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ABSTRACT

The goal of this research was to develop a greater understanding of the effectiveness of enrichment programs outside of the school setting. This study was also intended to contribute to the broader understanding of the mechanism of student school-related stress, reported by parents, as it relates to student academic performance, specifically in a population which primarily consists of students and parents who are of Asian-Indian-American descent. With rising standards and intensifying pressure on students to be academically successful, it is necessary to examine the stress students experience due to their academics, as well as its effects on their academic performance. Participants in this study included twenty 1st through 5th grade elementary students who attend weekly classes at one of three local academies where the after-school academic enrichment program is offered. Data from those students participating in both math and English was accounted for separately, resulting in 34 total student subjects which can be utilized for this study (N = 34). After performing bivariate logistic regression, the models did not reach significance (p > .05), therefore it cannot be said that an increase or decrease in dependent variable of students’ school grades can be predicted that any of the following independent variables: homework completion, length of enrollment, and academy homework scores. The perceptions of the parents, in addition to those of the children experiencing these stressors should be studied further.
CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

Background

Existing data has shown that students in the United States lack the necessary level of academic preparedness required to be competitive in the global marketplace when compared to students in other countries, although there is a large variation in opinion regarding the impact of a number of potential contributing factors (Greenstone & Looney, 2011; Heckman, 2008; Lee & Wassel, 2012). As a result, regularly-occurring debates regarding the concept of a common core curriculum given the academic standings of students in the U.S. have continued to take place.

The lack of preparedness and ongoing debates led to the National Governor’s Association (NGA) and the Council Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to begin the process of constructing new educational standards, dividing them into two separate categories: 1) college- and career-readiness and 2) K-12 (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017). With the advent of these updated standards, teachers, parents, standardized test developers, and program developers also found themselves needing to accommodate for the changes made to the new curriculum.

Not coincidentally, the global [private] tutoring market has shown dramatic growth over the past decade with increasing standards, evolving techniques, and growing pressure on students to achieve academic success (Global Industry Analysts, Inc. [GIA], 2016). There is a lack of program evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the individual programs on students’ academic success. Students are far more likely to have improved lifetime outcomes, higher self-esteem, and increased confidence when they perform better in school. Thus, evaluating the
effectiveness of these programs is vital to ensuring not only academic success, but also the associated positive outcomes (Greenstone & Looney, 2011; Heckman, 2008).

While positive outcomes are commonly seen as a result of academic success, it would be remiss to leave the impact of student stress on academic success unexamined. Along with the benefits an enrichment program can provide, there is also the potential for increasing the levels of stress experienced by the student which should be considered.

**Program Overview: A Grade Ahead**

The Academic Enrichment Program (AEP) examined in this study was created by A Grade Ahead (formerly MathWizard), a private, national company headquartered in Ohio with franchises, or enrichment academies, currently located in thirteen additional states across the U.S. The company defines its program as:

An after-school enrichment program with math and English classes for pre-kindergarten through high school students. Our classes are held once a week and last for 50 minutes. All of our classes have a maximum of eight students and are separated by subject and grade. Our curriculum is carefully crafted by our own education experts to follow and exceed national education standards. Students in our program learn not only fundamental skills, but also how to apply that knowledge to real world situations. In each class, a teacher presents a lesson and then the class works together on a worksheet that supports the lesson of the week. Our students are provided a total of four days of work per week to solidify the lesson. These worksheets are completed at home before the next class (A Grade Ahead [AGA], 2017a, p. 1).

While the three enrichment academies took part in this study are franchises of the company, a few minor distinctions regarding structure and procedure at these locations should be made. Instead of 50-minute classes, all classes at these academies last for one hour, as an additional 10 minutes is factored in to allow the teachers time to check the previous week’s homework and assist with any potential difficulties the student(s) may have experienced. Additionally, the classes have a maximum of 4-5 students as opposed to eight.
With such a wide variety of enrichment and tutoring programs, it is imperative to make a distinction between A Grade Ahead and its alternatives. The math and English programs offered at AGA differ from those of their competitors in a few, essential ways. According to A Grade Ahead (2017a):

We are very different. Our curriculum isn’t just numerical drills or fast facts, we also have word problems that promote critical thinking and help students apply basic concepts, like addition or multiplication, to real-life scenarios. […] Students at A Grade Ahead are taught in a small classroom setting by a teacher with at least three years of college education, not a high school student. We never mix grade levels or subjects in our classroom either. Each class will be all 2nd grade math students, or 4th grade English, etc. Starting this year, we will also include interactive hands-on activities once a month to further solidify the student’s real-life learning (pp. 1-2).

The goal of the A Grade Ahead programs is not only to create a better understanding of the concepts that will be covered in the students’ schools, but also to allow the students to get ahead in school. By running the program year-round with new grade levels beginning in the month of June, students are able to learn and familiarize themselves with concepts and topics 2-3 months prior to when the same topics are taught in schools. This is designed to not only create a deeper understanding of these concepts, but ideally, instills a sense of self-confidence in the student by providing them an opportunity to have already learned the concepts by the time they will be taught in school.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study is a multi-level issue involving not only academic success and program effectiveness, but also the level and impact of school-related stress on students. More specifically, this study examined students primarily of Asian-Indian-American descent attending [elementary] schools and residing in the counties adjoining to Hillsborough, which the three participating enrichment academies are currently located. Although academic success of these students tends to be a high priority for Indian-American parents, it was
necessary to examine the effect of the students’ participation in the AEP on their academic achievements, as well as the interactions between the academy-provided homework, and quarterly student school grades (Bodas, Ollendick, & Sovani, 2008).

**Study Significance and Research Questions**

The goal of this research was to develop a greater understanding of the effectiveness of enrichment programs outside of the school setting, especially those designed to align with the curriculum guidelines set by the state and federal governments. This study was also intended to contribute to the broader understanding of the mechanism of student school-related stress, reported by parents, as it relates to student academic performance, specifically in a population which primarily consists of students and parents who are of Asian-Indian-American descent. In order to accomplish these goals, the study addressed four main research questions:

1. Does completion of the homework provided by the academic enrichment program have a positive effect on the student performance?
2. Does the length of enrollment in the academic enrichment program have a positive effect on student performance?
3. Are scores on homework assignments provided by the academic enrichment program positively associated with student performance in school?
4. Is there an association/connection between parental perceptions of school-related stress and student performance?

**Study Rationale**

**Addressing program effectiveness.** With increasing standards, evolving techniques, and growing pressure on students to achieve academic success, the global [private] tutoring market has grown significantly over the past decade, forecasted to reach $227 billion by 2022 (Global
Industry Analysts, Inc. [GIA], 2016). As with many other markets, a higher demand begets a larger supply. Global Industry Analysts, Inc. (2016) cited 85 international major players in this market, which does not account for companies based solely in the United States or self-employed, independent tutors. While a large number of privately-owned tutoring companies exist, their programs have not been subject to a formal program evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program with regard to the improvement of students’ school grades. Program effectiveness is important not only to ensure the participants (students) and their parents are getting the best value for the time and resources being put towards the program, but also because a positive relationship between student performance and long-term success exists; when students do better in school, they are far more likely to have improved lifetime outcomes, higher self-esteem, and increased confidence (Greenstone & Looney, 2011; Heckman, 2008).

**Examining school-related student stress.** Although student performance and long-term success have been shown to be positively correlated, given the rising standards and intensifying pressure on students to be academically successful, it is imperative to examine the stress students experience due to their academics, as well as its effects on their academic performance. The target population of the academic enrichment program (See Appendix A), Asian-Indian-American parents and their children, is heavily represented at each academy, thus the majority of enrolled students are likely to experience a higher level of school-related stress than their peers as a result of their familial-cultural environment (AGA, 2017b; Bodas, Ollendick, & Sovani, 2008). Furthermore, school systems which implement high-stake testing and examinations, such as the Florida Standards Assessments (FSA), have been found to cause additional school-related stress (A Grade Ahead, 2017b; Bodas, Ollendick, & Sovani, 2008). The high representation of Asian-Indian-American students at an after-school academic enrichment program aligns with the
current literature which found that Indian parents strongly emphasize academic achievement, actively participate in their child’s education, and “often enroll their children in after-school tutoring to advance their academic achievements” (Bodas, Ollendick, & Sovani, 2008, p. 390).
CHAPTER TWO:
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

The following review of the literature is intended to highlight the essential concepts within both the current public education system and the enrichment program being evaluated and their relationship to school-related stress the parents perceive for their children within this population. The intention is to create a holistic understanding of the unique characteristics of the population which is overwhelmingly represented at academic enrichment programs similar to the one being examined for this study. The objective is to investigate how these characteristics, along with the enrichment program, interact and affect the in-school academic performance of the enrolled students.

This review begins with an overview of the current situation in the public education system in the United States, briefly explaining the reasoning behind the implementation of new national standards, now known as Common Core standards. The second section outlines the academic enrichment program being evaluated as a part of this study, including a description of the characteristics of the program’s intended target audience of foreign-born, Asian-Indian-American parents and children currently residing in the U.S. The following section includes a discussion on the potential impact of stress on children, both short- and long-term. Finally, the review concludes with a summary of the survey utilized in the study, specifically the previously developed 28-item scale intended to measure parental perceptions of childhood school-related stress.
The Educational Context

While there is a large variation in opinion regarding the impact of a number of potential contributing factors, existing data continue to show that students in the United States consistently lack the necessary level of academic preparedness required to be competitive in the global marketplace when compared to students in other countries (Greenstone & Looney, 2011; Heckman, 2008; Lee & Wassel, 2012). The Program for International Student Assessments (PISA) is a system of international assessments whose goal is to assess students’ preparedness for challenges of life young adults experience by allowing countries to compare outcomes of learning at a time when students are near the end of their compulsory education. The most recent findings on mathematics, science, and reading literacy, reported in 2015, placed the United States far behind other Asian and European countries in all three subjects, ranking 40th, 25th, and 24th respectively (National Center on Education Statistics, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c).

Common Core

The information about the academic standings of students in the U.S. has contributed to the regularly-occurring debates regarding the concept of a common core curriculum. In 2008, a report was released by the National Governor’s Association (NGA), the Council Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and Achieve, Inc., which advised states to “upgrade state standards by adopting a common core of internationally benchmarked standards in math and language arts for grades K-12 to ensure students are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to be globally competitive” (p. 10). With this goal in mind, the NGA and the CCSSO began the process of constructing new educational standards, dividing them into two separate categories: 1) college- and career-readiness; and 2) K-12 (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017).
After years of development and feedback, these standards, now known as *Common Core State Standards*, were adopted, and implementation began in December 2013 (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017). To date, 42 states (down from 45 states upon initial adoption in 2013), 4 territories, and the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) have adopted and implemented the Common Core State Standards in both English Language Arts, or ELA, and mathematics (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017).

**Academic Enrichment Program**

The academic enrichment program in question, developed originally as a mail-in enrichment program in 2001, operates year-round, with new grade levels beginning in the month of June each year. The program curriculum has been designed to follow the Common Core curriculum established by the federal government and currently followed by 42 of 50 states (AGA, 2017; Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2017). Ideally, students will encounter the topics covered by Common Core one to three months in advance, due to the year-round curriculum starting in the month of June as opposed to the month of August, when many public schools begin the new school year (AGA, 2017). The enrichment academy also provides an overview of their message hierarchy (Appendix B) which lays out components of the program which the company feels are essential to its success and that of its students (AGA, 2017).

**Target Population**

The target population, or target audience of the program, as established by the developers of the program, are parents and students who are among the most highly educated groups in the United States: foreign-born, Asian Indians (AGA, 2017b).

**Population characteristics.** According to the company’s marketing guidelines, the majority of parents whose children are enrolled in their program meet the following criteria: 1)
possess bachelor’s degrees, with many who have earned graduate degrees; 2) work in white collar management; 3) work in professions such as engineering, computer sciences, and medicine; and 4) have one of the highest median household incomes in the nation (AGA, 2017b).

While these particular professions can be demanding, parents of Asian-Indian-American children typically remain highly involved in their child’s schoolwork even as they enter middle and high school, often supervising and monitoring their child as they complete their school homework (Verma, Sharma, & Larson, 2002). The focus on parents and children of Asian-Indian-American descent results from the strong emphasis placed on children’s academic achievement within this community, including their active participation in their child’s education, often including the child’s enrollment in after-school tutoring programs to advance their academic achievements (Bodas, Ollendick, & Sovani, 2008; Sarma, 2014).

**Stress in Children**

While children experience a range of stressors from different areas of their lives, according to Greene (1988), school was identified as the most stressful domain of childhood stress and worrying about grades was found to be the third most frequent stressor after death of a pet and death of a relative. Although studies which examine stress within the school environment primarily emphasize more of the social and interpersonal elements of school-related stress, studies which have examined the academic aspects have frequently found potentially worrisome results with regard to aspects of a child’s mental health (Henke, 2012). In a study done by Morales and Guerra (2006), school stress, including a measurement on worrying about grades, was related to lower achievement in both math and reading and higher levels of depression and aggression. Additionally, in a study done in India by Verma, Sharma, & Larson (2002), homework was found to be the most negative aspect of schoolwork experience, “associated with
an experience of significantly more anger, irritability, stress, and boredom even than classwork.”

The study’s findings also suggested that “large amounts of time spent on homework may lead to negative adjustment for Indian adolescents,” and less time spent on leisure was related to more negative states, though this time was found to be related to increased academic anxiety (Verma, Sharma, & Larson). While this particular study focused on students in India, its findings are pertinent to any country or culture in which high-stake testing and pressure to perform well in school exists.

**Parent Survey and Parental Perceptions of School Stress [PPSS] Scale**

The 28-item PPSS scale was designed to measure parental perceptions of school stress in school-age children (Henke, 2012). The scale was developed as a part of a larger survey created to help fill a gap in the literature largely due to a lack of proper tools for measuring parents’ perceptions of the school-related stress their children experience (Henke, 2012). While the measurement of parental perceptions as opposed to student perceptions can be limiting, it is particularly relevant to examine the views of the parents in a community which places such a large emphasis on their children’s academic achievement.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was guided by the *Theory of Change (ToC)*, which is considered to be a model which views the intervention, the AEP in this study, as a contributory cause. The ToC model functions as a framework for analyzing how an intervention works (Mayne, 2015). The intervention is the proposed solution to the problem or situation given in the logic model: parents want to ensure their children perform well in school, specifically in math and English, especially in high-stake testing such as the Florida Standardized Assessment (FSA). Further explanation of this model can be broken down into a series of “if…then” statements. Provided the assumptions
of the logic model are true, and the necessary inputs are in place, if the outputs given in the model occur, then the result will be the short-term outcomes. Outputs are broken down into two separate categories: 1) services; and 2) participation. The services are provided by the AEP, and the participation is the necessary action by the intervention’s participants in order for the short-term outcomes to take place. If the short-term outcomes occur, then they will result in the intermediate outcomes over time. Likewise, if the intermediate outcomes occur, then they will result in the long-term outcomes over time. The final consideration for the logic model is external factors which are factors that may impact the intervention, but that the intervention does not have the ability to control.
Logic Model

Situation
Parents want to ensure their children perform well in school, specifically in math and English, especially in high-stake testing such as the FSA.

Inputs
- Funding
- School-aligned curriculum
- Training for staff
- Convenient location for classes
- Office space for classes
- Marketing of business

Outputs
- Services: Deliver weekly one hour classes for math and English and weekly homework for each.
- Participation: Student attend classes each week and complete homework.

Short-Term Outcomes
- Students are understanding the lessons/material taught at the academy.

Intermediate Outcomes
- Students are applying their understanding of material when topic arises in school.
- Students are applying what they’ve learned in standardized testing.

Long-Term Outcomes
- Students consistently perform well in their classes and on standardized testing.
- Students experience less stress regarding school grades and standardized testing.

Assumptions
Effective marketing, sufficient staffing, sufficient funding/tuition & enrollments, continued high student performance is related to student’s understanding of concepts/material, and effective school-aligned curriculum.

External Factors
Changes in school curriculum, school/teacher adherence to curriculum set by the state, vacations/long breaks taken by parents/students, and state of the economy (program affordability).

Figure 1. Enrichment Program Theory of Change Logic Model
CHAPTER THREE:

METHODS

Summary of Study Design

This study used a cross-sectional design to evaluate student performance (Denscombe, 2010; Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011).

Population Sample

Participants in this study included 20 1st through 5th grade elementary students who attend weekly classes at one of three local academies where the after-school academic enrichment program is offered. In order to be included in the study, students must have been enrolled in the program for a minimum of three months between June 2017 and March 2018 and for a minimum of two consecutive school grading periods. Students may be enrolled in either math, English, or both subjects, but data was only included in the subject or subjects for which they have met the minimum requirements to enter the study. Data from those students participating in both math and English was accounted for separately, resulting in 34 total student subjects which can be utilized for this study ($N = 34$). All participants were students in one of the three Florida counties: 1) Hillsborough; 2) Pinellas; or 3) Pasco.

Exclusion Criteria. Students who receive additional extra sessions outside of their weekly classes on a regular basis and students who are placed in a different grade level in the program than at school were excluded from the study.

Recruitment. After obtaining exemption (See Appendix C) from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and approval to examine the academic enrichment program by the company’s
corporate headquarters, as well as the franchise owner of the three academies proposed to be involved, a list including all active and inactive students fitting the study criteria was developed. Parents whose children meet participant criteria were contacted in-person and/or via email regarding both school grade submission and survey completion. Parents were able to chose either to only submit the student’s grades or to submit both the student’s school grades and complete the parent survey, but were not permitted to complete the survey without school grade submission. Incentives for parent participation included a $10 gift card for every tenth participant.

**Data Collection and Analyses**

**Definition of Terms**

**Parental perceptions.** Parental perceptions have been previously defined by Sorensen (1993), as well as by Henke (2012), the developer of the survey being utilized in the current study:

> The parents’ ability to recognize and understand the attitudes and emotions resulting from their children’s experiences that may occur during events or situations even when the parent is not present, and yet, provides a perspective on the child’s socioemotional adjustment.

Henke (2012) adds: “Perceptions are derived from the individual parent’s own unique experiences and culture, as well as subjective values, opinions and understandings” (Ravet, 2007).

**School-related stress.** For the purpose of this study, the use of the term “school-related stress” was based on the study from which the parent survey was obtained, emphasizing the dimensions of school-related stress as it relates to the academic focus of the school environment (Henke, 2012).
Instrumentation: Parent Survey and Parental Perceptions of School Stress [PPSS]

Scale

The 28-item scale used in this study was designed to measure parental perceptions of school stress in school-age children (Henke, 2012). The scale was developed as a part of a larger survey created to help fill a current gap in the literature largely due to a lack of proper tools for measuring parents’ perceptions of the school-related stress their children experience (Henke, 2012). The scale originally included an additional two items, totaling 30 items overall, but upon analysis of the responses, two items were determined to have negative corrected item-total correlations and were not believed to be theoretically important to the study. Thus, they were removed from the original scale (Henke, 2012). Despite this particular scale being in its initial phase of development at the time of the study in 2012, there is no evidence in the literature that a more appropriate scale has been developed.

Survey omissions and adaptations. Although the survey utilized was found to be an appropriate instrument to determine the level of childhood school stress as perceived by parents in this study, non-essential portions of the survey were omitted due to various reasons. All of Section A of the survey (See Appendix E) but the initial question regarding participant consent were omitted, as the information was either irrelevant or can be obtained through the academy by matching the parent with an anonymous student identification number. There were no questions omitted from Section B of the survey (See Appendix E). Only questions 1 and 2 have been included from Section C of the survey (See Appendix E); all other questions were not considered relevant to this study, as it did not intend to measure or investigate the level or type of parent involvement or family engagement (Henke, 2012). Questions 1 and 2, however, intend to
measure time invested in homework and perceived child academic performance which were considered pertinent to this study (Henke, 2012).

Section D, which is comprised of demographic questions, was significantly adapted to fit the needs of the current study and tailored to fit its participants. Questions regarding family marital and employment situations and income were omitted. Questions regarding both parent and student country of origin, as well as the number of years lived in the United States, were added to this portion of the survey. Finally, the question regarding the language spoken in the students’ homes was altered to specify only the primary language spoken, and response options were adapted to fit the target audience of the enrichment program (AGA, 2017; Henke, 2012).

Data Collection

Participant demographics. The following demographic variables were collected either via student records or parent survey, including: 1) student grade level; 2) student gender; 3) student race/ethnicity; 4) student and parent birthplace (United States or outside of the United States); 5) number of years in the United States (for both parent and student, if born outside the United States); 6) primary language spoken in student home; and 7) parent level of education.

Academy homework scores. Homework is provided weekly by the academic enrichment program after the lesson is taught in school. Each week includes four days of student homework in both math and English, although the first day of each homework is typically done with the teacher in-class as a part of the weekly lesson. The homework is then turned-in to the teachers when the students return for their lesson the following week, and the teachers grade homework and record the scores on what is referred to as a ‘monthly results recording sheet,’ which is kept in individual student folders for the remainder of the curriculum year.
While both a ‘numerical drill section’ and a ‘curriculum section’ are included in the students’ math homework each week, the ‘curriculum section’ is the focus of the weekly lessons and includes the material which has been aligned with Common Core. Therefore, only the ‘curriculum section’ scores were included in the data set for this particular study. Similarly, the English homework includes up to five separately scored subcategories: 1) reading comprehension; 2) vocabulary; 3) grammar; 4) writing; and 5) literary devices, but all scores fall under the ‘curriculum section’ category. Although the entirety of the program’s English material and homework provided by the academy is considered to be part of the curriculum, there are only two categories for English (or ELA) grades in public elementary schools in the area: 1) reading; and 2) writing. Due to this limitation by the data set including students’ school grades, only the program homework scores within the two subcategories of reading comprehension and writing were included in this study.

**Quarterly school grades.** Students’ quarterly school grades were provided by their parents or guardians. The data have a particular limitation due to the variability in the grade levels of the students selected for this study. At the elementary school level, grading scales contain letter grades only; they do not utilize number grades or a grade point average. Thus, results appear in an ordinal data set rather than a continuous one. Additionally, the grading scales vary slightly among the different county school districts as well as between grade levels (Hillsborough County Public Schools, 2016; Pinellas County Schools, 2016). In order to mediate this issue, this study focused on the upward or downward movement between letter grades, rather than utilizing the letter grades themselves. Student grades were obtained from the parents prior to the completion of the survey. Letter grades were coded into numerical values and collapsed into four categories (A or E = 4, B or S = 3, C or N = 2, D/F or U = 1). The differentiation between
letter grades D and F was deemed unnecessary, as none of the collected data included these letter grades.

**Parent survey.** Upon consent (See Appendix D), parents were administered, at one of three individual academies, a 39-item in person survey (See Appendix E), including the 28-item scale measuring parental perceptions of school-related stress (PPSS). Only one parent per student or family (in the case of siblings) completed the survey. The response options for the parental perceptions scale include a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *very seldom* to 5 = *very often*). All items begin with “How often does your child seem to…” and end in phrases regarding school-related stress including: “think the assigned school work is too hard?”; “be worried about homework?”; and “be highly motivated to do assigned work at home?”

**Independent Variables**

**Length of enrollment.** Length of enrollment was measured in months as an integer variable between 3 to 10 months (3-month minimum and 10-month maximum value due to the inclusion criteria and the defined period of time examined by the study), as the program is based on month-to-month tuition, but students may join the program at any point during the year. Start and end dates have been previously recorded in the enrichment program’s web application, facilitating a simple determination of all students’ length of enrollment.

**Attendance.** Attendance was measured by determining whether the student attended their weekly classes at least three of the four weeks (75%) in a given month of the program (attended/present = 1). Students who missed more than one weekly class in a given month were considered “not present” (did not attend/not present = 0). The total percentage of ‘attended’ months out of the number of months enrolled was then calculated and subsequently recoded into
a dichotomous variable with at least 75% attendance over the period of enrollment = 1 and below
75% attendance = 0.

**Homework completion.** Homework completion was defined by determining student
consistency in completing at least 50% of the assigned weekly homework. In order to be
considered as “complete” (complete = 1), a student must have completed the homework through
the end of the second day of the four days’ worth of assigned work. Homework belonging to
students who regularly completed less than 50% of their weekly homework for more than one
week per month (i.e. four weeks) was considered as “incomplete” (incomplete = 0). The total
percentage of months where homework was considered “complete” out of the months which
students ‘attended’ was then calculated and recoded into a dichotomous variable with at least
75% of homework completion = 1 and below 75% of homework completion = 0.

**School-related stress.** As the responses for all items within the 28-item scale utilize a 5-
point Likert scale, an average score was calculated for each participant. These scores were
represented as a continuous variable, ranging from one to five, or from the least = 1, to the most
= 5 amount of parent perceived school-related student stress. Responses for items 4, 6, and 17-19
were reverse coded, as a response of *very seldom* (1) indicated a high level of perceived stress
and *very often* (5) indicated a low level of perceived stress, unlike the remainder of the items
within the survey scale.

**Parental perception of student performance.** One of the additional questions on the
parent survey that was not included in the PPSS score was “How well do you think your child
performed in school?” which was measured and coded as a 4-point Likert scale response (0 =
“Don’t Know,” 1 = “Below Average,” 2 = “Average,” and 3 = “Above Average”). Two values
were recoded (1 = “Above Average” and 3 = “Below Average”) in order to test the correlation
between this variable and the school-related stress variable. The school-related stress score was thought to be correlated to a more negative parental perception of student performance; in order to test this correlation, the more negative parental perception of student performance was given a higher coded value to mirror the coding of the school-related stress variable where 1 = low stress levels and 5 = high stress levels.

**Time spent on school homework.** Another two questions included in the parent survey that were not a part of the PPSS score were the average amount of hours spent doing school homework on a regular school night. The first part of the question asked how much time the parent estimated that the child spends doing the homework; the second part of the question asked how much time parents estimated they spent working with their child on the school homework. Response options were represented as a continuous variable between 0.0 and 4.0 hours.

**Student gender.** Student gender was determined through the academy’s student records and coded as a dichotomous variable (1 = female/0 = male).

**Outcome Measures (Dependent Variables)**

**Student performance.** For purposes of this study, the operational definition of student performance, as mentioned in research questions 1-3, was collapsed into two separate categories of high performance (1)/low performance (0), with school letter grade increase of 1 or more/no change in a ‘good’ school letter grade = 1 and no change in a ‘bad’ school letter grade/school letter grade decrease of 1 or more = 0 [SPSS] (Yampolskaya, Massey, & Greenbaum, 2006). Letter grades B or S and above were considered ‘good’ grades, while grades below were considered ‘bad’ grades.
Data Analysis

All analyses were carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for Macintosh, Version 23 (IBM Corp., 2015). The analysis of the dataset first included descriptive frequency statistics on all available demographic variables, including: 1) student grade level; 2) student gender; 3) student race/ethnicity; 4) student and parent birthplace (United States or outside of the United States); 5) number of years in the United States (for both parent and student, if born outside the United States); 6) primary language spoken in student home; and 7) parent level of education.

Bivariate logistic regression was conducted to address the research questions related to student performance and the following: length of enrollment; homework completion; and students’ homework scores; (Foster, 2003; Vaughan, Lalonde, Jenkins-Guarnieri, 2014). Bivariate logistic regressions examined the association between each predictor and the outcome (UCLA, n.d.).

Additionally, Spearman correlation analysis was performed to test the relationship between the PPSS score, parental perception of student performance, and time spent on school homework for both the child and the parent. Finally, to test for any potential association between gender and other variables, Fisher’s Exact Test was performed. This test was performed in place of a Pearson Chi-Square test due to the lack of normality within the data (UCLA, n.d.).

Missing data. Missing data was likely to occur with regards to academy homework scores, as the work is not accepted if it is late or if a student is absent, resulting in a set of missing scores. In order to minimize the amount of missing data within the academy homework scores, the mean scores for each month was calculated for each student and category. Subsequently, the mean scores for each of the three quarters (between 3 and 4 months) in the
study were also calculated. Finally, the differences between the averaged academy homework scores for each quarter was obtained (Q1 to Q2; Q2 to Q3; and Q1 to Q3). This allowed for listwise deletion of missing data; performing listwise deletion of this missing data prior to the condensing of the data would have resulted in the loss of a large amount of data and a decrease in an already small sample size, thus risking the ability to run any analyses with sufficient power (Lieberman-Betz et al., 2014).
CHAPTER FOUR:

RESULTS

Frequency Statistics

Student Demographics

Of the 20 students included in this study, 15 (75%) were female and 5 (25%) were male; the majority of the students (6 students, 30%) were in 3rd Grade, both 1st and 4th Grades had 5 (25%) students each, and 2nd and 5th Grades each had 2 (10%) students. Sixteen (80%) of students were born in the United States, leaving four (20%) students who were not born in the United States. Of these 4 students born outside of the U.S., 3 (75%; or 15% of all students) have lived in the U.S. for 5 or more years, and 1 (25%; or 5% of all students) have lived in the U.S. for 3-5 years. When asked how they would describe their children, 15 (75%) of parents selected ‘Asian,’ 3 (15%) selected ‘Eastern Indian,’ 1 (5%) selected ‘Other,’ specifying ‘Indian’ in the blank, and 1 (5%) selected ‘White.’ Parents were also asked to indicate the primary language spoken in their home (the language spoken most often). While it was intended that parents would select only one language, many parents made two selections, all of which included English as one. English, alone, was indicated as the primary language spoken in their home by 7 (35%) parents, 1 (5%) parent selected both English and Hindi, 4 (20%) parents chose English and wrote in Telugu, 5 (25%) wrote in Telugu, and the following languages were selected or written in by 1 (5%) parent each: Tamil, Malayalam, and Farsi (Persian).

Parent Demographics
Parents were also asked if they were born in the United States, and if not, how many years they had lived in the U.S. Only 2 (10%) of the 20 parent participants indicated they were born in the U.S., with 18 (90%) of parents being born outside of the United States. Of these 18 parents, when asked how many years they had lived in the United States, 14 (~78%; or 70% of all parents) selected ‘more than 10 years’, 3 (~17%; or 15% of all parents) chose ‘5-10 years,’ and 1 (~6%; or 5% of all parents) selected ‘3-5 years.’ Finally, parents were asked about their highest level of completed education; there were no participants who have completed any less than an undergraduate degree, 2 (10%) have completed an undergraduate degree, and the majority, 18 (90%) parent participants, have completed a graduate degree.

**Bivariate Logistic Regression**

**Length of Enrollment**

Results of bivariate logistic regression indicated that there was no significant association between length of enrollment and student performance in either math or English.

**Homework Completion**

Results of bivariate logistic regression indicated that there was no significant association between homework completion and student performance in either math or English.

**Academy Homework Scores**

Results of bivariate logistic regression indicated that there was no significant association between academy homework scores and student performance in either math or English.

| Table 1. Factors Associated with Student Performance in Math Among Children (N = 34) |
|---------------------------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Program factors                | B      | Wald χ²(1) | OR     | 95% CI          |
| Length of enrollment           | -6.476 | 0.000 | 0.999 | [0.000, none]   |
| Homework completion            | -1.012 | 0.489 | 0.364 | [0.021, 6.187]  |
| Academy homework scores        | -0.010 | 0.015 | 0.990 | [0.842, 1.163]  |

*Note. OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval*
Table 2. Factors Associated with Student Performance in English Among Children (N = 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program factors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Wald $\chi^2$(1)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of enrollment</td>
<td>-6.376</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>[0.000, none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework completion</td>
<td>-1.504</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>[0.009, 5.275]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy homework scores</td>
<td>5.796</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>328.852</td>
<td>[0.000, none]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

Spearman Correlation Analysis

**PPSS and Parental Perception of Student Performance**

The Spearman correlation analysis revealed a positive relationship between the PPSS mean score and parental perceptions of student performance ($r_s = .501, p = .024, N = 20$). The same analysis also revealed a positive relationship between the average amount of time a parent estimated their child spent doing school homework on a regular school night and the average amount of time they estimated they spent doing school homework on a regular school night with their child ($r_s = .635, p = .003, N = 20$).
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Many studies have examined the effect of school-related stress on students, including its potentially negative effects on the students’ learning process and their mental health. However, rather than attempting to mitigate these effects by searching for ways to decrease school-related stress, the public education system continuously increases pressure on students and places emphasis on high-stake testing and examinations, such as the Florida Standardized Assessment (FSA).

Enrichment Program Evaluation

The following three research questions examined the enrichment program looked at factors related to the program and their effects on student performance, 1) Does completion of the homework provided by the academic enrichment program have a positive effect on the student performance; 2) Does the length of enrollment in the academic enrichment program have a positive effect on student performance; and 3) Are scores on homework assignments provided by the academic enrichment program positively associated with student performance in school. With the lack of statistically significant models, the effects of the different variables included in the evaluation cannot be accurately interpreted. With regard to the logic model, if these intermediate outcomes of student performance are not being reached, long-term goals will also not occur. Assumptions within the logic model may also not be true, or the inputs for the program may not be in place. It should also be noted that the participation portion of the outcomes within the logic model required parents to ensure students attended classes and
students completed their homework provided by the academies. With irregular attendance or frequently incomplete homework, one of the requirements for any of the outcomes to be met, is not occurring. This can prevent any of the outcomes from taking place, as the outputs are necessary even for short-term outcomes to be accomplished. Another potential explanation may not be that the program is not effective; it is also possible the lack of statistical power and lack of normality within the data, along with the fact that very few students enrolled in the program or in the study receive poor school grades, did not allow for a fully accurate view of the program.

**Parent Survey**

The demographic variables collected via the parent survey support the information regarding target audience provided by the enrichment program: the majority of the parents are foreign-born (Asian-Indian-Americans), with most parents holding a graduate degree (AGA, 2017b).

A strong, positive correlation was found between the mean PPSS score and how well the parent believed their student performs in school. While it may seem inherently logical that parents whose mean PPSS score indicated lower perceived school stress level in their children would also believe they perform well in school, it is essential to keep in mind these perceptions are not those of the children. Students whose parents believe they typically perform above average in academics may experience increased stress in order to meet the perceptions and expectations of their parents to maintain this level of performance.

Not surprisingly, there was also a strong, positive correlation found between the average amount of time a parent estimated their child spent doing school homework on a regular school night and the average amount of time they estimated they spent doing school homework on a regular school night with their child. This supports a previously discussed concept from existing
literature which stated that parents of Asian-Indian-American children typically remain highly involved in their child’s schoolwork even as they enter middle and high school, often supervising and monitoring their child as they complete their school homework (Verma, Sharma, & Larson, 2002).

**Study Strengths and Limitations**

The main strength of this study is that it is novel research; there have been no independent evaluations of available privately-owned tutoring companies, including the company involved in the study. Another strength of the study is the ability to have its results easily translated back to the program developers and the community. The results of the study findings are being directly reported back to the individuals directly responsible for the creation and design of the program, but also to those responsible for the implementation of the program at an individual academy level.

A main limitation of this study was its sample size due to the parameters set for inclusion criteria to allow for appropriate analysis. The maximum possible number of eligible participants at the beginning of the study was small at 61, which was increased to a total of 95 with students eligible in both subjects being counted twice. The final number of participants was 20, with a total of 34 after counting mathematics and English separately. Due to this small sample size, the data also lacked normality; both qualities make for a more challenging, accurate statistical analysis.

Another significant limitation was the incomplete data used for academy homework scores and a lack of indication on homework score recording sheets as to the reason for the missing scores (e.g., student absence and incomplete homework). Furthermore, a large majority of the students in the study were already academically high-performing students, making it
difficult to assess the impact of the program with regard to its ability to improve student understanding and student performance. There was no option to compare their performance within the program to an equivalent control had they not enrolled in the program.

**Implications for Behavioral Health and Public Health**

This study is significant to both the fields of public health and behavioral health and to those responsible for developing and/or implementing the academic enrichment program.

**Research**

Although the current literature already provides an abundance of data regarding both the potential negative effects of stress and the increased amount of parental pressure experienced by children with Asian-Indian-American parents (Verma, Sharma, & Larson, 2002), this study had the unique ability to explore the interactions between the parents’ perceptions of childhood student stress, student school grades, and the impact of an academic enrichment program. While too much pressure on a child is generally viewed to have a negative effect, this concept begs the questions of what can be considered ‘too much,’ and at what point does parental pressure for academic success become a detriment to the child’s academic performance and overall well-being (Verma, Sharma, & Larson, 2002).

Additionally, with the lack of evaluation of private tutoring and teaching companies’ programs, this study will make an important contribution to the current literature and begin to fill the existing gap involving these particular types of programs leading the way for future research. Additionally, it opens the possibility of continuing program evaluation for this particular program to study the effects of the program with greater depth. Further research with an increased sample size and, perhaps, expanded inclusion criteria which would allow for students who may have more room for improvement is also necessary to make more definitive claims.
regarding the true effectiveness of the enrichment program. Finally, research regarding the perceptions of the students, themselves, would better inform the overall understanding of their experience of stress as it relates to both school and the enrichment program. This would allow for a much deeper understanding of how enrollment in additional tutoring or enrichment, a common practice among Asian-Indian-American parents and families, affects the overall stress levels of the students as they relate to academics.

**Practice**

The survey utilized in this study was originally developed to bridge a gap in existing literature examining how parents perceive their children’s school-related stress levels. Thus, the additional use of this survey not only serves to assist in increasing the scale’s ability to apply to additional research, but will also contribute to narrowing the literature gap found regarding the parents’ perceptions of school-related stress found in their children. This literature gap is also indicative of a lack of focus on childhood stress as it relates specifically to academic aspects of school-related stress. As schools and teachers continue to increase workloads and standardized testing continues to increase pressure on students, the short- and long-term effects of this pressure should be further examined on a regular basis including the consideration of the cultural context in which it is being examined. Not only should the perceptions of the parents be studied, but also those of the children experiencing these stressors in order to better inform the management of these factors to avoid potentially negative outcomes.

While there can be a high level of complexity involved in the of stressors students may experience and how the different stressors interact, schools would be a more apt environment for examining and assessing students’ school-related stress levels. The use of a scale or a measure to test all students within the school system to examine academically-related stress levels of
students on a regular basis has the ability to be beneficial for students psychologically, emotionally, and academically. If schools and teachers are better informed regarding the experience of the student, it can serve to not only improve the well-being of the student along with their academic performance, but has the potential to improve classroom management as well. Children are less likely to be disruptive in class and receptive to teaching when they feel a sense of community within the classroom, as well as a positive relationship with their teacher(s), thereby enabling a continued decrease in the overall school-related stress experienced by students.

Policy

With such a large number of privately-owned tutoring programs and companies, it can be difficult to keep track of exactly how many even exist, but that should not prevent closer scrutiny of these types of programs. While there may be reasons outside of this program’s true effectiveness that provide an explanation for the study results, these types of programs should still be subject to some type of independent evaluation on a regular basis. Individuals or companies providing teaching and/or tutoring to students need to be closely looked at to ensure that parents and students are not being taken advantage of in the future. Additionally, when considering the implementation of new or additional testing or new curricula, the potential effects on school-related stress levels of students should be taken into account and inform the decision-making and implementation processes.
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Appendix A: A Grade Ahead Target Audience (AGA, 2017b, p. 26)

1.5 Our Target Audience

Even the best brands don’t try to appeal to everyone. Instead, they efficiently target their messaging and marketing to a clientele with a certain demographic and psychographic make-up that is most likely to buy the product or service.

The parents and students who A Grade Ahead traditionally attracts are foreign born Asian Indians who are among the most highly educated groups in the United States. The Asian American population as a whole is growing, affluent, and technologically savvy.

The majority of our parents:
- Hold bachelor’s degrees and many have graduate degrees
- Work in white collar management and professions such as engineering, computer sciences, and medicine
- Have one of the highest median household incomes in the nation

According to market research, members of this population:
- Consider being a good parent their most important personal ambition
- Feel they should have great influence on their children’s career choices
- Encourage their children to be successful academically to have a secure future
- Place great value on family, community, and interpersonal relationships
- Are heavily influenced by family and friends, which points to the importance of word-of-mouth recommendations and referrals
- Highly respect their elders, who often live with them and play a role in decision-making
- Are deliberate and thoughtful in their decision-making process
- Shun aggressive behavior and may feel aggressive sales tactics are disrespectful

Our target audience has unique media habits as well:
- Internet and ethnic newspapers are the preferred medium of communication
- Asian American men ages 25-54 spend on average 50% more time on the Internet than other men in the same age group, and 9% more time than the average reading newspapers
- Asian American Internet users spend more time online daily and view more pages than other English speaking ethnic or racial group
- They make significantly more online purchases annually than Whites, Hispanics, or African Americans
- Asian Americans use multiple digital screens to view programming and videos more often than other multicultural segments
Appendix B: A Grade Ahead Message Hierarchy (AGA, 2017b, p. 27)

1.4 Our Message Hierarchy

A Grade Ahead challenges your child to a higher academic standard than they receive in school and provides state-of-the-art curriculum aligned with Common Core standards.

- We continuously conduct research, evaluate best practices, and invest in our curriculum.
- We review our curriculum annually and seek input from teachers, academy directors, and parents to improve our performance.
- We focus on real-world applications of skills to encourage critical thinking and problem solving.
- Our students receive intensive preparation for standardized testing, including simulated practice tests to familiarize them with test formats and test-taking tips.

A Grade Ahead’s academy offers students the advantages of individualized attention within a small group classroom setting.

- Small groups facilitate a close working relationship between teachers and students, enabling teachers to identify and adapt to each student’s needs and progress.
- We provide a comprehensive assessment for all new students.
- We conduct ongoing assessments to identify strengths and areas of improvement and monitor each student’s progress to ensure they are working at their maximum potential.
- Teachers provide progress reports to students and parents.
- Our caring, fun atmosphere results in higher attendance, participation, and performance among highly-engaged students.
- Small groups (with a maximum of 8 students in each class) build a sense of community, camaraderie, and respect among students.

A Grade Ahead’s highly educated teachers are passionate about helping students reach their potential.

- The majority of our teachers hold college degrees and, at a minimum, have three years of college coursework primarily in education, math, or English.
- New teachers are required to take math and English assessments to verify subject matter knowledge prior to classroom placements.
- New teachers receive comprehensive training with mentor teachers and are observed in class to ensure they meet our high standards.
- We regularly observe all teachers to ensure quality lessons are consistently delivered to the students.

A Grade Ahead’s learning system has proven to be effective for more than 14 years.

- More than 25,000 students have benefited from A Grade Ahead’s system.
- Parents find the program easy to implement with one weekly class and a packet of homework that solidifies the weekly topic.
- Word-of-mouth referrals account for 86% of new students.
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Appendix D: Informed Consent

Informed Consent to Participate
Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Program Evaluation

We are carrying out a program evaluation study. To do this, we need the help of people who agree to take part in the evaluation study. This form tells you about this program evaluation. We are asking you to take part in an evaluation study that is called: Effects of an Academic Enrichment Program on Elementary Aged Students’ Grades. The person who is in charge of this program evaluation is Lauren Nieder. This person is called the Principal Investigator.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this evaluation study is to develop a greater understanding of the effectiveness of enrichment programs outside of the school setting, especially those designed to align with the curriculum guidelines set by the state and federal governments. This evaluation study is also intended to add to the greater understanding of student school-related stress, reported by parents, in relation to student academic performance, specifically in a population which primarily consists of students and parents who are of Asian-Indian-American descent.

Why are you being asked to take part?
We are asking you to take part in this evaluation study because your child or children are enrolled or have previously been enrolled in an elementary grade level at the academic enrichment program included in the study, for at least three months between June 2017 and March 2018, and for at least two consecutive school grading periods.

Study Procedures
If you take part in this evaluation study, you will be asked to allow your child or children’s academy homework grades between June 2017 and March 2018 to be included as data for this study. You will also be asked to provide your child or children’s quarterly school grades for the time they were enrolled in the enrichment program.

Finally, you will also be asked to complete a brief 40-question survey (less than 15 mins). Upon your consent, you will be provided the option of completing the Qualtrics survey either online via tablet at one of the enrichment academies or online at your home through the link provided in the recruitment flyer given to you.

In order to be included in this evaluation study, the survey is not mandatory; you may consent to allowing the homework grades and quarterly school grades, provided by you, as data for the study, without taking the study. In order to maintain privacy and anonymity, each child will be given an ID number, which will be provided to you to utilize in lieu of their name when providing their quarterly school grades and when completing the survey.

Alternatives / Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal
You have the alternative to choose not to participate in this evaluation study. You also have the alternative to participate by only providing your child or children’s quarterly school grades and not completing the parent survey.

You should only take part in this evaluation study if you want to volunteer; you are free to participate in this study or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this evaluation study. Your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect your student or their enrollment in the program.

Benefits and Risks
We are unsure if you will receive any benefits by taking part in this evaluation study. This study is considered to be minimal risk.

Compensation
Every 10th participant will receive a $10 Visa gift card.

Privacy and Confidentiality
We will do our best to keep your records private and confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. It is possible, although unlikely, that unauthorized individuals could gain access to your responses because you are responding online.
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In order to be included in this evaluation study, the survey is not mandatory; you may consent to allowing the homework grades and quarterly school grades, provided by you, as data for the study, without taking the study. In order to maintain privacy and anonymity, each child will be given an ID number, which will be provided to you to utilize in lieu of their name when providing their quarterly school grades and when completing the survey.
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You have the alternative to choose not to participate in this evaluation study. You also have the alternative to participate by only providing your child or children’s quarterly school grades and not completing the parent survey.

You should only take part in this evaluation study if you want to volunteer; you are free to participate in this study or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this evaluation study. Your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect your student or their enrollment in the program.
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Privacy and Confidentiality
We will do our best to keep your records private and confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. It is possible, although unlikely, that unauthorized individuals could gain access to your responses because you are responding online.
Appendix E: Parental Perceptions of School-Related Student Stress Survey

Section A
Although you may have more than one child in 1st through 5th grades, please answer the following questions considering only one child for each survey. Keep this child in mind throughout your completion of the survey.

Please answer by circling either yes or no for each question.

1. Are you willing to participate in this survey? Yes / No

2. Are you willing to provide your child’s 2017-2018 school grades to be included as a part of this study? Yes / No

Section B
The following items indicate what you have observed or how YOU believe the child identified above generally feels or thinks about different things at school.

Some of the questions may seem similar but there are differences; you should treat each one as a separate question. The best approach is to answer each question fairly quickly.

Please read each statement carefully and respond according to your current thoughts and feelings by circling one number in each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often does your child seem to:</th>
<th>Very Seldom</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. be upset or stressed about school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. feel the teacher is very concerned about the class performance on standardized tests such as the FSA?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. feel uneasy about classroom tests or quizzes?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. feel his/her teacher is generally pleased with his/her school work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. think the teacher does not give him/her enough time to do his/her work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. enjoy going to school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. think the assigned school work is too hard?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. be worried about homework?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. be nervous about taking required standardized achievement tests (like the FSA)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. worry about following school rules and expectations (being counted tardy, or forgetting things such as homework, papers needing parent signature)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. avoid going to school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. be frustrated about not understanding assignments?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. be angry about something that happened at school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. be worried about the grades on his/her grade report to parents?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often does your child seem to:</th>
<th>Very Seldom</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. struggle to complete assignments correctly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. feel pressure to do well on daily assignments?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. be confident about his/her ability to get good grades?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. think the teacher tries to make sure he/she understands the assigned work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. think the teacher is usually fair?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. have a hard time paying attention at school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. have a problem with sitting still at school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. be anxious because the school work load seems overwhelming?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. be troubled because his/her grades are behind other children in the class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. be afraid of his/her teacher?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. think the teacher is not very friendly with the children in his/her class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. be concerned about being embarrassed by the teacher?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. feel the teacher doesn’t like him/her when he/she does something wrong?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. have physical/health complaints that might be related to school (stomach ache, headache, etc.)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section C**

These questions are about you and your relationship with your child’s school. Remember the questions are about you, not your child’s other parent or other household members. Please respond considering what YOU do.

1. On a regular school night, how many minutes on average do you estimate
   a. your child spends doing school homework? _______
   b. YOU spend working with your child on school homework? _______

2. How well do you think your child performs in school?
   a. Below Average _______
   b. Average _______
   c. Above Average _______
   d. Don’t Know _______

*Please continue to the next page.*
Section D

Demographic Questions: These are a few questions to understand more about your family. Please be assured that this information is for research purposes only.

Please answer by filling in or checking the blank beside your response.

1. Was your child born in the United States?
   a. Yes _________ (Please go to Question 3)
   b. No _________ (Please go to Question 2)

2. How many years has your child lived in the United States?
   a. Less than 1 year _________
   b. 1-3 years _________
   c. 3-5 years _________
   d. 5 or more years _________

3. How do you describe your child? (check all that apply)
   a. White ______
   b. Black ______
   c. Hispanic ______
   d. Eastern Indian ______
   e. American Indian (Native American) ______
   f. Middle Eastern ______
   g. Asian ______
   h. Pacific Islander ______
   i. Other, please specify ____________

4. What is the primary language spoken in your home (the language spoken most often)?
   a. English ______
   b. Hindi ______
   c. Tamil ______
   d. Gujarati ______
   e. Other, please specify ____________

5. Were you born in the United States?
   a. Yes _________ (Please go to Question 7)
   b. No _________ (Please go to Question 6)

6. How many years have you lived in the United States?
   a. Less than 1 year _________
   b. 1-3 years _________
   c. 3-5 years _________
   d. 5-10 years _________
   e. More than 10 years _________

7. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   a. Less than High School or GED ______
   b. High School Diploma or GED ______
   c. Some Trade/Technical school training ______
   d. Completed Trade/Technical School ______
   e. Some College ______
   f. Associate Degree ______
   g. Undergraduate Degree ______
   h. Graduate Degree ______

Please continue to the next page.
Section E
Please submit below your student’s school grades from the 2017-2018 academic year.
*Please answer by circling one option for each.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quarter 1: Reading or ELA</th>
<th>Quarter 1: Writing</th>
<th>Quarter 1: Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quarter 2: Reading or ELA</th>
<th>Quarter 2: Writing</th>
<th>Quarter 2: Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quarter 3: Reading or ELA</th>
<th>Quarter 3: Writing</th>
<th>Quarter 3: Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  E  S  N  U  NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation!