Summary:

1. Evidence gap - previous studies reveal contradictory results as to the influence of family and community inputs to students’ learning outcomes.
2. Knowledge gap - previous studies focused on the cognitive aspects of learning, ignoring the affective and psychomotor aspects.
3. Family inputs - cultural capital and parental involvement were the specific factors looked into, along with,
4. Community inputs - support for schools, security network and school reforms
5. Three sets of questionnaires were administered to respondents in Nigeria, where the study was conducted.
6. The study proved that family and community inputs significantly contributed to students’ learning outcomes.
7. Therefore, parents and community leaders must work together with secondary schools.

1 Introduction

1. An appropriate study of students’ learning outcomes involves all three learning domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.
2. Previous studies link students’ learning outcomes in high school to 1) students’ characteristics (age, health, motivation, innate ability, social capital), to 2) school-related factors (administrative expense, curriculum offering, school facilities, student-teacher ratio) and to 3) administrators (leadership style, attitude towards accountability, qualification)
3. A more comprehensive understanding of student achievement can inform the development of more effective education policies and practices, which will improve student outcomes.
4. Families and communities play a critical role in shaping students' educational experiences, and by understanding these groups’ inputs, research can show how to better support and engage these groups in the education process.

1.1 Study on Family Inputs

Questions:

1. How was “family inputs” defined? What are some examples?
2. What do researchers say about the relationship of a family’s socioeconomic status and the education of their children?
3. What does the research say about the number of children in a family and the children’s level of achievement and graduation rate in high school?
4. What does it mean when something “relates positively” to something?
5. What do studies reveal about parental involvement and learning outcomes?
6. What is cultural capital? What has research shown as its impact on children's educational attainment?
7. What is the main point of this section of the article?

Answers:

1. Family inputs are factors that explain how families contribute to the education of their children.
2. Research has shown that families with higher socioeconomic status can provide better educational opportunities to their children.
3. Bigger families are likely to have children with lower levels of achievement and graduation rate in high school. Children in smaller families receive better parental guidance than those from large families.
4. A positive correlation means that the two variables move in the same direction (negative correlation - the two variables move in opposite directions.)
5. Low parental involvement related positively to underachievement among students. There is clear evidence that parental involvement affects educational production.
6. Cultural capital refers to the knowledge, educational attainment, and skills parents possess, including their behaviors, beliefs, and practices that can shape how their children think and act in the home or school. Research has shown that it had the highest effect on children’s educational attainment.
7. Although there’s plenty of research saying that parental involvement and cultural capital affects children’s educational attainment, the focus has always been on cognitive achievement, resulting in a knowledge gap.

1.2 Studies on Community Inputs

Questions:

1. What is community input?
2. Give examples in which the community contributes to children’s education.
3. What do studies say about security measures and its effect on students’ educational achievement?
4. What do studies say about community support for schools and learning outcomes?
5. What do studies say about school reforms and its effect on learning outcomes?

Answers:

1. Community inputs are those community-based factors that shape the teaching and learning process in schools within the community.
2. Communities can mobilize its members for increased enrollment and maintain an effective security network for school safety. They also support schools with financial help, and they ensure that schools implement educational reforms.
3. There’s a disagreement in the literature because some studies say that disruption (like kidnappings in Nigerian schools) of academic activities could affect students’ learning, while another study found no relationship between physical security measures provided in schools, students’ academic performance and school attendance, resulting in an evidence gap.
4. Studies show that community support for schools was a strong determinant of student achievement, whether in the form of financing and promoting policies, etc., but they focused only on the cognitive aspect, resulting in a knowledge gap.
5. Regarding school reforms, studies don’t agree, creating an evidence gap. Some say that community initiatives in reforming school programmes enhance students’ academic achievement, while other studies claim otherwise. Further studies are necessary to clarify the link between school reforms and students’ achievement. The same studies have focused only on the cognitive aspect, resulting in a knowledge gap.

1.3 The Present Study

Questions:

1. What does the present study aim to achieve?
2. How is the present study different from previous ones when it comes to data collection?
3. What are the study’s hypotheses?

Answers:

1. The present study aims to 1) bridge the two major gaps - the knowledge gap, by considering the two other domains (affective and psychomotor), and the evidence gap, by presenting new evidence. 2) It also assessed the extent to which specific family and community inputs predict students’ overall learning outcomes on the three domains.
2. The present study followed acceptable practices to develop and refine two instruments with good psychometric properties for data collection.
3. The study sets out to prove or disprove its hypotheses that cultural capital and parental involvement, as well as security networks, support for schools and school reforms predict students' overall learning involving the three domains.

2 Method

2.1 Research Design and Participants

Questions:

1. What methodology was used in the study?
2. What sampling procedure was used in the study?
3. Who exactly were included in the study?

Answers:

1. The study used a quantitative method with predictive correlational research design to allow for an analysis of the relationships among variables.
2. A multi-stage random sampling procedure was used in selecting the study’s respondents. It involved 4 stages in total.
3. School administrators (principals and deputy principals) and senior secondary class II (SSII) students, attending a public high school in one of the 7 local education authorities. Secondary school teachers were excluded as well as primary or tertiary school administrators.

2.2 Measures and Instruments

Questions:

1. What things does the study measure?
2. What instruments were used for data collection?

Answers:

1. It measures 3 things: family inputs, community inputs, and learning outcomes. It uses 5 predictors - cultural capital, parental involvement, security network, support for school, and school reforms and looks at one variable - learning outcomes with three dimensions.
2. 3 instruments were used for data collection: The Family Inputs Questionnaire (FIQ), The Community Inputs Questionnaire (CIQ), and Educational Outcomes Questionnaire (EOQ). The latter was designed to measure students’ affective and psychomotor outcomes, while the students’ cognitive outcome was based on average exam scores.

2.3 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

Questions:

1. What did the study employ to validate the research instruments? What was the result of the validation exercise?
2. How else did the study try to validate the research instruments?

Answers:

1. The study asked ten experts to determine whether the items/questions were relevant and clear for the measured domains. All questions were maintained based on the ratings obtained from the experts.
2. The research instruments were also subjected to further analysis. A pilot study of school leaders, teachers and students from non-participating schools was conducted in the validation process. The questionnaires were also subjected to further statistical research processes, such as Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

2.4 Ethical Considerations

Questions:

1. What did the researchers do to make sure that they follow ethical standards in conducting research?

Answers:

1. 1) They got written consent from all the participants who had been informed of the study. 2) The information provided by the participants were de-identified and anonymised. 3) The coded information was kept on computers accessible only to the researchers and protected with a security system.

2.5 Data Collection and Analysis

Questions:

1. Describe the data collection process.
2. Describe the data collected.
3. What was used for data analysis?

Answers:

1. 1) Six research assistants were recruited for data collection. 2) Participants were told that participation is voluntary and that they were free to quit the exercise at any point. 3) Principals responded to CIQ, while students to FIQ and EOQ. 4) The collected data were coded and prepared using a spreadsheet package.
2. They recovered completed questionnaires from all school administrators, but weren’t able to recover 45 copies from the students. These unrecovered questionnaires represent 5% of the administered documents. All recovered questionnaires were filled correctly, so there was no missing data.
3. Multiple hierarchical linear regression analysis was used for data analysis.

3 Results

3.1 and 3.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Questions:

1. What were the results of the EFA and CFA?

Answers:

1. Based on the data collected in the pilot sample, the result indicated that the sample of participants was large enough for a statistical analysis to be performed on the data. It also revealed no duplication in the data. A problematic item was eliminated from the analysis after the CIQ was subjected to the EFA. The models performed well under several fit indices after the CFA was done.

3.3 and 3.4 Composite and Relative Contributions of Family and Community Inputs to Learning Outcomes

Questions:

1. What information do these sections present?

Answers:

1. A) These two sections present the relative contributions in percentages of the different variables or inputs to the students’ overall, cognitive, affective, and psychomotor outcomes. B) They show the effect of adding a second or third variable to the analysis and how much the contribution of the family or community input changes overall. For example, they show how the addition of parental involvement as a second variable increased the contribution of family input by at least 10% in all 3 domains. On the other hand, the addition of security network and school reforms to the first variable, support for school, only increased the overall contribution of community inputs to learning outcomes by 3% at most. C) They also show how much cumulatively of the total variance in students’ overall learning outcomes, broken down into the 3 domains, is explained by family and community inputs and therefore, how much cannot be explained due to variables not included in the analysis.

3.5 Test of Hypotheses

Questions:

1. What does the study say about the relative and composite contributions of family inputs to students’ overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes?
2. What does the study say about the relative and composite contributions of community inputs to students’ overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes?

Answers:

1. A) Family inputs, both cultural capital and parental involvement, have significant composite contributions to students’ overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes. B) It shows that only parental involvement is the input that significantly contributes to students’ overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes in a relative sense. C) Cultural capital made significant contributions in models where it was the sole predictor but turned non-significant amid parental involvement. Cultural capital did not significantly predict students’ overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor learning outcomes.
2. A) The results suggest that community inputs contribute significantly to students’ overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes. B) Support for school and school reforms as community inputs all made significant positive contributions. In contrast, security networks significantly but negatively\* impacted students’ overall, cognitive, affective and psychomotor learning outcomes.

4. Discussion

Questions:

1. What does the study imply regarding the family inputs?
2. Does the present study corroborate previous studies as to the role of the family in students’ learning outcomes?
3. What does the study reveal specifically about cultural capital and parental involvement?
4. What does the study imply regarding the community inputs?
5. What were some of the recommendations on improving students’ learning outcomes?
6. What factor was the strongest predictor of students' learning outcomes?

Answers:

1. The result implies that students from families where parents are highly educated and actively involved in their education tend to achieve better in schools across the three learning domains. The support from family and parents not only helps students acquire knowledge and skills but also helps them develop physical skills, positive attitudes and behaviors towards learning.
2. Yes. The result of this study agrees with previous research that parental guidance and involvement and homes where parents have high expectations for their success in school are also reported as factors that shape students’ learning and achievement in schools.
3. While cultural capital and parental involvement are important, they may affect students’ learning outcomes differently and need to be considered separately. Parental involvement weakened the contribution of cultural capital in predicting students’ educational outcomes in schools. This result could be explained because students may be motivated to study because of their parents status, educational achievement, and occupation on their own without the influence of their parents. However, when parent take full part in children’s education, the motivation they had already formed tends to disappear as their parents begin to tailor their education towards their desires.
4. The result implies that secondary schools receiving diverse support from host communities are more likely to produce successful students than those receiving little or no support. Conversely, low community participation in the education production process can reduce the quality of educational outcomes in schools. This result supports the position that the quality of education offered in school is influenced by community factors. This result implies that individual improvement in the three community inputs is associated with higher educational outcomes, assuming other things remain equal. The result strengthens the finding that supporting schools is one of the ways communities ensure that quality education is delivered to the children.
5. Educators and policymakers should focus on supporting and enhancing school community engagement to improve student learning outcomes. This can be done through community outreach programs, collaboration with local organization and businesses, and creating opportunities for parents, community members and other stakeholders to get involved in school decision-making. Additionally, providing a safe learning environment and implementing school reform measures tailored towards meeting the community’s needs can also go a long way in improving the quality of education and students’ learning outcomes.
6. The study showed that community support for schools was the strongest predictor of students’ educational outcomes.

5. Limitations and Implications for Further Research

Questions:

1. What were the two limitations of the study and the recommendations to compensate for those limitations?

Answers:

1. A) Relying only on quantitative methods to generalize results to a broader population can also be seen as one limitation of the study. The quantitative technique allows for generalizations based on large sample sizes but does not comprehensively explain the relationships between the predictors and criterion variables. Future research may consider mixed methods approach that combines the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative methods.

B) The study’s scope does not include control or moderating factors such as family background, family income level, type of community and occupation, which could hinder the level of support families and communities provide to individual children. Future research should consider using multigroup analysis to investigate the impact of the moderating factors on the connection between the predictors and variables across the three domains.

Conclusion:

Question: What are the study’s implications for parents, host community leaders, educators and school administrators?

Answer:

1. The result of the study has implications for secondary school managers and teachers to maintain a healthy school-community relationship with parents and members of the host communities. That schools should actively involve families and the community in the education production process and that they should also focus on creating opportunities for parents to be involved in their children’s education, such as through parent-teacher associations and volunteering programs.
2. Providing a safe and secure learning environment and implementing school reform measures tailored at meeting the community’s needs can also improve the quality of education and students’ learning outcomes.
3. Parents and host community leaders must strengthen their partnerships with secondary schools and contribute their quota to institutions’ curricular and co-curricular activities.
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