***			***Third Quarter***		
	WM	***Interpretation***	***Rank***	***WM***	***Interpretation***	***Rank***	***WM***	***Interpretation***	***Rank***
1. Restless. Runs about or jumps up and down. Doesn't keep still. (Walay pahulay, modagan ni molukso pataas ug paubos. Dili makanunayon)	2.40	OP	1	2.13	SP	2	1.47	NP	10
2. Squirmy fidgety child. (Bata nga dili mahimutang)	2.13	SP	9	2.13	SP	2	1.27	NP	22
3. Destroys own or others' belongings. (Paguba sa kaugalingon ni sa ubang mga butang okabtangan)	1.73	SP	26	1.80	SP	12	1.33	NP	17
4. Fights with other children. (Makig-away sa ubang mga bata)	1.93	SP	21	1.53	NP	23	1.40	NP	14
5. Not much liked by other children. (Dili kaayo nagustohan. Sa ubang mga bata)	2.33	SP	3	1.67	NP	18	1.53	NP	7
6. Is worried. Worries about many things. **(Naguol. Magul-anon kabahin sa daghang mga butang)**	2.33	SP	3	1.73	SP	13	1.33	NP	17
7. Tends to do things on his own, rather solitary ***(Gustong mobuhat sa mga butang nga dayag kay sa tago)***	2.20	SP	8	1.87	SP	10	1.40	NP	14
8. Irritable, quick to "fly off the handle". (Initon ug ulo, dali moatras)	2.13	SP	9	1.73	SP	13	1.47	NP	10
9. Appears miserable, unhappy, tearful, or distressed. (Makitang luoy, dili malipayon, daling mohilak, ni magul-anon)	1.87	SP	22	1.67	NP	18	1.67	NP	2
10. Has twitches, mannerisms or tics of the face and body. (Lihokan, kinaugalingong lihok ni lihok ang nawong ug lawas.)	2.27	SP	6	2.00	SP	5	1.47	NP	10
11. Bites nails or fingers. (Pahiton o paakonang mga kuko ni mga tudlo)	1.80	SP	24	1.47	NP	28	1.33	NP	17
12. Is disobedient. (Dili mosanong o motuman).	2.07	SP	15	2.00	SP	5	1.33	NP	17
13. Has poor concentration or short attention span. (Minos o hinay ug sentido ni mubo ra ang pagpaminaw)	2.13	SP	9	1.60	NP	22	1.20	NP	25
14. Tends to be fearful or afraid of new things or new situations. (Dali rang mohilak ni mahadlok sa mga bag-ong mga butang ni sitwasyon)	2.13	SP	9	1.93	SP	8	1.60	NP	5
15. Fussy or over-particular child. (Batang sukitan ni magsigeg pangutana)	2.40	OP	1	2.20	SP	1	1.87	SP	1
16. Tells lies. (Manugilon o mosulti ug mga bakak)	1.87	SP	22	1.73	SP	13	1.47	NP	10
17. Has wet or soiled self this year. **(Basaon ni lapukong kaugalingon kining tuiga)**	2.00	SP	18	1.53	NP	23	1.13	NP	28
18. Has stuttered or stammered. (Mosultig dili tarong ni hapsay)	1.73	SP	26	1.47	NP	28	1.13	NP	28
19. Has other speech difficulties. (Maglisod ug sulti)	1.73	SP	26	1.53	NP	23	1.20	NP	25
20. Bullies other children (Sungogan sa ubang mga bata)	2.07	SP	15	1.73	SP	13	1.33	NP	17
21. Inattentive. (Lingas o dili maminaw)	2.00	SP	18	2.00	SP	5	1.53	NP	7
22. Doesn't share toys. (Dili magpahulam sa mga dulaan)	2.00	SP	18	1.67	NP	18	1.40	NP	14
23. Cries easily. ***(Daling mohilak)***	2.07	SP	15	2.07	SP	4	1.67	NP	2
24. Blames others. (Manangil sa uban)	2.13	SP	9	1.73	SP	13	1.27	NP	22
25. Gives up easily. (Daling moundang o dili molahutay)	2.33	SP	3	1.87	SP	10	1.60	NP	5
26. Inconsiderate of others. (Dili mohunahuna sa uban)	2.13	SP	9	1.67	NP	18	1.67	NP	2
27. Unusual sexual behaviour. (Dili kasagaran nga kinaiyang panghilawas)	1.60	NP	30	1.47	NP	28	1.13	NP	28
28. Kicks, bites, or hits other children. (Mamatid, mamaak, ni manapat sa ubang mga bata)	1.67	NP	29	1.53	NP	23	1.20	NP	25
29. Stares into space. (Motutok o motan-aw sa palibot)	2.27	SP	6	1.93	SP	8	1.53	NP	7
30. Do you consider this child to have behavior problems? ***(Isipon ba nimo nga kining bataa dunay mga problema sa kinaiya o batasan.***	1.80	SP	24	1.53	NP	23	1.27	NP	22
Composite Mean	**2.04**	**SP**		**1.76**	**SP**		**1.41**	**NP**	

For the second group of learners as presented in Table 5 in the First Quarter, the common misbehavior practice that took the highest rank for obtaining the lowest weighted mean of 1.60 (Not Practiced) is item number 27 which tells us that unusual sexual behavior was no longer practiced by the learners based on parents' perception. Item 1 obtains the highest mean grade of 2.40 (Often Practiced) which would tell us that a fussy or an over-particular kind of behavior is certainly apparent to learners as one of their common misbehavior practices.

For the Second Quarter, items number 11, 18, and 27 tied for the highest rank obtaining the lowest mean score of 1.47 (Not Practiced). This would lead us to the conclusion that the indicated common misbehavior practices which include biting of nails and fingers, stuttering and stammering in speech, and unusual sexual behaviors, respectively, are misbehaviors that are no longer practiced based on parents' perceptions. On the other hand, a student's fussiness and an over-particular behavior acquired the lowest rank with a weighted mean of 2.20 (Sometimes Practiced). This would tell us that this conspicuous common misbehavior among children can be moderately observed.

For the Third Quarter, items 17, 18, and 27 equally achieved the highest rank with a weighted mean of 1.13 (Not Practiced) which pertains to student behaviors of getting soaked or soiled, stuttering or stammering during speech performance, and unusual sexual behaviors, respectively. This illustrates that such common misbehaviors are no longer manifested based on parents' perception in the given last quarter, while, fussiness or over-particular type of behavior acquired the lowest rank with a weighted mean of 1.87 (Sometimes Practiced).

The composite mean for the First Quarter yields a value of 2.014 (Sometimes Practiced), Second Quarter scores value of 1.76 (Sometimes Practiced), and Third Quarter obtains 1.41 (Not Practiced). The generated results would mean that there is a significant improvement of the learners' misbehavior practices throughout the whole three quarters as perceived by parents under the second group given that home visitation was employed.

c. Problem 3

Is there a significant degree of correlation between learners' misbehavior in any two quarters in the two groups? The answer can be seen on Table 6.

Table 6. Presents Relationship between Learners' Misbehavior in any Two Quarters in the First Group

Variables	*r*	*Crit. Value @ 28 df (0.05) = 0.3620*	*Decision*
First and Second Quarters	0.08894	Insignificant	Ho: Accepted
First and Third Quarters	0.33012	Insignificant	Ho: Accepted
Second and Third Quarters	0.44549	Significant	Ho: Rejected

Table 6 displays the significance of the relationship between learners' misbehavior in any of the two quarters in the first group. The correlation test between the first and Second Quarters yielded an R-value of 0.08894 demonstrating positive but insignificant correlation. Further analysis in testing the significance of the R-value shows that it is that the computed value is apparently less than the critical value of 0.3620 at a 0.05 level of significance with 28 degrees of freedom; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. The decision hereof would tell us that there is no significant relationship in learners' misbehaviors between the First and Second Quarters.

Moreover, in the first and third quarters the computed value of r is 0.3301 showing a slight positive correlation in the relationship between learners' misbehaviors between the first and Third Quarters. Further analysis also implicated that the computed R-value is less than the critical value. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. It can be inferred then that there is no significant relationship in the learners' misbehaviors between the First and Second Quarters. The computed Pearson's r yielded a value of 0.44549 indicating a moderate positive correlation between the learners' misbehaviors in the Second and Third Quarter. Furthermore, the computed r's value is greater than the given critical value; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that the linear association between the two quarters is significant.

In general, we can conclude that for the first group, only Second Quarter and Third Quarter, has the only significant degree of linear association in terms of the perceived misbehavior practices that can be observed by these learners. The findings revealed that the learner's misbehavior in the second quarter affects the misbehavior in the third quarter. Hence, it implies that the progress of the learners' behaviors in the second quarter positively influenced their manifested behaviors in the third quarter.

Next, significance of the relationship between learners' misbehavior in any of the two quarters in the second group can be seen on Table 7.

Table 7. Manifests the Significance of the Relationship between Learners' Misbehavior in any of the Two Quarters in the Second Group

Variables	*r*	*Crit. Value @ 28 df (0.05) = 0.3620*	*Decision*
First and Second Quarters	0.38849	Significant	Ho: Rejected
First and Third Quarters	-0.30870	Insignificant	Ho: Accepted
Second and Third Quarters	0.39635	Significant	Ho: Rejected

As presented in first and second quarters, the obtained value of r is 0.038849 indicating a positive correlation in the learners' misbehavior between the First and Second Quarter. At a 0.05 level of significance, the critical value of 0.3620 with 28 degrees of freedom is evidently smaller than the computed R-value. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. This would substantiate that

there is significant in degree of relationship between the First and Second Quarter and though relatively small, the association between these two quarters is significant.

The findings revealed that the manifested behaviors of the learners in the first quarter positively influenced their observed behaviors in the second quarter. While the first and third quarter the table revealed a negative correlation between the First and Third Quarter since the obtained value of r is -0.3087. Since the computed r is less than the critical value; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, there is no significant degree of relationship in the learners' misbehavior between the First and Third Quarter.

The correlation coefficient r for the second and third quarter has a computed value of 0.3964 denoting a slightly positive correlation. Since the computed value of r is higher than the critical value, hence the null hypothesis is rejected. This would mean that there is significance in the degree of linear association in the learners' misbehaviors between the Second and Third Quarters.

In general, under the second group, the perceived students' misbehaviors in the First Quarter are significantly associated with the observations recorded in the Second Quarter. Though First Quarter has no substantial relationship with the observations documented in the Third Quarter, the Second Quarter is found to be significantly associated with the observations done in the last quarter. We can further conclude that the actual home visitations made in the Second Quarter can be positively associated with the observed behaviors during the parents and teacher post-conference in the Third Quarter as based on parents' perception in the second group.

Several studies have proven the effectiveness of home-visiting programs [21]. One of these results showed that it encouraged the reduction of delinquent behaviors, less aggression, and aids to the decrease of anti-social behavior; hence a progress can be observed.

d. Problem 4

Is there a significant degree of difference on the extent of misbehavior of the learners in the first and second group in the following quarter? The answer can be seen on Table 8.

Table 8. Determine the Difference Between the Extent of Misbehavior of the Learner in the First and Second Group on First Quarter

	First Group	*Second Group*
Mean	2.20	2.04
Variance	0.03619	0.13023
Observations	15	15
Pooled Variance	0.08321	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Df	28	
t Stat	1.49791	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.07267	
t Critical one-tail	1.70113	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.14535	
t Critical two-tail	2.04841	
Result: Insignificant Ho: Accepted		

Table 8 displays the difference between the extent of learners' misbehavior in the first and second group during the First Quarter. Using a two-tailed t-test at a 0.05 level of significance, the tabulated value of test statistic is 2.0484 at 28 degrees of freedom. Furthermore, the computed test statistic resulted in a value of 1.4979 which is not bounded within the critical region based on the tabulated value. In addition, the obtained p-value for the two-tailed test is 0.1454 which is apparently higher than the value of alpha (α). Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. The decision hereof would suggest that there is no significant difference in the extent of observed misbehaviors of learners between the first and second group during the first quarter. The learner's misbehavior in the first group and second group are more or less similar.

Next, we can see difference of the misbehavior during the second quarter on Table 9.

Table 9. Determine the Difference Between the Extent of Misbehavior of the Learner in the First and Second Group on Second Quarter

	First Group	*Second Group*
Mean	1.81	1.76
Variance	0.09013	0.03865
Observations	15	15
Pooled Variance	0.06439	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Df	28	
t Stat	0.52765	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.30095	
t Critical one-tail	1.70113	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.60190	
t Critical two-tail	2.04841	
Result: Insignificant Ho: Accepted		

As shown in Table 9, the tabulated value of the test statistic and the computed value at a 0.05 level of significance with 28 degrees of freedom, are 2.0484 and 0.5277, respectively. Also, the computed p-value of 0.6019 is distinctly higher than the value of the chosen value of $\alpha = 0.05$. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. This would lead us to the conclusion that there is no significant difference in the extent of learners' misbehavior between the first and second group during the Second Quarter.

Next, we can see difference of the misbehavior during the third quarter on Table 10.

Table 10. Determine the Difference Between the Extent of Misbehavior of the Learner in the First and Second Group on Third Quarter

	First Group	*Second Group*
Mean	1.72	1.41
Variance	0.07246	0.03559
Observations	15	15
Pooled Variance	0.05402	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	28	
t Stat	3.74431	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.00042	
t Critical one-tail	1.70113	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.00083	
t Critical two-tail	2.04841	
Result: Significant Ho: Rejected		

In Table 10, the computed value of the test statistic equal to 3.7443 is bounded within the critical region since it is greater than the tabulated value of 2.0484. Furthermore, the computed p-value is 0.0008 indicating that the value is apparently much lower than the value of alpha (α). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. This will imply that there is a significant difference between the extent of misbehavior of the learners in the first and second group during the Third Quarter. It was found out that the first group of learners who are exposed in the home visitation program showed a significant improvement in their behavior than the second group.

e. Problem 5

Is there a significant degree of difference on the extent of misbehavior between the learners of the two groups in the first and second groups? The answer can be seen on Table 11.

Table 11. Presents the Difference on the Extent of Misbehavior Between Learners of the Two Groups in the First and Second Group

	First Group	*Second Group*
Mean	1.91	1.74
Variance	0.03497	0.02744
Observations	15	15
Pooled Variance	0.03121	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	28	
t Stat	2.71016	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.00568	
t Critical one-tail	1.70113	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.01135	
t Critical two-tail	2.04841	
Result: Significant Ho: Rejected		

Displayed in Table 11 is the output in evaluating the significance of the difference in the extent of learners' misbehavior between the first and second group. Based on the data presented, the computed value of the test statistic in a two-tailed t-test is 2.71016. The critical value at a 0.05 level of significance yields a value of 2.0484 at 28 degrees of freedom. Furthermore, the computed p-value of 0.0114 is ascertained to be less than the determined value of alpha (α). This strongly suggests that there is a significant difference in the degree of learners' misbehavior between the first and second groups. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. The findings implied that the home visitation program shows an improvement on the learner's behavior, compared to the first group.

f. Problem 6

Is there a significant degree of difference on the mean gained in the extent of misbehavior between the learners of the two groups in the first and second groups? The answer can be seen on Table 12.

Table 12. Illustrates the Difference in the Mean Gained in the Extent of Learners' Misbehavior Between the First and Second Groups

	First Group	**Second Group**
Mean	0.4756	0.6356
Variance	0.0748	0.2079
Observations	15	15
Pooled Variance	0.14134	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	28	
t Stat	-1.165499	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.126825	
t Critical one-tail	1.701131	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.253650	
t Critical two-tail	2.048407	
Result: Insignificant Ho: Accepted		

At 0.05 level of significance, the tabulated value of test statistic at 28 degrees of freedom resulted to value equal to 2.0484, while the computed value of -1.1655 is not bounded within the critical region. Moreover, the p-value of 0.2537 is much higher than the value of alpha (α). This result illustrates an insignificant level of difference with regard to the extent of learners' misbehavior between the First and second group. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. These statistical findings revealed that the mean improvement of the learner's behavior does not show a significant difference between the first and second group.

g. Problem 7

Is there a significant degree of difference between the extent of learners' misbehavior on the first and 3rd quarters in the? For the first group, the answer can be seen on Table 13.

Table 13. Presents the difference the Extent of Learners Misbehavior on the First and 3rd Quarters in the Second Group

	First Quarter	*Third Quarter*
Mean	2.2000	1.7244
Variance	0.0362	0.0725
Observations	15	15
Pearson Correlation	0.33012	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	14	
t Stat	6.7327	
P(T<=t) one-tail	4.79153E-06	
t Critical one-tail	1.7613	
P(T<=t) two-tail	9.58306E-06	
t Critical two-tail	2.1448	
Result: Significant Ho: Rejected		

Table 13 portrays the result of testing the significant difference for the first group within the First and Third Quarters. It is shown that at a 0.05 level of significance, the critical value of 2.1448 at 14 degrees of freedom and the computed value of 6.7327 is perceptibly within the critical region. Also, compared to alpha-value, the p-value of 0.0000096 is much lesser to a great extent. This would tell us that there is a significant degree of difference in the observed misbehavior of learners under the second group between the first and third quarters, thus the null hypothesis is rejected. It implies that the

learner behavior was significantly improved in the third quarter.

Next, we can see the answer for the second group at Table 14.

Table 14. Presents the Difference Between the Extent of Learner's Misbehavior on the First and Third Quarters in the Second Group

	First Quarter	*Third Quarter*
Mean	2.0422	1.4067
Variance	0.1302	0.0356
Observations	15	15
Pearson Correlation	-0.30870	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	14	
t Stat	5.3991	
P(T<=t) one-tail	4.6881E-05	
t Critical one-tail	1.7613	
P(T<=t) two-tail	9.3762E-05	
t Critical two-tail	2.1448	
Result: Significant		
Ho: Rejected		

Based on the computed t-test, a value of 5.3991 is bounded within the critical region given the tabulated value of 2.1448 at a 0.05 level of significance with 14 degrees of freedom. The resulting p-value of 0.000096 is also much lower than the value of alpha (α). With this, we can ascertain that there is a significant level of difference in the degree of learners' misbehavior between the First and Third Quarter. The provided substantiation from the decision made would imply that home visitation carried out in the Second Quarter made a significant effect on the progress and development in the learners' characterized behaviors.

h. Problem 8

Is there a significant degree of variance on the extent of learners' misbehavior of the two groups of learners in the three quarters? The answer for the first group can be seen on Table 15.

Table 15. Presents the Variance on the Extent of the Two Groups of Learners in the Three Quarters

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*
First Quarter	15	33.00	2.20	0.03619
Second Quarter	15	27.20	1.81	0.09013
Third Quarter	15	25.87	1.72	0.07246

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit (0.05)*
Between Groups	1.91783	2	0.9589	14.4725	1.66E-05	3.21994
Within Groups	2.78281	42	0.0663			
				Result: Significant		
Total	4.70064	44		**Ho: Rejected**		

Using a one-way ANOVA test as illustrated in Table 15, the computed F-value of 14.4725 is substantially higher than the critical value of 3.2199 at a 0.05 level of significance. Additionally, the obtained p-value of 0.00002 is much lesser than the predefined value of alpha (α). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. The obtained result hereof implies that there is a significant difference in the three consecutive quarters with respect to the computed means accounted for the level of misbehavior perceivable in the learner-participants demeanor and conducts.

The test showed a statistical significance, a post-hoc test is further applied to examine where the quarters' differences lie. Using Scheffe's test for multiple comparisons, the critical value at a 0.05 level of significance gives a value of 6.44. Since the computed value of F between the First and Second Quarter resulted to value of 16.92 which is much greater than the critical value, hence null hypothesis is rejected. This means that the discernible behaviors characterized by the learner-participants between the two consecutive quarters are significantly different. The second row also showed a computed F-value of 25.60 denoting that there is also a significant difference on the perceived level of learners' misbehaviors between First and Third Quarter. Nevertheless, with an F-value of 0.89, the comparison between the Second and Third Quarter showed that there is an insignificant difference in the level of misbehaviors observed.

Next, we can see the answer for second group on Table 16.

Table 16. Presents the Analysis of Variance on the Extent of Learners Misbehavior of the Second Group of Learners in the Three Quarters

SUMMARY

Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*
First Quarter	15	30.6333	2.04	0.1302
Second Quarter	15	26.4667	1.76	0.0386
Third Quarter	15	21.1000	1.41	0.0356

ANOVA

Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit (0.05)*
Between Groups	3.0455	2	1.5227	22.3423	2.463E-07	3.2199
Within Groups	2.8625	42	0.0682			
				Result: Significant		
Total	5.9080	44		**Ho: Rejected**		

Upon evaluating the second group as portrayed in Table 16, at a 0.05 level of significance, the critical F-value obtained using the ANOVA test is 3.2199. It also follows that the computed F-value of 22.3423 is bounded within the critical region since it is less than the critical value. The resulting p-value is estimated to be close to zero; hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Since the result for the ANOVA test reveals a statistically significant difference on the extent of learners' misbehavior along the three succeeding quarters, Scheffe's test is again used to test a comparison among the group means being assessed. At a 0.05 level of significance, the F-critical has a value equal to 6.44. Further analysis showed that all comparisons between any of the two quarters obtained computed F-statistics higher than the critical value, since First Quarter vs. Second Quarter got 8.49, First vs. Third quarter is 22.22, and Second vs. Third Quarter has an F-value of 14.09. This leads to the conclusion that all consecutive quarters have significantly differed among each other; hence the null hypotheses are rejected.

4. Conclusion

Based on the study conducted, it can be suggested that a good design of home visitation for pre-elementary learners must be done in every alternate quarter starting at the very beginning of the academic year. Overall, it has been concluded that home visitation indeed, has a very significant impact on the growth and positive development of students' behaviors as compared to the group of learners where home visitation was not employed. Home visitations could greatly give an impact on the learners' conduct as well as their respective performances in school, given the fact that parents were able to be regularly updated with feedbacks from the teacher about their children's' current status/condition in school.

References

[1] Departement of Education Philipines. (2019). Omnibus Policy on Kindergarten Education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/DO_s2016_47.pdf

[2] Pianta, R. C., Cox, M. J., Taylor, L., & Early, D. (1999). Kindergarten teachers' practices related to the transition to school: Results of a national survey. *The Elementary School Journal*, *100*(1), 71-86. https://doi.org/10.1086/461944

[3] Stetson, R., Stetson, E., Sinclair, B., & Nix, K. (2012). Home Visits: Teacher Reflections about Relationships, Student Behavior, and Achievement. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *21*(1), 21-37.

[4] Canary, D. J., & Dainton, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Maintaining relationships through communication: Relational, contextual, and cultural variations*. Routledge.

[5] Basnyat, S. (2023). Parental Involvement on Home Schooling of Basic Level Children in Nepal. *Educational Journal*, *2*(2), 111-122. https://doi.org/10.3126/ej.v2i2.61701

[6] Clarke, B. L., Sheridan, S. M., & Woods, K. E. (2010). Elements of healthy family-school relationships. In *Handbook of school-family partnerships* (pp. 61-79). Routledge.

[7] Whyte, K. L., & Karabon, A. (2016). Transforming teacher–family relationships: Shifting roles and perceptions of home visits through the funds of knowledge approach. *Early Years*, *36*(2), 207-221. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2016.1139546

[8] Ihmeideh, F., & Oliemat, E. (2015). The effectiveness of family involvement in early childhood programmes: perceptions of kindergarten principals and teachers. *Early Child Development and Care*, *185*(2), 181-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2014.915817

[9] West, J. M. (2000). Increasing Parent Involvement for Student Motivation.

[10] Peabody, E. P. (1887). *Education in the Home, the Kindergarten, and the Primary School*. Swan Sonnenschein.

[11] Broström, S. (2002). Communication and continuity in the transition from kindergarten to school. In *Transitions in the early years* (pp. 76-87). Routledge.

[12] Dahlberg, G., & Moss, P. (2004). *Ethics and politics in early childhood education*. Routledge.

[13] Kraft-Sayre, M. E., & Pianta, R. C. (2000). Enhancing the Transition to Kindergarten: Linking Children, Families, & Schools.

[14] Mapp, K. L., & Kuttner, P. J. (2013). Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships. *Sedl*.

[15] Hirshberg, D., Huang, D. S. C., & Fuller, B. (2005). Which low-income parents select child-care?: Family demand and neighborhood organizations. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *27*(10), 1119-1148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2004.12.029

[16] Miller, C. B. (2014). *Character and moral psychology*. OUP Oxford.

[17] Thornton, S., & Kilbert, G. (1997). California strategic plan for parental involvement. *Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education*.

[18] Cassity, J., & Harris, S. (2000). Parents of ESL students: A study of parental involvement. *NASSP Bulletin*, *84*(619), 55-62. https://doi.org/10.1177/019263650008461906

[19] Parental Involvement in Education. (1999). The importance of parent involvement. https://bit.ly/2CL6LzZ. Date accessed January 21, 2019

[20] No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2 U.S.C. § 6319. (2002). https://bit.ly/2HzwDTh.

[21] Franklin, C., Harris, M. B., & Allen-Meares, P. (Eds.). (2008). *The school practitioner's concise companion to preventing dropout and attendance problems*. Oxford University Press, USA.