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Teacher home visits provide important student outcomes including improved attendance, improved academic growth and reduced behavior issues. There are three important stakeholders in the teacher home visit: the student, the teacher, and the family (or parent). Ascertaining how the home visit changes the perspectives, expectations, and relationships of these stakeholders is the focus of this research. A modified retrospective pre- post-BIRS survey ($N = 12$) determined both change and social acceptability followed by interviews of selected stakeholders ($N = 5$) which clarified and solidified themes. The survey was evaluated with a paired t-test and the interviews were coded. Results indicated that perceptions and relationships between stakeholders were improved. Due to low participation rates, results must be interpreted with caution. With these considerations in mind, I concluded with a discussion of study implications and future research.
PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Teacher Home Visits: Perceptions and Expectations of Key Stakeholders

Kevin R. Thomas

Teacher home visits have been shown to improve student attendance, academics and to reduce behavior issues. Three groups are involved: the student, the teacher, and the family (or parent). This research focused on determining if and how the teacher home visit changes the perspectives, expectations, and relationships of these three groups. A survey followed by interviews of some of the students, parents, and teachers was used. The surveys and the interviews were evaluated. Results indicated that perceptions and relationships between stakeholders were improved. Due to low participation rates, results must be interpreted with caution. With these considerations in mind, I concluded with a discussion of study implications and future research.
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CHAPTER I

At both the elementary and secondary levels positive student-teacher relationships engender greater academic gains for students (Blum, 2005; Crosnoe et al., 2004; Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Knesting & Waldron, 2006; McNeely, 2005; Pianta et al., 2003). When students report stronger relationships with their teachers, they also report higher levels of motivation and self-efficacy and are more likely to be engaged in their learning. This, in turn, increases their engagement in learning and in their academic progress in school (Crosnoe et al., 2004; Farmer, 2018; Finn & Rock, 1997).

Student academic performance is also enhanced by family engagement (Fan & Chen, 2001; Hill & Tyson, 2009; Jeynes, 2007). Parents provide a critical foundation for student success as they are aware of school happenings, encourage student attendance, promote positive student behavior, and are capable of supporting their student’s academic efforts (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Furthermore, parents who initiate contact with the school, interact with their child using emotional restraint, demonstrate academic ambitions for their child, and engage in frequent and purposeful educational activities are more likely to foster their child’s success at school (Clark, 2015). In short, family connection to the education process engenders students’ academic progress. This is particularly important for students experiencing situations and conditions that put them at risk for school failure (Connell et al., 1994).

Educators continue to seek strategies to increase the academic progress of each student. Providing opportunities, structures, and/or programs to build student/teacher and family/educator relationships may be a beneficial strategy for doing so and especially for populations at-risk for school failure where the need, by definition, is greater.
These risks include both immediate and long-term outcomes. From poor relationships with parents, maladaptive behavior, and referral to special education as youth to unemployment and societal disruption in adulthood, the consequences of negative student-teacher relationships are real (McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015). Yet, risks associated with negative student-teacher relationships can be ameliorated. Concluding their review of research on student-teacher relationships, McGrath and Van Bergen (2015) provide this poignant reminder, “The predictive and protective functions of the student–teacher relationship suggests that one positive relationship may be sufficient to alter the trajectory of a student at risk of negative outcomes” (p. 14). A teacher who believes in the student and is willing to provide opportunities for the student can make a marked difference (Hattie, 2003). Therefore, finding and implementing structures that may inculcate or enhance that relationship is critical.

**Statement of the Problem**

A problem in education we continue to face is the disengagement and sometimes the eventual dropping-out of school by our at-risk youth. While recognizing the value of the student-teacher relationship, educators’ interactions with students are primarily limited to the classroom, the hallway, the gym, and the auditorium in short, to the school. This reduces access to a powerful tool for building relationships and increasing student performance—family engagement. Commonly used practices to enhance family engagement such as back-to-school night, parent/teacher conferences, or assorted athletic games or fine art performances (Kronholz, 2016) do not necessarily generate the connection needed to ensure family engagement. Meanwhile, students at risk for school failure or dropout need the added benefit that comes from more personal relationships
(Connell et al., 1994; McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015; Murray & Malmgren, 2005). This is especially true in adolescence as this time period is associated with lower student engagement, academic achievement, and school adjustment (Alspaugh, 1998; Barber & Olsen, 2004; Mac Iver & Messel, 2013).

**Significance of the Problem**

Students who experience greater engagement in school have relationships with other students and with school staff. “Students who are at risk tend to have poorer relationships in school, and that fact, coupled with their tendency toward external control expectancies, could combine to produce an ever-increasing alienation from the school enterprise” (Nowicki et al., 2004, p. 228). Those students without supportive relationships or with relationships that are deteriorating often disconnect from school. Their chances for academic success diminish and dropping out of school altogether becomes more likely (Davis & Dupper, 2004). In addition, the consequences of dropping out are increasing in their severity. For example, in 1964 a high school dropout earned 64 cents for every dollar earned by an individual with at least a high-school degree. In 2004, the high-school dropout earned only 37 cents for each dollar earned by an individual with more education (Monrad, 2007).

**Purpose of the Study**

Because student-teacher relationships and family engagement both play an important role in student efficacy and consequently student achievement, effectively building those relationships remains a preeminent consideration for educators. Moreover, as students at risk for school failure also, and maybe particularly, appear to benefit from the building or maintaining of these important relationships, strategies that build or
strengthen such relationships take on additional importance. A promising practice that provides a bridge between teacher-student relationships and family engagement is the teacher home visit. While studies on home visits provide evidence that home visits are linked to strong teacher-student relationships (Ilhan et al., 2019; Kronholz, 2016; Lucas, 2017; Meyer et al., 2011; Stetson et al., 2012), student attendance (Heath & Heath, 2017; Kronholz, 2016; Meyer et al., 2011; Sheldon & Jung, 2015), and academic performance (Heath & Heath, 2017; Ilhan et al., 2019; Meyer et al., 2011; Sheldon & Jung, 2015; Stetson et al., 2012; Wright et al., 2018), these studies do not explain how or why home visits relate to these aforementioned outcomes. Perhaps after an initial home visit teachers initiate more contact with parents, perhaps parents engage more with teachers, or perhaps teacher-student and parent-child relationships change in ways that foster positive outcomes (such as holding higher expectations), or perhaps all or some of these changes occur. Likewise, very little is known about students’ perceptions of these visits and the role those may play in explaining these important connections. Watt (2018) speaks to the importance of perception in the evaluation of educational programs and practices.

To ensure successful educational programs, leaders must consider more than simple outcome data or statistical descriptions of the program’s reliability and validity. Successful leaders of schools must also determine the program’s value from the perspective of the stakeholders it purports to serve—that is, by its social validity. Understanding what consumers of education do and do not find valuable is crucial when developing, implementing, and evaluating educational programs. Unfortunately, this type of evaluation is seldom utilized and has resulted in a nearly inaudible stakeholder voice in public education and its program. (p. v)

This study begins to respond to the call for more evaluation of educational programs that may increase the likelihood of building or strengthening relationships between the home and the school by exploring the use of home visits for a group that may particularly
benefit from them—adolescent at-risk students. The study is guided by the descriptive questions listed below.

**Research Questions**

1. How do students’ perceptions of and relationships with their respective teachers change for at-risk students who experience a home visit?
2. How do family’s perceptions of and relationships with the child’s school and teacher change for families of at-risk students who experience a home visit?
3. How do teachers’ perceptions of and relationships with at-risk students and their families change for teachers who engage in home visits with at-risk students and their families?

**Definition of Terms**

**At-Risk.** To begin his review of literature on resilient at-risk students, McMillan (1992) traced the evolution of the usage of the term at-risk:

The term used to signify a "culturally deprived" child in terms of home life. It then evolved into a school definition where the at-risk child did not mesh, or fit in, with school characteristics. Currently, the at-risk problem is seen as a complex interplay of a multitude of variables—home, school and societal that combine to give a student at-risk status. (p. 10)

At-risk status then is a combination of factors that generally result in detrimental outcomes, including dropping out of school, self-harm, harm to others, or simply poor academic performance with its accompanying loss of opportunity. These students have some form of barrier to learning that places students at risk for academic and life failure. These barriers according to Li and Edmonds (2005) include “learning disabilities, low literacy rates, language barriers, and/or life struggles. . . . [and other factors such as]
family socioeconomic conditions, family instability or tragedy, or having a sibling who drops out of school” (p. 144).

Labeling students as at-risk may perpetuate the belief that students so labeled will be subject to lower expectations or relegated to programs or opportunities that track them below regular education. The at-risk label then becomes an additional obstacle or barrier. The concern extends to educators who may view students so labeled as having deficits or existing in a culture of deficits (Brown, 2016). The researcher, while cognizant of this danger, will not interrogate this line of thinking as this is beyond the scope of this study. The label will not be used with students, teachers or parents during interviews, surveys, or any other information-gathering portion of this study. Use of the term “at-risk students or youth” in this study is for purposes of simplicity and categorization.

Home Visit. Proponents of the teacher home visit including Parent Teacher Home Visits (PTHV) and the Flamboyan Foundation endorse a model that encompasses five nonnegotiable practices: the home visit must be voluntary for educators and families and arranged in advance; be implemented by trained and compensated educators; have relationship-building as its focus; not be targeted to a specific population; and be done in pairs of educators. These organizations further recommend that the visit should take place in the family home and last approximately one-half hour. The conversation should center on the parents’ hopes and dreams for their student (Venkateswaran et al., 2018). Heath and Heath (2017) provide an example of what a teacher home visit meant for some families; “It was the first time anyone had asked them about their dreams for their kids” (p. 228). The teachers were not there to register their child, engage in conversations about discipline or their expectations for the coming year. They were there to ask the family,
“What do I need to do to help your child learn more effectively?” (p. 227). Moments like these have the potential to affect perceptions and build relationships.

**Family Engagement.** Mo and Singh (2008) define family engagement as “the proactive involvement of parents in a student’s education. This involvement is initiated by the family as part of their responsibility for children’s psychosocial and educational development and is likely to influence students’ educational engagement and performance” (p. 1). Clark (2015) adds to this definition by including the behaviors in which the family engages and the aspirations they hold for their students.

The first and second research questions reference the family. For purposes of this study, family means the parent or adult guardian who participates in the teacher home visit. This may be more than one person in the home. The terms parent, family, or adult guardian may each be used in this study.

**Social Validity.** As said by Marchant et al. (2013), “In its simplest form, social validity is a measure of how well a social program is embraced by those who are targeted to benefit from it” (p. 223). Wolf (1978) provided three areas in which social validity may be evaluated:

1. The social significance of the goals. Are the specific behavioral goals really what society wants? 2. The social appropriateness of the procedures. Do the ends justify the means? That is, do the participants, caregivers and other consumers consider the treatment procedures acceptable? 3. The social importance of the effects. Are consumers satisfied with the results? All the results, including any unpredicted ones? (p. 207)

The work of the researcher will be ascertaining the perceptions of all three stakeholder groups and determining if teacher home visits do change their perceptions. In other words, how socially valid is the home visit as perceived by students, their families, and their teachers.
Limitations

In applying the abovementioned definition for home visits, by default the teachers who will participate in the study voluntarily participate in home visits. As such, we necessarily limit the breadth of possible outcomes. The students chosen by these volunteer teachers to receive visits also constrain any findings or interpretations of the study. Families are also free to accept or decline the visit from the teachers. In each case, the participant pool becomes more limited, the inference space less broad.

Most of the research done on teacher home visits has been done among populations of students and families classified as at-risk. This study is looking at students at-risk in a suburban junior high school population. The researcher hoped to honor the five non-negotiables of the home visit in selecting an appropriate study site, yet ultimately the school determines their own adherence to these non-negotiables. As one of those five is not to target a population, the number of visits to families of students who are at-risk cannot be reliably determined in advance. Further, by focusing the study on visits done with at-risk students the researcher will likely face a small number of cases that may limit the generalizability of this study.

Studies on teacher home visits have been done predominantly in elementary schools. These studies have also typically been in schools in which the majority of the students live in adverse conditions. Students at-risk of school failure often suffer from adverse conditions, some of which may be exacerbated by school practices. This study takes place in a suburban junior high school, so it is different from many of the aforementioned studies. The researcher’s decisions also bounds the study. Choosing a study goal that is primarily descriptive means that potentially important information may
be missed in the selection process and analysis. For instance, this study does not purport to be experimental or even quasi-experimental. Therefore, opportunities to compare to similarly situated populations or control groups are not possible within the study’s parameters, which include elements of self-selection. A small sample size without adequate controls for representativeness in the selection process also increases the potential of possible missed information. The checks on internal and external validity as explained in the methods sections should alleviate some of these issues.

**Summary**

Positive student-teacher relationships and family engagement are associated with increases in the likelihood of academic gains for students. Students with factors that place them at-risk for school failure or dropout benefit from increases in both. According to research, teacher home visits appear to help establish those important relationships and enhance family engagement (Ilhan et al., 2019; Meyer et al., 2011; Stetson et al., 2012; Sweet & Appelbaum, 2004; Venkateswaran et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018). Extant research does not clearly address the students’ and families’ perceptions of home visits or how teacher and student perceptions may change in conjunction with home visits. This study intends to provide further insight into these gaps in the literature using descriptive approaches to uncover how home visits potentially change participant perceptions and hence the relationships to which they are linked.

Chapter II includes both historical and developmental contexts and considerations for the proposed study. After this, is a synthesis of the literature on at-risk students and the importance of addressing their needs, the critical role of relationships, and the chapter concludes with a look at home visits themselves.
Chapter III describes the methods that will be used to answer the research questions. After explaining the chosen study design, the research questions are presented. Following the questions, the researcher presents information about the intended participants, procedures, variables, and measurement instruments. Threats to internal and external validity are mentioned and Chapter III concludes with the data collection and data analysis processes.

Chapter IV provides the results. The researcher sets the stage using information and data gathered during an interview with the principal of the selected school. He describes the process of implementing teacher home visits and his intended goals. School collected data was also provided to the researcher. With the setting supplied, the research questions are addressed in turn. Data from the surveys and interviews are proffered (when available) and provide an explanatory look at teacher home visits in this suburban junior high.

With the data and results presented, learnings and salient findings from the research are discussed in Chapter V. From the role of the principal to teacher confidence and from implications for research to implications for practice, the researcher discusses both findings consistent with previous research and outcomes that open new doors and suggestions for future research. The limitations of this research are also discussed as the research took place during the Covid-19 pandemic.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

To understand how a teacher home visit may influence school/home perceptions, a review of a historical perspective of the relationship between the school and the home is provided. Then, the chapter turns to the student-teacher relationship from a developmental lens to consider what developmental time points may be opportunities for growth in that critical relationship. A review of what it means to be at-risk follows and moves into concerns over and consequences of dropping out. Documented effects of teacher/student relationships follow and then research highlighting the importance of combining efforts with the home are reviewed. The role of the teacher home visit concludes this chapter.

School-Home Connections: An Historical Perspective

Schooling in America began in the home. This foundation provided the early religious moorings from which the initial purpose of education proceeded. The early settlers of Massachusetts worked to build a method of schooling to thwart the insidious efforts of the Old Deluder. The Massachusetts Bay Colony used the law in 1642, 1647, and 1648 to mandate the teaching of basic literacy and numeracy skills so that the Bible could be read and trade could be conducted (Eberling, 1999). Such instruction was accomplished with the use of itinerant teachers who boarded in the homes (Eberling, 1999). The family and the teacher were well acquainted with one another and that relationship served in the educative process. As the age of Enlightenment moved into the Industrial Revolution, schools adapted to the needs and values of the society they served. Purpose changed as swiftly as did the country’s demographics. Turning to enculturation,
assimilation, and standardization; schools represented the melting pot for society and the training center for employment. As the country transitioned to an urban and industrial environment, the schools left their rural moorings and adopted a factory model. This transition allowed for the public education of the masses but at a cost. As noted by Broom and Trowbridge (1926),

As the school grew, however, the social relations between the home and the school disappeared, until in the present complicated school system the parents and the teachers of a child rarely meet. As a result teachers feel a lack of co-operation and sympathy on the part of the parents of their pupils; while parents come to regard the school as an outside institution, provided for and protected by law, which is planned and administered by strangers. (p. 653)

During this time of societal upheaval, reformers recognized the diminishing link between the home and school. Bhavnagri and Krolikowski (2000) note that as they sought a practice for the “development of young children by addressing needs of poor and vulnerable children, their families and their communities” (p. 36) these reformers implemented home visits.

Among early reformers was a public health nurse named Lillian Wald. With concerns about how students were doing in public schools, especially the poor and immigrants, she began the visiting teacher movement in 1906. Forming a group of volunteer women, they began making home visits (Knupfer, 1999). They addressed the “student’s physical, social, vocational, and academic needs which resulted in differentiating instruction to meet student’s individual learning needs” (Knupfer, 1999, p. 3). This program moved from this group of volunteers to the New York City Public Education Association a year later as the first visiting teacher was hired and worked as a cross between a teacher and a social worker (Knupfer, 1999).
Prior to the time that Wald was doing her work, other reformers introduced the kindergarten movement to America. Originated by Friedrich Froebel in Germany in 1837, these early education programs based on play and toys to stimulate young learners became the model for early intervention for poverty-stricken immigrants. At its inception, teachers would work with their young pupils in the morning and visit homes in the afternoon to teach child rearing to the parents. As the need for these introductory school classes increased, afternoon kindergartens began and the afternoon home visit was abandoned (Bhavnagri & Krolikowski, 2000; Finello, 2012).

Even with the inroads into the home made by the reformers of the 1800s and 1900s, home visits were greatly reduced, as the Great Depression hit, by the loss of funding from generous donors who had subsidized the work (Trattner, 2007). A reemergence of the home visit did take place in the 1960s as federal dollars sought to fight poverty as Head Start programs were initiated (Finello, 2012). Head Start continues today to offer a home-based option with a focus on parenting (or the work of a primary caregiver) and child development, particularly in support of speech and vocabulary development (Head Start Program Performance Standards 1302.22 Home-based option, 2020; Roggman et al., 2016). While not implemented or funded by the federal government, appeals for universal home visits to battle the plague of child abuse were proposed in the early 1990s (Krugman, 1993).

Today multiple states use home visits for medical, social, and educational reasons. These states appear to believe that intervention in the home yields opportunities to change behavior. Yet the practice remains relatively uncommon for the majority of schools. The structure of school and the relationship with the home has changed little
since Broom and Trowbridge (1926) provided their description. This distance created by
the absence of a significant relationship between the home and the school creates a loss
of connection between the two most important entities in the lives of students. For many
students, separate relationships for school and home may not constitute a significant
barrier to their success. For students challenged by economic, social, familial, and
academic issues this divide or lack of a significant relationship between home and school
limits the connection so students may become more at risk for school failure. The divide
between home and school can become even wider as students progress through education
and as developmental factors place a greater emphasis on relationships with peers over
those with adults (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1997).

**School-Home Connections: A Developmental Perspective**

Jerome et al. (2009) and Lynch and Cicchetti (1997) observe that as students grow
older and particularly in the transition from elementary to middle school the teacher-
student relationship becomes less important to the student at the same time the influence
of peers increases. McGrath and Van Bergen (2015) continue the narrative by noting that
this transition places students in situations where they spend “significantly less time with
an individual teacher during a school year than do primary students, and that this too may
result in less student–teacher closeness overall” (p. 9). While the influence of peers
increases, it is still the student-teacher relationship that is predictive of school motivation
and adjustment and not the student-peer relationship (Ryan et al., 1994).

The teacher-student relationship is especially critical for at-risk youth. Silva et al.
(2011) in their study of minority students and students from low socio-economic
backgrounds found that improved relationships with teachers might improve students’
attitudes toward school. A positive student-teacher relationship also provides a protective feature to at-risk students. Indeed, for students at risk of negative student–teacher relationships, a positive teacher-student relationship provided benefits ranging from improved peer relationships to better school adjustment, attendance, and academic achievement (McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015).

At-Risk Students

For years, medical researchers and practitioners described the potential for exposure to harm or inclination to disease with a single term: at-risk. This term denotes a potential or likelihood to suffer harm. Following the release of A Nation At Risk (Gardner et al., 1983), educators have co-opted the term to describe students facing the issues, singly or in combination, of low socio-economic status, the degradation of the family, poor attendance, inadequate academic progress, minority status, behavioral issues, and special education status. Adding to the problem, Knesting and Waldron (2006) suggest that at-risk student characteristics and situations may inculcate a belief that schools can do little to improve student outcomes. Additionally, labeling students as at-risk may perpetuate the belief that students so labeled will be subject to lower expectations or relegated to programs or opportunities that track them below regular education and possibly below their potential. The at-risk label then becomes an additional obstacle or barrier. The concern extends to educators who may view students so-labeled as having deficits or existing in a culture of deficits (Brown, 2016). Each of these factors increases the probability that the student will drop out of school.

The tragedy of the decision to drop out of school is explained by Nowicki et al. (2004); “dropping out. . .has immense personal, communal, and societal ramifications. . .
Increasing levels of education are necessary for success. And those students who drop out before achieving a high school degree are at increased risk for a variety of problems in later life” (p. 226). Fashola and Slavin (1998) noted that “factory jobs that once allowed workers to make good incomes without a high school degree are diminishing, and the educational requirements for jobs, in general, are increasing. High school dropouts are seriously at risk” (p. 3). Students subjected to this situation suffer the potential multiple harms of enduring the difficulties presented by their situations, the increased likelihood that they will not graduate from high school, and the resulting marginalization presented by their status as nongraduates.

Monrad (2007) provides a look at what individuals who do not graduate from high school face as they “are more likely to be unemployed, earn lower wages, have higher rates of public assistance, are more likely to be single parents, and have children at a younger age” (p. 1). Table 2.1 provides additional details about the likely outcomes faced by high school dropouts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incarceration</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of state inmates</td>
<td>Earns $260,000 less over a lifetime</td>
<td>Contributes $60,000 less in federal and state income taxes</td>
<td>3.5 times more likely to be imprisoned than a high school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59% of federal inmates</td>
<td>Median income was $12,184 (in 2003)</td>
<td>America loses more than $26 billion in federal and state income taxes each year from the 23 million high-school dropouts aged 18 to 67 and losses for one cohort of 18-year-olds who drop out is $192 billion which is 1.6% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</td>
<td>1964—a high school dropout earned 64 cents for every dollar earned by an individual with at least a high-school degree. In 2004—the high-school dropout earned only 37 cents for each dollar earned by an individual with more education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, students at-risk face challenges in academic progress that make them susceptible to emotional problems. These problems result from their frustration and discouragement in their failed attempts at learning (Tannenbaum & Baldwin, 1983). This frustration manifests in areas such as grasping new concepts, challenges with higher-order thinking skills, mathematic computation, and reading comprehension. These issues often lead to disruptive behaviors. These behaviors increase the likelihood that their experience in school and relationships with school staff will prove unsatisfactory. Recognizing the dangers in this situation, the school community realizes that students who are at risk of school dropout need additional resources to aid them (Baker et al., 2009; Cauley & Jovanovich, 2006).

The effects of not completing high school—personal, community, economic, and societal—are generally well known, well researched, and well documented (Bear et al., 2006; Christle et al., 2007; Croninger & Lee, 2001; Davis et al., 2014; Davis et al., 2013; Heck & Mahoe, 2006; Mac Iver & Messel, 2013; Porowski & Passa, 2011; Soland, 2013). Now increasingly evident in the research are the actions taken by schools to ameliorate this problem (Archambault et al., 2009; Bridgeland et al., 2006; Davis et al., 2013; Duckworth et al., 2007; Dweck, 2006; Knesting & Waldron, 2006; Nowicki et al., 2004; Worrell & Hale, 2001; Yeager & Dweck, 2012). Educators realize that socio-economically challenged students are capable of academic progress when they are provided appropriate supplemental aid (Pogrow, 2005). In their study of students at-risk for negative teacher relationships McGrath and Van Bergen (2015) note that these same students may find greater success as positive relationships are developed. “The predictive and protective functions of the student–teacher relationship suggests that one
positive relationship may be sufficient to alter the trajectory of a student at risk of negative outcomes” (pp. 13–14).

**Relationships**

One may rightly question whether the focus should be on the amelioration of societal issues that result in the conditions influencing the lives of these students instead of on interventions. Three considerations push this researcher toward the path of intervention. First, the scope of the conditions resulting from poverty, family degradation, and other societal ills remain beyond the power of an individual educator or even a team of educators to address effectively. Second, strengthening the relationship between the home and the school as an educative strategy holds the promise of providing a reinforcing foundation for individuals to begin to address the societal ills in their own lives. Finally, as noted by Lee et al. (2013) in their meta-analysis of research targeting resilience, “enhancing the protective factors (e.g., self-efficacy, positive affect, and self-esteem) is more effective than reducing the risk factors (e.g., depression and anxiety) to improve resilience” (p. 275). Likewise, the inculcation of positive relationships in the home and at school can be protective factors (McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015) and as such could provide greater benefits than simply reducing risk factors.

Blum (2005) reports that

school connection is the belief by students that adults in the school care about their learning and about them as individuals….Critical requirements for feeling connected include high academic rigor and expectations coupled with support for learning, positive adult-student relationships, and physical and emotional safety. (p. 1)

Belief may be synonymous with perception. Theoretically, student-teacher relationships enhance school connection and are correlated with student success measures.
Others in a student’s life who model and support healthy development remain necessary to supportive connections and the development of relationships (Constantine et al., 1999). According to Knesting and Waldron (2006), among the factors that interrelate and inculcate student persistence are “meaningful connections—relationships with teachers who believed students could graduate and provided support and caring” (p. 603). Knesting and Waldron (2006) provided students’ perspectives on the positive power of the public school as they “recognized there also were people at school who wanted them to stay and who would help them to stay….Teachers and administrators could make a difference in students’ ability to persist in school” (p. 610).

**Teacher Expectations.** One factor embedded in teacher-student relationships is the expectations teachers hold for individual students. The classic and perhaps first study on teacher expectations is Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). Since their study, others have explicated the factors that make teacher expectations operational. High teacher expectations are the beliefs about individual students that are modeled through the fostering of engagement, motivation, and autonomy in students (Rubie-Davies et al., 2015). Dweck et al. (2011) report that

> when teachers have high expectations for their students, they invest more attention in them. . . . It also reinforces the message of growth that psychological research shows to be critical. . . . Teachers with high expectations for their students express more positive feelings toward them.” (p. 24)

Research on teachers’ expectations of students who are perceived by teachers to be more or less capable, also described as high- and low-achieving students provide continued examples of the power of perceptions. This literature indicates that students who are believed to be less capable are provided with fewer choices in assignments,
opportunities to perform publicly in class, and experiences for higher-order thinking and analysis. Although teachers are likely to perceive at-risk youth as less capable, there has been less research on teachers’ explicit expectations of at-risk students. (Babad, 1990, 1992, 1993; Babad et al., 1989; Good & Lavigne, 2017; Rubie-Davies, 2006)

**Student Perceptions.** Student-teacher relationships are dyadic, meaning that students play an equally important role in the development, maintenance, and evolution of the relationships that they hold with their teachers. Thus, it is important to collect data in which students describe their own perceptions of their experiences. Indeed, one concern is the scarcity of descriptive and qualitative research that reflects adolescents’ interpretation of their own experiences. Such research has implications not only for theory, but has potential for influencing the design and implementation of effective interventions. As Zaslow and Takanishi (1993) report, “The failure to take such a step may lead to a flawed understanding of normal development; it may also limit the effectiveness of interventions” (p. 190).

For all that schools do to assist their at-risk student populations, it is still the students’ perception that makes the work of the schools efficacious. It is also student perceptions that may push students away from the efforts of schools. Rubie-Davies et al. (2015) showed that student results are influenced by teacher expectations for both good and bad. Todis et al. (2001) reported that “if dropping out is characterized by a lack of academic success and low motivation for school work, it is not surprising to find that dropout students also have low self-esteem and an external locus of control” (p. 313). Conversely, research done by Todis et al. (2001) provides the hope that if schools can provide “retraining programs. . . to at-risk and dropout students to convince them that
they have control over what is happening in their lives, they may have a better chance at overcoming obstacles and barriers to completing their high school education (p. 329). By engaging factors of student perception, students may be better situated for success.

Bandura (1997) also reminds us that student perception is key to student success. Stating that students engage in learning because they believe they are capable of performing a task, he terms this product of social learning self-efficacy. Coming from four sources, self-efficacy may result from mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and one’s emotional and physiological state. Importantly, these sources may build self-efficacy or may diminish it. Student beliefs or perceptions provide the foundation for student action.

Reemphasizing the importance of student perception is a report from the Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA (2011) which indicates that in motivation the learner’s perception is a critical factor in defining whether the environment is a good fit. Matching motivation requires factoring in students’ perceptions in determining the right mix of intrinsic and extrinsic reasons. It also requires understanding the role played by expectations of outcome. This is fundamental to engaging (and re-engaging) students in classroom learning. (p.17)

As noted, both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are critical in the student’s perception and in the educator’s opportunity to influence the student. Seeking relationships beyond the school-house with the student and the family provides additional environmental influences in the student’s life.

In the context of this study, educators must be aware of the factors that compromise the student-teacher relationships and should develop and provide intervention strategies to maximize this significant protective factor. Anderson et al. (2004) provide this important conclusion, “despite there being a great deal of research to
indicate that relationships with adults are extremely important for children’s successful development, these relationships are often overlooked as a point of intervention in schools” (p. 108). Instructional leaders must create points of contact to build appropriate relationships between adults in the school and students. These may include advisory time, homerooms, houses, clubs, sports, and especially the classroom. Although not as frequently used by schools or addressed in the literature, a home visit may provide an additional opportunity to build these important educator/student relationships. The connection to the home and nurturing of positive relationships assist in the formation of the emotional and physiological states necessary for the development of student relationships.

Among the many factors or themes pertinent to improving student-teacher relationships and encouraging increased graduation rates is the teacher home visit. Furthermore, home visits may also influence teachers in important ways. Just as a student may be categorized as at-risk by the issues faced in his or her life—and that risk is heightened as the number of those issues increase—so there exist factors that increase the chance of ameliorating the risk and the more of these positive factors the more the improved opportunity.

In their executive summary, McKnight et al. (2017) speak of teachers’ implicit biases and supply this conclusion from their research on teacher home visits: “after close to two decades of practice, leaders of the model believe it does counteract these biases and that bridging divides as a result of race, culture, language, and socioeconomic status is an essential component of the program’s impact” (p. vii). This conclusion was reached after they “interviewed 11 principals, 96 teachers and staff, and 68 adult family members
across four districts implementing PTHV” (p.11). It appears that by entering the homes of their students and speaking to their families, teachers find greater understanding, more cultural awareness, and reduced deficit assumptions.

According to Rutter (1993), one cannot assume that youth even in the same family will experience the same risk factors. Varied environments may differentially affect different children, given their biological predisposition, birth order, gender, age, etc. Thus, it is necessary to consider individualized aspects of youth experiences and to obtain their perspective regarding their experiences of risk.

**Home Visits**

Outside of education, the home visit has been shown to have positive effects. In a study of recidivism rates among juveniles on probation, Alarid and Rangel Jr (2018) found that those “juveniles who received home visits were significantly less likely to reoffend for up to 24 months following probation discharge (17 of 287 = 6% recidivism) than juveniles on regular probation supervision who did not receive home visits (102 of 487 = 21% recidivism)” (p. 158). Those juveniles receiving home visits were more than three times less likely to reoffend. Home visits appeared to have a positive effect on these at-risk youth.

Another example of the use of home visits comes from the field of social work. Cooley (2011) in her review of home visiting programs across the nation shares a basic purpose for these visits: family wellness. The family benefits “through education, prevention, and health services that are offered in the home of the family receiving the services” (p. 1). The training, actions, and interactions of these workers are critical for the success of the home visits. The family benefits in additional ways. Bull et al. (2004) in
their review of reviews indicate that both parents and children have been shown to benefit in multiple ways. Parents develop better parenting skills. Mothers are encouraged and supported in efforts to breastfeed and postpartum depression is more likely to be recognized and treated. There is improved child development with the greatest gains seen in babies with low birth weight or that are premature. Children experience reduced rates of injuries. Importantly, Bull et al. (2004) also documented that children see benefits to their intellectual development as a result of home visits with improvement of the mother–child interaction as well.

Continuing to look through the lens of a social services worker, Russell et al. (2007) noted that families at-risk benefit the most from home-visiting services. The term at-risk implies that the family is commonly dealing with multiple or complex difficulties, including but not limited to homelessness or poverty, mental health issues, substance abuse or dependency, and domestic violence. One of the major benefits of home-visiting programs is the capacity to provide selected intervention strategies to at-risk families, especially those that fall within a single-parent marital status, younger parent age group, or lower socio-economic status, who may not have access to services or other family support programs (Sweet & Appelbaum, 2004).

As demonstrated above, home visits have been used to build relationships between educators and families over the course of the public school’s history. Although not new, a new start for the teacher home visit introduced itself to education in 1998. As parents from a low-income neighborhood in Sacramento organized and began conversations with the school district about working together, an increasingly popular version of the teacher home visit began (Kronholz, 2016). As constituted by the Parent
Teacher Home Visits (PTHV) organization, home visits must include these five nonnegotiable practices, the home visit must be voluntary for educators and families, and arranged in advance; be implemented by trained and compensated educators; have relationship-building as its focus; not be targeted to a specific population; and be done in pairs of educators. The visit should take place in the family home and last approximately one-half hour. The conversation should center on the parents’ hopes and dreams for their student (Venkateswaran et al., 2018). The PTHV organization sought a research-driven evaluation of their program. Three seminal studies were produced (see Table 2.2) which evaluated teacher mindsets, teacher home visits implementation, and student outcomes. These studies provided some teacher perspectives, some family perspectives, and student outcomes yet did not provide student perspectives.

**Summary**

This chapter has provided a brief historical perspective of the growing distance between the school and the home and established justification for the need for stronger bridges between school and students’ homes. Research was reviewed on what it means to be at-risk, the concern over and consequences of dropping out, and the power of the teacher-student relationship. The role of the home visit concluded this chapter and evidence was provided that home visits are one promising strategy for supporting at-risk adolescents.

In the next chapter the researcher proposes an explanatory case study investigating the teacher home visit. Specifically, how do students’ expectations of and relationships with their respective teachers change for at-risk students who experience a home visit? How do family’s perceptions of and relationships with the child’s school and
Table 2.2: **PTHV Studies on Teacher Home Visits (McKnight et al., 2017; Sheldon & Jung, 2018; Venkateswaran et al., 2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Teacher Mindset Shifts 2017</th>
<th>Implementation Study 2018</th>
<th>Student Outcomes 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data from 4 large districts* from across the nation—175 Home Visit Participants (Teachers and Parents)</td>
<td>Data from 4 large districts* from across the nation—187 Interviews and video of training sessions</td>
<td>Data from 4 large districts* from across the nation—demographic data from over 100,000 students, participation data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>According to the research literature, how are mindsets related to race, class, and culture formed? According to research, what are effective strategies for changing these mindsets? What reported changes in beliefs and behaviors do educators and families attribute to participating in Parent Teacher Home Visits? What aspects of Parent Teacher Home Visits support mindset shifts?</td>
<td>How do stakeholders uphold the five core practices of PTHV? Should schools continue to follow the five core practices as “non-negotiable”? To what extent do stakeholders consider the two-visit-per-year component of the model critical to improved relationships between educators, students, and families? What are effective strategies that schools and districts could use to successfully implement the five core practices? What are effective practices to support and monitor implementation of visits? What barriers should organizations seeking to replicate the model be mindful of?</td>
<td>To what extent does schools’ implementation of PTHV predict school-level outcomes? To what extent does student and family participation in a home visit predict student attendance and proficiency on standardized tests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Literature Review and Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews and Video Review</td>
<td>Multilevel modeling, Multilevel logistic regression analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>PTHV supports mindset shifts in ways that improve partnerships between educators and families and that are supportive of student success.</td>
<td>Most educators, administrators, and family members agreed that the five core practices ensured that home visits resulted in positive relationships between educators and families.</td>
<td>Implementation of the PTHV model can support positive outcomes for students, associated with a decreased likelihood of chronic absenteeism and an increased likelihood of proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher change for families of at-risk students who experience a home visit? How do teachers’ expectations of and relationships with at-risk students and their families change for teachers who engage in home visits with at-risk students and their families?
Chapter III
Methodology

Bamberger et al. (2010) recommend that the research question should determine the methods of research. Therefore, to determine the correct method of study, the researcher must examine the research question(s). This study examined how the home visit may affect changes in the perceptions and relationships of the major stakeholders: the parents, teachers, and especially the at-risk students.

The intentional focus on “how” is informed by Pharris-Ciurej et al. (2012) who note that “risk factors tell us who is most likely to fail, but not why and how” (p. 678). Teacher home visits may provide a potential interruption to the link between at-risk status and school failure. Through their positive effects on attendance, school performance, and family engagement (Ilhan et al., 2019; Kronholz, 2016; Stetson et al., 2012; Sweet & Appelbaum, 2004; Venkateswaran et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018) a home visit may ameliorate the negative effects of being at-risk. Understanding this relationship requires an examination of how perceptions and relationships may change following the home visit. As understanding is the goal of the researcher, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to make this mixed methods research. By understanding teacher home visits and how the visits can change perceptions and relationships of the stakeholders involved in those visits, educators may make better decisions about the use of home visits and thus increase the effectiveness of their efforts, specifically relating to at-risk youth. A case study methodology was used to understand the use of home visits within the context of a single school and the possible changes in parents’, teachers’, and students’ perceptions and relationships. While demonstrable changes have been seen in the
research (McKnight et al., 2017; Sheldon & Jung, 2018; Venkateswaran et al., 2018), there remains little discussion of the student perception of the teacher home visit. As the critical stakeholder, this oversight needed to be addressed and this research attempted to fill this gap (see Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1. A graphic of the critical triad made up of the student, family representative, and teacher.

Case Study Characteristics

Given the research questions and the desire to understand the role of parent, teacher, and student perceptions and/or expectations, an explanatory case study design was selected. Case studies allow researchers to emphasize complete contextual examination of the connections of a limited number of situations (Creswell, 2012; Yin, 2009). Yin notes that case studies allow researchers to explore real-life situations when barriers exist not visible between the phenomenon and situation by grasping a holistic perspective of the phenomenon under exploration. Using the case study design allowed the researcher to answer how and what (Yin, 2009).

The case study, often situated in qualitative research but also used with quantitative approaches, provides a meaningful look at the phenomenon of interest.
While this study began with quantitative approaches, Todis et al. (2001) note that qualitative approaches help, “to gain a clear and more in-depth theoretical understanding of both person-based and environmental variables” (p. 119) and so this approach was also used. Creswell (2012) explains that the case study intends “to understand a specific issue, problem, or concern and…cases selected to best understand the problem” (p. 98). A deep understanding of the perceptions and expectations of the key stakeholders in a home visit required both quantitative and qualitative data. The researcher intended that the quantitative data or survey provided a significant indicator of perceptual changes among the stakeholders while the qualitative data or interviews provided contextual understanding of the home visits and those perceptual changes (See Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1.**

*Researcher Decisions on Design and Methods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlational</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Grounded Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Experimental</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Explanatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A Rationale for Using an Explanatory Case Study**

The type of case study selected was important as understanding was an essential goal of this study. The researcher considered other types of case studies but set them aside as the explanatory case study best met the considerations driven by the research questions. While using descriptive methods, the descriptive case study design was not selected because this design seeks to provide a complete description of a phenomenon within the event background, which is not the goal of this study (Yin, 2009). Although
not selected, the exploratory case study design was considered because the purpose of the exploratory design is to evaluate portions of an emerging hypothesis or to explore a case in depth and then determine its frequency (Creswell et al., 2003). The explanatory case study was selected because the explanatory case study design provides an opportunity to take an in-depth look at the possible perceptions and expectations of the involved stakeholders. The qualitative information gave substance to the initial quantitative data.

As teacher home visits, by the definition used in this study, are voluntary, a purposive and convenient method of case selection was used. Both the teachers and the families chose to participate in the home visit. Therefore, all selected cases included only participants involved in the teacher home visit of their own free will. Seawright and Gerring (2008) note that “purposive methods cannot entirely overcome the inherent unreliability of generalizing from small-N samples, but they can nonetheless make an important contribution to the inferential process by enabling researchers to choose the most appropriate cases for a given research strategy” (pp. 295–296). The researcher selected only those situations in which a home visit was completed. Emphasis was placed on student perspectives and especially the perspectives of at-risk students.

As demonstrated in the research, school personnel continue in their efforts to increase the school success of students at-risk. Seeking evidence that these efforts produce the desired results, educators and researchers look to the external manifestations of effects of the home visit: attendance, continued effort, perseverance, and academic progress. Yet, these changes may be manifestations of the perceptions of the individual student. This leads the researcher back to the premise of the research questions, namely,
after a teacher home visit how do the students and their families and teachers change in their perceptions and expectations?

**Research Design**

The mixed methods sequential explanatory design consisted of two distinct phases: quantitative followed by qualitative (Creswell et al., 2003). The researcher first collected and analyzed the quantitative data from a survey and selected academic data provided by the school. The survey although administered after the home visit had occurred evaluated perspectives of the stakeholders from before and after the visit in a retrospective pre-post-design.

Based on the results of the t-test done on the surveys and the review of academic data, the researcher moved to the qualitative portion of the study. Use of the quantitative results allowed the researcher to query the participants about confirming or disconfirming data through selected interviews. This qualitative data clarified the quantitative portions providing a more detailed and complete perspective and providing the researcher the best opportunity to answer the research questions.

This explanatory case study examined perceptions of a teacher home visit and the perceptions and relationships of stakeholders involved in those visits at one case study site. To both contextualize and identify these perceptions required an understanding of the stakeholders’ experiences with the teacher home visit. To ascertain that understanding the researcher used surveys and interviews (Yin, 2009). Case studies are completed in a bounded system (Yin, 2009) or at least contextual (Creswell, 2012); the setting was a suburban junior high school, in a large school district. The study encompassed
perceptions of the teacher home visit by and of school staff and a family. The effects of that visit were studied.

**Figure 3.2.** A graphic depicting the research design, participants selection, and analysis (red print indicates changes required by the IRB and Covid-19 protocols).

**Research Questions**
1. How do students’ perceptions of and relationships with their respective teachers change for at-risk students who experience a home visit?

2. How do family’s perceptions of and relationships with the child’s school and teacher change for families of at-risk students who experience a home visit?

3. How do teachers’ perceptions of and relationships with at-risk students and their families change for teachers who engage in home visits with at-risk students and their families?

**IRB and COVID-19**

The methods described above were subject to changes required by both the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and novel coronavirus (COVID-19) protocols. The largest effect was in the recruiting of parents and students. To ensure that the parents and students were not subjected to any undue influence, neither the principal nor the teachers could be involved in the parent/student recruitment process. Further, the recruitment information could not be targeted to those who had received a home visit. COVID-19 protocols under the direction of the IRB required all recruitment to be done digitally. Therefore, the researcher sent up to three recruitment emails to over 2000 guardians, of those only one parent responded and completed the survey, a response rate of approximately .05%. Emails were sent to 45 teachers of whom 11 responded and completed the survey, a response rate of 24.4%. Students could be contacted only with permission granted by the parent. While the parent did grant permission, her student did not respond, as a result, no students took the survey. Neither the parent or the student consented to an interview.
Case

The selected single case for this study is bounded within a single junior high. The selected junior high is a large, growing, 7-9 grades school in an area transitioning from rural to suburban with a student population of approximately 2000. A part of the largest school district in this western state, the school demographics show that the students who attend the school are predominantly Caucasian with approximately 14% of students on free or reduced lunch (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2:  
**Junior High Demographics (1900-2100 total students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Language Spoken</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>650-700</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>650-700</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>&gt;70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>&gt;90</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>600-650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>&gt;1900</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>&gt;1700</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Polynesian</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>&gt;160</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

The participants for this research study were purposively sampled (Creswell, 2012) from the junior high school. At-risk students and their families who had received a home visit and the teachers who made home visits to at-risk students made up the purposive sample pool. An at-risk student, their family, and a respective teacher together make up a triad. As was possible, the researcher sought triads but as noted above, only one parent completed the survey and no students completed the survey making a
complete triad an impossibility for this study. All available, consenting participants’ data was used.

At-risk was determined in several ways. Part of that determination was socio-economic status. As is common, socio-economic status is determined by free and reduced lunch status. Parents apply for student eligibility for the free or reduced lunch; eligibility is based on a predetermined scale of income and family size. This practice may result in an underreporting of actual eligible students (Harwell & Le Beau, 2010). Another part of the at-risk determination was inadequate school attendance (missing more than 15% of school days) and poor academic progress (failing grades in one or more core courses—Math, Science, English, and Social Studies).

Thus, for this study a student was classified at-risk by their parent or family representative. Informed by common practices for determining at-risk status, the parent was asked to make that determination based on one or more of the following factors: poor attendance (attending less than 85% of all school days or the equivalent of missing 27 or more of the 180 days); poor academic progress (failing grades in core subject areas); behavioral issues, special education enrollment, minority status, and low socio-economic status (as measured by eligibility for free and reduced lunch) (Bear et al., 2006; Berkowitz et al., 2016; Connell et al., 1994; Davis et al., 2013; Finn & Rock, 1997; Ginsburg et al., 2014; Jimerson et al., 2000; Knesting & Waldron, 2006; Lan & Lanthier, 2003; Mac Iver & Messel, 2013; Nowicki et al., 2004; Pharris-Ciurej et al., 2012; Reyes et al., 2012; Schonert-Reichl, 2000; Soland, 2013; Somers et al., 2009; Worrell, 1997). Students with a greater number of at-risk factors would have received priority in the qualitative portion of the study. An additional point of selection for at-risk students was
the list of students provided to teachers by the school administration from which home visits were to be made. This list was predominately created to include students with poor attendance and/or deficient academic progress.

Again, the students, teachers, and families selected came from a pool of students whose families received a home visit from a pair of teachers. All visits were done by teachers from the same junior high during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years.

The original intent of the research study was to target teacher home visits and specifically to identify at-risk student perceptions. To provide both points of comparison and to more fully develop the context for this case study; the recruitment pool was expanded to include other students, families, and teachers. It was hoped that these additional families and teachers would provide insight and their perspectives would have allowed points of comparison for the student perceptions in this bounded explanatory case study. As only a single parent participant and no student participants engaged in this study, the participant pool did not allow for such comparisons. To provide history, context, and insight into the implementation of the home visit at the respective junior high, the principal was interviewed.

Procedures, Variables, and Instruments

The research commenced in June 2021 following approval from the school district and Utah State University’s Institutional Review Board (Protocol #11860). With the support of the school’s principal, teachers who completed home visits were identified and recruited to participate in the study. Each of the identified teachers were sent an informational letter, consent forms, and the survey through email. The email to parents also included an informational letter, consent forms (including a FERPA consent form),
and the survey. Furthermore, the parent email included a request for permission to contact their student (see Appendix H and Appendix I). All forms were done digitally and the survey could not be accessed without the consent form being completed first. Efforts were made to create full data sets of responses from students, families, and teachers. Each willing parent and all teachers who completed the consent forms and survey were placed in the participant pool.

The three groups of stakeholders, students (Appendix A), families (Appendix B), and teachers (Appendix C), received a survey tailored to their group. As already noted, there were no students who completed the consent forms and therefore, there was no student who completed the survey. The researcher used a retrospective pre-post questionnaire or as it is also known, a post then pre design (Colosi & Dunifon, 2006). In this model, participants provided answers about their experience both before and after the home visit, all in the post experience period. Selection of this questionnaire or survey enabled the researcher to explore the experience of the teacher home visit without the concern of response shift bias evidenced in some pre- and post-approaches (Bhanji et al., 2012; Colosi & Dunifon, 2006; Davis, 2002; Pratt et al., 2000).

The survey, modeled on the original Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS) (Appendix D), was intended to be used to ascertain the perceptions of students, teachers, and families after having been a part of a home visit. Using both an oblique and an orthogonal factor analysis, the BIRS was shown to have content and construct validity and reliably measures acceptability, effectiveness, and time of effect (Elliott & Treuting, 1991).

A coefficient alpha was used to determine the reliability of each scale. The total BIRS (24 items) yielded an alpha of .97. The three factors of the
BIRS, Acceptability, Effectiveness, and Time, yielded alphas of .97, .92, and .87, respectively. (p. 49)

Additionally, Elliott and Treuting (1991) noted that the BIRS could be modified and used with many treatments including “in evaluating consumers’ pretreatment and post-treatment reactions to interventions” (p. 50). Watt (2018), in his evaluation of the Center for Advanced Profession Studies (CAPS), provides an example of such modifications. The researcher used a modified version to do both the pre- and post-treatment reactions in the posttreatment setting (See Table 3.3). Modification of the survey’s wording provided for easy adaptation to other settings and multiple treatments.

Table 3.3
Adaption of the BIRs for current study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original BIRs Question (what is measured)</th>
<th>Factor Loading Oblique/Orthogonal</th>
<th>Adapted Question Watt’s Study</th>
<th>Adapted Question Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I would suggest the use of this intervention to other teachers. (acceptability)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>I would suggest participation in CAPS to other students.</td>
<td>I would suggest participation in a teacher home visit to other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would be willing to use this in the classroom setting. (acceptability)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>I would be willing to re-enroll in the CAPS program.</td>
<td>I would be willing to accept a teacher home visit in my home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The intervention is consistent with those I have used in classroom settings. (acceptability)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>CAPS is consistent with other school programs in which I have participated in the past.</td>
<td>I had considered having a teacher visit my home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The intervention was a fair way to handle the child’s</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>CAPS does a fair job at providing me professional</td>
<td>I believed that a visit from teachers would demonstrate that they have an interest in me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(acceptability)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td>skills in career fields.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I like the procedures used in the</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>I like the programs and experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervention.</td>
<td></td>
<td>offered through CAPS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The child’s behavior will remain</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>The professional skills I learn in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at an improved level even after the</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAPS will help me in my future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervention is discontinued.</td>
<td></td>
<td>career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Using the intervention should</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>The skills acquired in CAPS should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not only improve the child’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>not only improve my professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior in the classroom, but also</td>
<td></td>
<td>skills, but also skills in other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in other settings (e.g., other</td>
<td></td>
<td>academic and/or professional areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classrooms, home).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The intervention should produce</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>CAPS should produce enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough improvement in the child’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>improvement in my professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior so the behavior no longer</td>
<td></td>
<td>skills that I will feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a problem in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>prepared to enter a professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td>field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The factor analysis done by Elliott and Treuting (1991) included both an oblique rotation factor and a varimax or orthogonal rotation factor. These two analyses provide factor loadings for the BIRS at the item level. Factor loadings are typically represented by eigenvalues that range from 0.00 to 1.00 (both negative and positive). A value closer to 1.00 indicates that the individual survey item is representative of the underlying latent construct. Factor loadings of .6 and above can be used reliably to measure constructs, with relatively small sample sizes and few items per construct (MacCallum et al., 1999). Using .70 as the threshold score for acceptability, the researcher reduced the BIRS from 24 to 8 items. In addition to factor loadings, items were also analyzed for study fit. As the time factor is not relevant to this study questions 16 and 19 from the original BIRS were discarded and instead questions assessing the factors of acceptability and effectiveness were retained. The survey was administered once and provided both a pre- and post-retrospective look at the previous experience of the teacher home visit and its accompanying perceptual changes. Study data was collected and managed using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at Utah State University. REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) is a secure, web-based application designed to support data capture for research studies, providing 1) an intuitive interface for validated data entry; 2) audit trails for tracking data manipulation and export procedures; 3) automated export procedures for seamless data downloads to common statistical packages; and 4) procedures for importing data from external sources (Harris et al., 2009).

Following the administration of the survey, interviews with selected teachers were conducted to acquire detailed perceptions and expectations of participants. (An interview
was requested from the parent who responded to the survey and their student but no response was received.) Thus, teachers \((N = 5)\) were invited for interviews based on the results of the survey in an attempt to capture both typical and diverse responses for further investigation and to expand on ideas, patterns, and anomalies found in the quantitative data. Teachers were invited to interview until saturation was reached. Reaching saturation was recognized as the researcher had new information and new themes were not being developed (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Although some teachers were selected to be interviewed because of divergences in the survey responses, the interview responses were similar and the researcher determined additional interviews were unnecessary. The interviews used a semi-structured protocol, were conducted via Google Meet, and were recorded. Results from these interviews, allowed the researcher to understand points of comparison and contextualization of the retrospective pre-post questionnaire.

**Threats to Internal and External Validity**

As with any research study, the researcher must be aware of the possible threats to the validity of the findings. In the present study, such threats may be present as delineated below. First, the threats to internal validity are addressed. An inherent part of this explanatory case study is the perceptions and expectations of key stakeholders. As the home visit is voluntary for all participants, the stakeholders may already have positive feelings about the treatment. Additionally, these stakeholders may be susceptible to a history event or influence that may confound results. For students and their families it is likely that a home visit is an usual and unique event and highly salient, thus enhancing memory and recall. However, home visits may have occurred some time ago and the
memory of the home visit may be reduced, especially for some at-risk populations (Peeters et al., 2014). To respond to this limitation, one item was added to the survey to ask participants to indicate how well they remember the home visit. Another possible threat would be a maturation effect. Some of the results may simply be a reflection of student growth. With the relatively small numbers involved in a case study, attrition appears as a significant threat. Finally, there may be alternative explanations for the results seen (Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

External validity threats exist as problems with generalizability. “Typically, generalizability is not the purpose of qualitative research, and, not surprisingly, external validity tends to be a weakness of qualitative research” (Johnson & Christensen, 2014, p. 305). The portions of this research that are qualitative are susceptible to this weakness.

To combat both the internal and external validity threats, the following were planned to be a part of this study: Triangulation (multiple sources with varying perspectives to corroborate evidence), peer review (an opportunity for an external check on the work), negative case analysis (looking for and explaining disconfirming or divergent evidence), reflexivity (recognizing, clarifying and combating researcher bias), member checking (soliciting the views of participants about interpretations), and rich, thick description (detailed writing enabling the reader to ascertain generalizability) (Creswell, 2012; Johnson & Christensen, 2014). This research design also seeks to address the external validity threat by providing participants with divergent socio-economic status, and perceptions from various stakeholders. The researcher does not pretend this eliminates the external validity threats yet it does provide the reader information from which to ascertain possible generalizability to their own situation.
Data Collection

Institutional Review Board. As this case study involved students and their perceptions and the perceptions of families and school staff and the relationships upon which those perceptions are based, the primary ethical consideration is confidentiality. The researcher submitted the proposal to Utah State University’s Institutional Review Board for approval as well as to the school district and school officials for their approval. All data was stored in a password-protected computer that was kept in a locked office. Once secured, the data was transferred to a usu.box.edu account. Participant names were given pseudonyms to preserve the integrity of the process and the confidence of the participants. Pseudonyms were used for all records. A key of names and pseudonyms was created for organizing purposes. During transcription, any names of individuals, school names, locations, or other identifiable information (e.g., neighborhood, community site, school name) mentioned were removed or replaced by pseudonyms. As was necessary, descriptive details of participants' school environments were altered to protect confidentiality. The key connecting names and pseudonyms was kept in a file on Box.com, an encrypted, cloud-based storage system. Subjects were given a consent form that will include basic information about the study.

Informed consent. The informed consent form and FERPA consent contained an explanation of the purpose of the study, possible risks and benefits derived from the study, a statement describing methods of confidentiality, notice that the study was voluntary and that the participant may withdraw at any time, and instructions to enable the participant to contact the researcher to ask any questions. Participants were provided with a copy of the consent form to keep for their records. The FERPA consent
specifically allowed the researcher to access school records for at risk determinations although this proved to be unneeded as the parent identified the at-risk status of their student and the school provided results to the researcher (see Table 4.1).

**Survey.** Three different surveys (Appendices A, B, and C), one for each key stakeholder, each modeled on the original Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS) (Appendix D) (Elliott & Treuting, 1991) that was adapted by the researcher were ready to be used to ascertain the perceptions of students, teachers, and families after having been a part of a home visit. Again, only the teacher stakeholder group had multiple respondents and the parent stakeholder group had a single respondent. The BIRS uses a 6-point Likert scale and has been validated as to measures of acceptability, effectiveness, and time of effect. An example of acceptability from the original BIRS is question 9, “The intervention would be an appropriate intervention for a variety of children”. An example of effectiveness from the original BIRS is question 20, “The child’s behavior will remain at an improved level even after the intervention is discontinued”. As noted previously, measures of time were not used in this research.

**Interviews.** Individual interviews (see Appendix E) were attempted with the responding parent and their student but did not occur. Only participants from the teacher stakeholder group (N = 5) were held after the retrospective pre-post questionnaire. The interviews were semi-structured and included open-ended questions (Creswell, 2012). The interviews explored in greater depth the perceptions and expectations of participants. This enabled the researcher to provide additional clarification to the survey. The interviews took place virtually using Google Meet, were recorded, and were transcribed.
Additionally, the researcher engaged in member checking. The researcher discussed developed themes with one of the interviewees to determine that the researcher’s understanding was representative of the interviewee’s intent (Creswell, 2012). This process helped to ensure that the researcher clearly understood the participant’s perceptions and afforded the researcher the opportunity to follow up on questions that arose in the process of coding.

**School records-attendance.** While the researcher intended to view student participants’ school attendance for the school year previous to the home visit (2018-2019) and the year of the study (2019-2020) two changes were made that altered this intent. First, there were no direct student participants and second, the school provided the researcher attendance data for all students that received a home visit (see Table 4.1). The researcher therefore, relied on the school provided data and the teacher reports to make interpretations. School attendance demonstrably contributes to school completion (Ginsburg et al., 2014), indicates student engagement, and remains necessary for students to fully receive benefit. The attendance record allowed the researcher to see a possible important effect of the home visit. This effect may indicate a possible correlation to a perceived student-teacher relationship.

**School records-academic.** Again, while the researcher intended to view student participants’ school academic records for the previous school year and the year of the study looking at both overall GPA and individual course grades, two changes were made that altered this intent. First, there were no direct student participants and second, the school provided the researcher some academic data for all students that received a home visit (see Table 4.1). The researcher therefore, relied on the school provided data and the
teacher reports to make interpretations. These records served as an indicator of change in student academic behavior. It should be noted that the school district elected to pass all students during the 4th quarter of the 2019-2020 school year as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. Other than participation rates, grades were not be evaluated for the 4th quarter.

Attendance and academic records provided the researcher two important pieces of information. First, these records served as an important factor in determining the at-risk status of students. Second, these records, comparing attendance and academic performance from before and after the home visit, yielded another indicator of change in the individual student’s disposition.

**Data Analysis**

The data generated and collected in this case study were acquired by the researcher in ways successfully demonstrated in other prior studies. For this study that included surveys, interviews, and school provided data. (Bruce & Ross, 2008; Creswell, 2012; Gardiner, 2012; Yirci et al., 2014). Additionally, these strategies could have provided opportunities for triangulation as the statistical analysis of the surveys, coding of the interviews, and additional data yielded common and confirming and contradictory themes across the varied strategies. These sources of data provided the best opportunity to ascertain the perceptions and expectations of the students, parents, and educators although the acquired data was less than originally planned. As the data were substantially less than planned, the anticipated opportunities for triangulation dissipated. The data did yield opportunities to see some convergence with the surveys, interviews, and school provided data (see Tables 3.4 and 3.5) yet full triangulation was elusive.
### Table 3.4

*Theme Convergence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Quantitative Evidence</th>
<th>Qualitative Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Perception</td>
<td>Change in Perception/Relationship</td>
<td>-No Survey</td>
<td>-No Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-School Recorded Data (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>-As Perceived by Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Perception</td>
<td>Change in Perception/Relationship</td>
<td>-Survey ($N = 1$)</td>
<td>-No Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-As Perceived by Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Perception</td>
<td>Change in Perception/Relationship</td>
<td>-Survey ($N = 11$)</td>
<td>-Teacher Interview ($N = 5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Teacher Interview ($N = 5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned about home visits</td>
<td>Principal Influence</td>
<td>-Principal Interview ($N = 1$)</td>
<td>-Teacher Interview ($N = 5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In lieu of parent teacher conferences</td>
<td>Principal Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosen students</td>
<td>Other Considerations</td>
<td>-School Recorded Data (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>-Principal Interview ($N = 1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased communication</td>
<td>Teacher Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Teacher Interview ($N = 5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of home visits</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>-School Recorded Data (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>-Principal Interview ($N = 1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations to home visits</td>
<td>Other Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Teacher Interview ($N = 5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of home</td>
<td>Other Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Teacher Interview ($N = 5$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the quantitative data from the survey provided the researcher with a post pre- and post-responses from each participant, the researcher evaluated any potential change using paired t-tests. While data from a Likert scale, as used in the survey in this research, is considered ordinal Baggaley and Hull (1983) note that researchers can confidently use parametric statistics. Additionally, Norman (2010) in his review of statistical assumptions concluded that the robustness of parametric tests permits statistical evaluation of “Likert data, with small sample sizes, with unequal variances, and with non-normal distributions, with no fear of ‘coming to the wrong conclusion’” (p. 631). While a small sample size made finding significant differences harder to achieve, significance was still demonstrated on several question pairs. Another important consideration addressed by the researcher during analysis beyond the statistical application is the practical application. SPSS was used for the computational statistics in this research.

Hattie (2008) in his extensive meta-analysis on the influences on student achievement found that the effect size of home visits was .29. This was calculated using Cohen’s d. He notes that home visits are likely to have a positive effect on student achievement. Using G Power (Faul et al., 2007) set at .29 effect size would require a sample size of 96 (see Appendix F). Yet, Hattie’s definition of home visits, “[g]enerally, a practice to bring childhood development professionals into the homes of young children in an effort to shape caregiver behavior and improve the home environment” (Meta^ Influence Glossary, 2019) served both a different population and a different purpose than the current research. The researcher believed that the smaller sample size might have still yielded sufficient power to achieve significant results as the studied population tends to
respond to relationship building and intervention. The size of both the student and parent participant pool made this belief moot.

Table 3.5:
*Research Questions, Participants, Methods, and Analysis Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do students’ perceptions of and relationships with their teacher change for at-risk students who experience a home visit?</td>
<td>0 Students at-risk whose family received a teacher home visit.</td>
<td>School-reported attendance and academic data of students who received home visits, insights from teacher interviews</td>
<td>Review of school provided data; coding from interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do family’s perceptions of and relationships with the child’s school and teacher change for families of at-risk junior high students who experience a home visit?</td>
<td>1 Family (Parent) of an at-risk junior high student</td>
<td>Retrospective pre-post questionnaire (adapted BIRs for families), insights from teacher interviews</td>
<td>Data from Likert scales statistically evaluated with a paired t-test; coding from interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teachers’ perceptions of and relationships with at-risk students and their families change for teachers who engage in home visits with at-risk students and their families?</td>
<td>11 Teachers doing the home visit, a sub-set of 5 interviewed</td>
<td>Retrospective pre-post questionnaire (adapted BIRs for teachers), selected interviews</td>
<td>Data from Likert scales statistically evaluated with a paired t-test; coding from interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative data for this explanatory case study design were analyzed using content analysis. Using this method, the researcher identifies meanings of context clues through interviews to establish the presence of relationships, develop particular themes, and make inferences from the gleaned information (Creswell, 2005). Following the recommendations of Tesch (1990) and Creswell (2005), the researcher uses content analysis to ensure that a thorough review of transcripts is conducted. The researcher then
identifies the fundamental meaning by selecting a single interview rather than sifting through a bulk of information. Once a fundamental meaning is ascertained, the rest of the transcripts are reviewed. Once a review of transcripts has been conducted the researcher labels major, unique, and leftover topics. The next step is to take the data and develop codes. With the codes, the researcher locates newly materializing categories and classifies them based on unique characteristics. The researcher then identifies relationships between categories to reduce categories into similar groups. Once, the data has been coded and alphabetized the researcher executes an primary analysis (Creswell, 2012; Tesch, 1990). The researcher used this process and also used a more deductive approach by using the research questions themselves to point to codes.

As noted by Huberman and Miles (1994) and Creswell (2012), the process of analyzing data and writing reports are not separate stages in the research process nor is this process systematized. It is instead an interrelated and reflective process that moves in a recursive progression. Having done an initial review of the survey, the interview transcripts were reviewed as the researcher began an initial coding. After developing some initial codes, the researcher engaged in an external check or peer review process similar to interrater reliability found in quantitative studies (Creswell, 2012) and then began the coding process again. The coding was then evaluated to determine general themes. These general themes were assessed to determine both the inclusivity and the specificity of the data. Data from these themes, although only taken from teacher interviews, were separated in groups of student, family, and teacher perceptions in order to facilitate comparisons and understandings.
As this research study included three separate questions, the data analysis will be broken into the components identified in research and will include both themes and samples of the data representing each question. This visualization of the data created the picture that enables deeper analysis. The data included and was subject to a negative case analysis (Creswell, 2012), as a validation strategy. By including disconfirming evidence as it appears in the data, the validity of the research itself is enhanced as the reader is able to conclude that the data was not selected to be self-confirming.

The documentation (attendance and academic records) collected from the school and on each student was evaluated to determine if there are changes after the home visit. This data may indicate perceptual changes in the selected students and when coupled with the surveys and interviews, this documentation and review provided the researcher with the understanding needed to make evaluative statements. Creswell (2012) describes the conclusive portion of analysis: “In the final interpretive phase, the researcher reports the meaning of the case. . .that meaning comes from learning about the issue of the case. . . . As Lincoln and Guba (1985) mention, this phase constitutes the lessons learned from the case” (p. 101).

The researcher may now make informed statements regarding stakeholders’ perceptions regarding home visits and the resulting relationships. With codes, themes, and context described, “the researcher establishes patterns and looks for a correspondence between two or more categories” (Creswell, 2012, p. 199). Much of the home visit research involves reports about behavioral changes, improved attendance, and increased academic proficiency. By attempting to investigate the perceptions of the at-risk students themselves, their families, and their teachers, the researcher intended the home visit
process to be clearer and more replicable. As explanatory case studies seek to determine results (Johnson & Christensen, 2014), the researcher expected this research process to yield answers to the research questions. The researcher also expected that stakeholder perceptions may solidify some current practice and discourage other practices as schools seek to build stronger student-teacher and educator-family relationships. The participant pool limited many of the hoped-for expectations.

The final analysis came as the researcher discussed the limitations and future possibilities created by the project. In the present case, it was anticipated that the coding, examination of the data, and analysis will yield both insight and uncertainties. The insight took the form of conclusions in this qualitative study and the uncertainties provide the opportunity for future study.

Summary

Getting answers to research questions depends on using good methodology. To find answers to the three questions in this research, the researcher selected an explanatory case study. This model enabled the researcher flexibility to pursue both quantitative (survey) and qualitative (interviews) components. This combination provided the best opportunity to find the perceptions of the participants with the ability to probe deeper.

The setting for this research was a sizable suburban junior high in a large school district in the western United States. This setting allowed the researcher to explore aspects that had not been adequately addressed in the teacher home visit literature.

The selected participants were to be composed of three stakeholder groups: students, teachers, and a family representative (generally a parent). While the methodology was sound, the IRB and Covid-19 protocols had a significant effect on
participant recruitment. Only two (parents and teachers) of the three stakeholder groups were represented with only the teachers participating in both the survey and the interview.
Chapter IV

Results

Home Visit Case Context

Context for the home visits was established using data collected from a 45-minute interview with the principal in which he provided insight into the beginnings of home visits at his school. The principal was in his second year at that school and had been in administration for several years prior to becoming the principal there. The interview included questions such as: “Why did you want to use the strategy of teacher home visits with your school and community?” and “What did you hope would be the results of this strategy?” (see Appendix E for full interview protocol). Since the interview served to establish important contextual information to situate the research questions, but was not central to the research questions themselves, no formal coding process was conducted and all information extracted from the interview is presented in a narrative format that follows.

While he had done home visits as a principal, he became aware of the additional uses of home visits and the impact teachers could have in that process. This awareness grew as he conversed with colleagues, as he read a section from Heath and Heath (2017) *The Power of Moments* that detailed the implementation and results of teacher home visits in a Washington D.C. elementary school, and even as he did some online searching about home visits.

Recognizing that at his school, he rarely had the opportunity to meet with the families who he most wanted to see and wanting to have a meaningful impact on them, he determined to institute teacher home visits at his school. As he said, “if they weren’t
coming to me, I needed to go to them.” To accomplish this, and recognizing that he must provide compensation to teachers whether that was monetary or trading for time, he and his leadership team determined to use some of the hours allocated for parent-teacher conferences for teacher home visits. For those allocated hours, teachers could choose to do home visits or they could choose to do a minimum of 10 phone contacts. His hope was that teachers would choose the home visits.

The first round of home visits occurred in the 18-19 school year. The second round of home visits was being attempted just prior to the shutdown of schools as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic in March of the 19-20 school year. He hoped that the teacher home visits would be an ongoing practice at his school and would result in better school attendance, stronger school/home connection, and that the visits would provide evidence that teachers cared about their students beyond their academic grades. He did anticipate that the results of this strategy would be seen over multiple years as the teachers and the community learned together.

To ensure that teachers would make good use of the visit, the principal provided training. The training was faculty wide and included instruction on the purpose of the visit, role-playing, and even a written script (see Appendix G). He also indicated that the five non-negotiables were not strictly adhered to as appointments were not made and students were generally selected because of their poor attendance or lack of academic progress.

Teachers were provided with a door hanger, to leave if the family was not home at the time of the visit, that included the school logo and this message in both English and Spanish: “Sorry We Missed You We stopped by today to see how we can help your child
succeed in their classes. We would like to meet with you and your student to see how we can help. Please call or email so we can arrange a future time to meet.” The door hanger had a place for the teachers to sign.

They also took a backpack to leave with the student that included school supplies and a school t-shirt. The hope was that even families that did not receive teachers into their home would recognize the efforts to reach out to them.

A list of students who could benefit from a home visit was compiled by the administration and the counselors. These selected students were largely comprised of students who missed substantial amounts of school or who were failing classes or both. While these students were recommended for a visit, teachers did have the latitude to choose any student for a visit.

As the principal was interested in multiple outcomes, data were collected on changes in attendance and academic performance of those students who received a visit (see Table 4.1). Notably, of the students who received a home visit (beyond a door hanger), nearly 59% showed an increase in attendance and over 93% increased the number of classes that they were passing.

Additionally, the principal noted improved collegiality as the teachers performed their home visits in pairs as he had recommended to them. He also indicated that there was greater teacher/student connection. Finally, he mentioned that some teachers enjoyed their experience so much that they volunteered for additional visits.

Although improved connection was an outcome indicated by the principal, he did not believe that the home visits improved student response to teachers and their school work during the time that students were online as a result of the COVID-19 epidemic. He
attributed that lack of affect to being more worried about safety than connection at the beginning of the pandemic and that the shutdown happened so quickly that there was not conscious preparation.

Some teachers expressed concerns prior to their visit. The principal reported that the teachers were concerned about a variety of things including spending time working outside of contract hours, personal safety concerns, and the fear of trying something new. Some teachers just did not want to do it. The principal indicated that those teachers that did complete home visits had transformative experiences and would do it again. Tamra (Each teacher was given a pseudonym. To further protect the identity of the teachers, the pseudonyms may or may not relate to the sex of the teacher.) shared this insight about the teachers,

some were slow to warm up and then realize that they were able to make a big impact in a small amount of time and actually kind of came around to the idea so it was nice to see people being humble enough to say oh that was actually positive and that actually worked.

The principal’s final comments related to the future of home visits at his school. Based on what he saw, he was pleased with the results and absolutely intends to continue having teachers do home visits.
### Table 4.1 School recorded home visit results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Contact Made (Not a Door Hanger)</th>
<th>Before Visits</th>
<th>After Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>KK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>QQ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home Visits Results (taken from 1/1 - 4/16) - 67 School days
Research Question One: How Do Students’ Perceptions of and Relationships with Their Respective Teachers Change for At-risk Students Who Experience a Home Visit?

Results for research question one were to be derived from the quantitative portion of this mixed method sequential explanatory study, particularly stakeholders’ (e.g. teachers, parents, and students) responses to the retrospective pre-post-survey (see Appendix A for the full survey). In answering question one, How do students’ perceptions of and relationships with their respective teachers change for at-risk students who experience a home visit? no students took the survey. As noted above, under the COVID-19 guidelines implemented by the IRB, students could only be contacted through their parents or family representative. With very limited parent response, the probability of student response was even lower resulting in no students who took the survey.

Answers to question one from the survey can only be inferred from other stakeholder responses.

**Student Response**

As noted above and to provide additional clarity, no student took the survey. Additionally, no student was interviewed.

**Parent Response**

As noted only a single parent took the survey. That parent consented to an interview yet did not respond to the request for interview and therefore was not interviewed.

**Teacher Response**
As no students or parents were interviewed, data to inform the results of research question one were instead derived from the teacher interviews ($N = 5$). Teacher interviews were transcribed verbatim and then coded using both a deductive and an inductive approach. Deductively, the researcher used the research questions to directly point the researcher to codes that provided indications of perceptional and relational changes between the stakeholders. Specifically, the researcher began by looking for indications that the students had perceptional or relational changes. Statements from the teachers like “I was nice to that kid, so they felt more seen” or “they seemed more receptive to what we were doing in class” were examples that were coded as student perceptions.

Inductively, the researcher, in the iterative process of coding, produced additional codes. Inductive codes were common statements made by the teachers that were not generated by looking through the lens of the research questions themselves. Some of these were a result of the teachers’ responses to the interview questions. For instance, the teachers were asked, “How did you learn about the home visits?” This generated the code “learned about home visits” and also led the researcher to see the emergence of the “principal influence” code.

The researcher then reviewed these codes and produced themes. The themes generated the final narrative (see Table 4.2). Each of the teachers interviewed reported student dispositional changes. The teachers interpreted these changes as directly resulting from their visits. This interpretation leads into the theme of “teacher confidence” which will be discussed later.
Seventeen instances were coded as student perceptions, some of which are detailed below. Quotes were used that both illustrated and developed the theme. Although not every coded quotation was used, the researcher was careful and cognizant to seek variation and to note disconfirming quotes as they were encountered.

Table 4.2
*Interview generated codes and themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive Codes</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Inductive Codes</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Perception</td>
<td>Change in Perception/Relationship</td>
<td>Learned about</td>
<td>Principal Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as perceived by teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>home visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Perception</td>
<td>Change in Perception/Relationship</td>
<td>In lieu of parent</td>
<td>Principal Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as perceived by teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>teacher conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Perception</td>
<td>Change in Perception/Relationship</td>
<td>Chosen students</td>
<td>Other Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased communication</td>
<td>Teacher Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose of home visits</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations to home visits</td>
<td>Other Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of home</td>
<td>Other Considerations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the changes described by the teachers were observable. Tamra recounted the experience the day after the visit along with an interpretation for the behavior, “the next day he came to school just beaming, smiling…because we had a made a
connection.” Jared attributed a change in attendance to the visit, indicating that the visit “actually made her start coming to school more.” From a visit to another student, Jared saw that the student’s willingness to do homework changed, “after I visited him he actually did my homework and only my homework.”

Beyond the observable changes, the teachers conveyed changes in the students’ perceptions and the relationship between the teacher and the student. For instance, Trenton related that “they seemed more receptive to what we're doing in class, not that they were bad before but…they seemed to enjoy it more because we had a different connection.” Jared added, “being able to go and visit him and his parents it just made me his favorite teacher. He would just rave about me all the time because he felt like I cared enough to just be there for him.” From improved attendance and work completion to changes in perceptions and better relationships, the teachers reported noticeable differences in student behavior following their visits to their students’ homes.

An experience that Debi had emphasizes how it appears to be the visit that effected these observable changes in students. Debi and a fellow teacher attempted to visit “one girl that had been absent for like 38 days in a row.” Unsurprisingly for Debi, they did not receive an answer at the door when they knocked. Debi and her fellow teacher “left our names on. . . the door hanger that we left with them. She would have known my name, but. . . she never mentioned it to me or or contacted me in any way.” When asked if the student started attending after this attempted contact, Debi simply replied, “Nope, she did not.” The students that had experienced a teacher home visit appear to exhibit observable changes. Those students who did not experience the teacher
home visit do not appear to share in those same results as noted in the contrasting examples above.

The teachers also provided insight into why they believed these changes took place. Tamra stated, “instead of me being nice to the class I was nice to that kid and so they felt far more seen.” Michael related that “he knew I was interested in him in a way that definitely could not have been communicated another way.” Jared perhaps sums up the feelings described by the teachers, “relationships are what make kids trust you and want to learn from you.” Remarkably, the teachers believed that these changes resulted from a single home visit and further, they believed it changed the perceptions of and relationships with their students.

**Research Question Two: How do Family’s Perceptions of and Relationships with the Child’s School and Teacher Change for Families of At-risk Students Who Experience a Home Visit?**

Data to inform the answers to research question two, How do family’s perceptions of and relationships with the child’s school and teacher change for families of at-risk students who experience a home visit? also suffered from inadequate responses from family participation in the study. Only one parent completed the pre-post survey (see Appendix B for full survey). Again, as a result of COVID-19 protocols implemented by the IRB and as the parent or family representative of at-risk students often are themselves difficult to contact, efforts to reach them resulted in a single survey completed.

**Student Response**

As noted above and to provide additional clarity, no student took the survey. Additionally, no student was interviewed.
Parent Response

As noted only a single parent took the survey. A nonparametric review of Table 4.3 shows a pre- post-change indicating a more positive perception of the teacher home visit after the visit took place. The survey used a six-point Likert Scale: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Slightly Disagree (3), Slightly Agree (4), Agree (5), Strongly Agree (6) (see Appendix B). For every pair of pre- post-questions, excepting the 8-17 pairing (the 9-18 pairing showed no change), the parent identified more agreement with the statements in the post- than in the pre-survey questions.

Table 4.3
Parent survey response pre- post-comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>q1</td>
<td>I would have suggested participation in a teacher home visit to other parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q10</td>
<td>I would suggest participation in a teacher home visit to other parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>q2</td>
<td>I would have been willing to accept a teacher home visit in my home.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q11</td>
<td>I would be willing to accept a teacher home visit in my home.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>q3</td>
<td>The teacher home visit seems consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q12</td>
<td>The teacher home visit is consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>q4</td>
<td>I believed that a home visit from a teacher would demonstrate that the teacher has an interest in my child.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q13</td>
<td>A home visit from a teacher demonstrates that the teacher has an interest in my child.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>q5</td>
<td>I believed the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit would be necessary for a good teacher home visit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q14</td>
<td>I believe the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit are necessary for a good visit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>q6</td>
<td>I believed that a teacher home visit would produce an improved relationship over the course of the school year.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q15</td>
<td>I believe that the teacher home visit produced an improved relationship over the course of the school year.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>q7</td>
<td>Other relationships (e.g. student/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit would improve as well.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q16</td>
<td>Other relationships (e.g. student/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit improved as well.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>q8</td>
<td>A teacher home visit should produce enough change in my relationship with my child’s teacher that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q17</td>
<td>A teacher home visit produced enough change in my relationship with my child’s teacher that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>q9</td>
<td>I believed that a strong relationship with my school/teacher was important for my child’s success.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q18</td>
<td>I believe that a strong relationship with my school/teacher is important for my child’s success.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To avoid providing specific responses of a single respondent, the difference between the pre- and post-answers are shown in the table. The parent had a generally favorable view even in the pre-answers. For there to be movement beyond the favorable start may speak to the positive effect of the home visit.

**Teacher Response**

To extract information from the teacher interviews, the interviews were transcribed verbatim and then coded using both a deductive and an inductive approach. Deductively, the research questions pointed the researcher to codes that provided indications of perceptual and relational changes between the stakeholders. Statements from the teachers like “they were thrilled to see us and excited that we cared about their child that much” or “she sees how I work with her son and communicate with her” were coded as parent perception.

Inductively, the researcher, in the iterative process of coding, produced additional codes. These codes were then reviewed and themes were produced. The themes generated the final narrative (see Table 4.2). Seventeen instances were coded for parent (or family) perceptions. Each of the teachers (N = 5) interviewed reported positive dispositional changes in the parents or family members. The teachers interpreted these changes as directly resulting from their visits.

The teachers generally related the initial trepidation shown by the parents as they arrived. As related by Tamra, “every parent is a little bug eyed when you first show up like what are you doing here.” Yet, they also related how that quickly changed, Tamra
continues, reporting that they “ended up warming right up to us.” Michael shared the following experience about:

how interested they were in the fact that I can came to their house….First of all they thought the world of me and then they thought that that was really neat that you know like that the school cared enough to like come visit them….and it was interesting cause…I just got the feeling that that meant more in a Latino culture than maybe it would have meant elsewhere. I don't know, maybe it's because they felt so marginalized because of the language difference and you know and of other things. But um, it made an incredible impact….I saw them a few other times and they were just like “Oh hi.” You know, “We love you.” You’re this wonderful teacher that we think is just amazing…they were so incredibly grateful.

The teachers reported that the parents recognized that the home visit was an indication of the teachers’ care for their child. Trenton described that “they were just thrilled to see us and were excited that we cared about their child that much.” Michael expressed the same thought, “they were I think really intrigued at the fact that the school was so interested in her son that they would have sent two people there.” As noted in Chapter I, students, and especially students at risk for school failure, need the benefit that accompanies relationships (Connell et al., 1994; McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015; Murray & Malmgren, 2005) and as these teachers discovered, their parents seemed to understand that as well.

The teachers also indicated that the visit opened lines of communication in positive ways. Debi recalled, “I think it both impacted…the parents’ perceptions and relationships with me in these, the communication since the home visits.” Michael added “Like mom is going to make sure that my homework maybe got done or that you weren't getting too far behind in math…cuz…she’d been to the house.” And Jared concluded with this, “the parents were really…supportive and excited.” The teachers reported that
the home visits improved the perception that these parents had about these teachers. They also indicated that change in perception changed parental behavior.

Research Question Three: How do Teachers’ Perceptions of and Relationships with At-risk Students and their Families Change for Teachers Who Engage in Home Visits with At-risk Students and their Families?

Teacher Response

Data to inform research question three, How do teachers’ perceptions of and relationships with at-risk students and their families change for teachers who engage in home visits with at-risk students and their families? were more robust and derived from both the pre-post teacher surveys (N = 11) and from the teacher interviews (N = 5). Table 4.4 shows the survey data from the 11 teacher respondents. Questions one through nine ask the respondents to recall their feelings prior to a teacher home visit. Questions 10 through 18 are similar to questions one through nine but ask about their feelings after a teacher home visit occurred. Questions 19 through 22 ask the respondents to report their feelings about the results of the home visits. Using a 6-point Likert Scale: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Slightly Disagree (3), Slightly Agree (4), Agree (5), and Strongly Agree (6); one can see a slight and general increase in agreeability between the first nine questions and the second nine questions. This is more clearly shown in the t-test. Significance is indicated in Table 4.7.

Tables 4.4 through 4.7 show the results of a paired t-test comparing the corresponding pre and post answers to determine if the difference is significant. As noted in Table 4.4, pair five consisting of questions four and thirteen, could not be computed, as the standard error of the difference is zero. Each of the other question pairs are very
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would have suggested participation in a teacher home visit to other teachers.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would suggest participation in a teacher home visit to other teachers.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have been willing to perform a teacher home visit.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to perform a teacher home visit.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher home visit seems consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher home visit is consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believed that a home visit from a teacher would demonstrate that the teacher has an interest in the child.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A home visit from a teacher demonstrates that the teacher has an interest in the student.</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believed the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit would be necessary for a good teacher home visit</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit are necessary for a good visit</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believed that a teacher home visit would produce an improved relationship over the course of the school year.</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the teacher home visit produced an improved relationship over the course of the school year.</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relationships (e.g. parent/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit would improve as well.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relationships (e.g. parent/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit improved as well.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher home visit should produce enough change in my relationship with the student that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher home visit produced enough change in my relationship with the student that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believed that a strong relationship with my student was important for my student’s success.</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that a strong relationship with my student is important for my student’s success.</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The correlation and t cannot be computed because the standard error of the difference is 0.
strongly and positively correlated (see Table 4.5). The mean of the paired differences showed that in nearly every case the respondents found the home visit more agreeable in the post response (see Table 4.6). Finally, four or one half of the survey item pairs that were viable for analysis were significant at the p < .05 level (see Table 4.7). This was pair 1 (q1 and q10), pair 2 (q2 and q11), pair 3 (q3 and q12), and pair 4 (q4 and q13). The implications of these findings will be discussed in Chapter V.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 q1 &amp; q10 I would have suggested participation in a teacher home visit to other teachers.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 q2 &amp; q11 I would have been willing to perform a teacher home visit.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 q3 &amp; q12 The teacher home visit seems consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 q4 &amp; q13 I believed that a home visit from a teacher would demonstrate that the teacher has an interest in the child.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5 q6 &amp; q15 I believed that a teacher home visit would produce an improved relationship over the course of the school year.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 q7 &amp; q16 Other relationships (e.g. parent/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit would improve as well.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 q8 &amp; q17 A teacher home visit should produce enough change in my relationship with the student that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 q9 &amp; q18 I believed that a strong relationship with my student was important for my student’s success.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 q1 - q10</td>
<td>-0.818</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 q2 - q11</td>
<td>-0.909</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 q3 - q12</td>
<td>-0.727</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 q4 - q13</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 q6 - q15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 q7 - q16</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 q8 - q17</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9 q9 - q18</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.7

*Test statistic and significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 q1 - q10 I would have suggested participation in a teacher home visit to other teachers.</td>
<td>-2.324</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 q2 - q11 I would have been willing to perform a teacher home visit.</td>
<td>-2.654</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 q3 - q12 The teacher home visit seems consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.</td>
<td>-3.068</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 q4 - q13 I believed that a home visit from a teacher would demonstrate that the teacher has an interest in the child.</td>
<td>-2.887</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 q6 - q15 I believed that a teacher home visit would produce an improved relationship over the course of the school year.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 q7 - q16 Other relationships (e.g. parent/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit would improve as well.</td>
<td>-0.803</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 q8 - q17 A teacher home visit should produce enough change in my relationship with the student that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.</td>
<td>-1.838</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9 q9 - q18 I believed that a strong relationship with my student was important for my student’s success.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Chapter III, of the 11 teachers who completed the survey, five were interviewed. These five teachers have an average of 11.4 years of teaching with a low of 7 years and a high of 20 years. Three of the interviewees were women and two were men. Their teaching disciplines included Science, English (2), Math, and Choir. All appeared to be Caucasian. Each interview took place using Google Meet, was recorded, and transcribed. All interviewees elected to leave their cameras on although they had the option of turning the camera off.
Ensuring both confirming and disconfirming views were represented, teachers were purposively selected for interviews primarily based on their survey responses. For instance, Trenton consistently provided high marks throughout the survey. Jared rated the corresponding questions (pre and post) nearly identically. Debi rated consistently low on the pre-questions and some post-questions were rated higher and some were rated lower. Michael rated the pre-questions lower but nearly all of his post-questions were rated much higher. Finally, Tamra rated the pre-questions in the mid-range and nearly each corresponding post-question one to two points higher. Selecting these teachers for interviews allowed the researcher to capture a significant variance in survey responses. Although there were divergences in the survey responses, the interview responses were so remarkably similar that additional interviews were deemed unnecessary.

As the first question during the semi-structured interview was “How did you learn about teacher home visits?”, the teachers provided insights into the beginnings of home visits at their school. Each of the teachers indicated that the principal was the driving force. A member of the school leadership team, Trenton remembers as the principal provided some rationale for trying teacher home visits. He said, “we could do home visits and maybe that would help with attendance, maybe that would help with connection.” Debi added to the narrative, “our principal, he was…very committed to it. He had heard something about it, got some information about it and just really wanted to do it. So he told us, this is what we are doing.”

As previously noted, the principal recognized that teachers would need compensation for the time they invested in home visits. Debi recalled
our principal … decided … instead of doing, I think it was two hours of our parent teacher conferences, he said I will let you count two home visits to make that up. So, he decided it would be more worthwhile than parent teacher conferences.”

Other teachers verified the principal’s plan to do home visits in lieu of part of parent/teacher conferences.

It was recognized that counselors and school administrators had done home visits but those visits served a different purpose. As noted by Debi, “I think most people have the impression that the teacher’s there cuz they want to help. And as unfortunate as it might be, principals are there because there is a problem, someone is in trouble.” Knowing their visit served a different purpose encouraged the teachers in the possibilities their visit could bring.

The principal’s plan also included the selection of students. Jared reported that the “counselors and admin got together and created a list of people that they felt really needed them and we all went through and picked two.” The students selected for home visits fit many at-risk categories:

- a student in foster care
- a student missing classes
- a couple of Spanish speaking families
- a girl had been absent for 38 days in a row
- a brand-new student
- a student with a passing grade but that hadn't really connected
- the students most at-risk had multiple F’s
The teachers also reported that other considerations were made in the selection of who to visit. While the principal did suggest some reasons to do a visit, the teachers also knew that they could see who they wanted. Tamra stated, “I can go see who I need to see and prioritize who really needs that support and why.” Trenton even “visited one girl in our class who was doing super well.” Although the principal’s stated purpose of reaching out to students with poor attendance and/or inadequate academic progress may not have been met with Trenton’s visit, it did conform to the tenet espoused by teacher home visit proponents: that these visits not be targeted to a specific population (Venkateswaran et al., 2018). The teachers did have the latitude to visit the students they felt needed a visit.

Teachers related that the home visits indeed changed their perceptions and relationships with both students and families. It was an experience that each teacher found valuable. “It was a good experience to get into the homes of the kids and get to know them on a little more personal level.” Jared went on to say, “it created a much better a relationship with the parents and partnership with the things that their students were doing.” Debi concurred, “it altered my perception of what my communication and my role with the parents is.” Michael spoke about how the visit affected the classroom relationship, “I really saw him in a different light. I don’t know what it was, but it was like everything that he said or did in class, I just noticed more.” Trenton also spoke of the classroom relationship, “they were positive before but then they just became more positive. Oh, I can see, I saw the inside of your house. I know where you are coming from. I just felt a deeper connection to them.” Tamra continues this theme, “those feelings of endearment probably just grew….I would say I definitely had a personal
feeling of warmth towards that student like hey I’m showing you I care because I really
do.” Each teacher expressed that their perceptions of the students they visited had
changed.

Other Considerations

As the teachers reflected on the power of the teacher home visit, they also
recognized some of the difficulties they had in deciding with which students to work.
Michael described some of the considerations this way, “do you intervene with the ones
that are like 0% in your class, who maybe will succeed, maybe won’t? Or do intervene
with the ones who are like 30%? You know, you could kinda pull up.” Trenton added, “I
think we should go visit the kids who struggle. The behavior problem kids. Imagine what
that would do for teachers and students.” Debi also noted that,

This takes some time where I can sit down and review what students are
being successful, what students aren’t being successful. It requires some
training on the, on the, the part of the administration, so they can help
teachers know: Don't just pick the kid that’s got the lowest grade in your
class. You’ve kinda got to figure out maybe there's a kid that's got a B in
your class, just needs this or you know. And the time to kind of like
observe and watch and decide which kid might need a visit like that.

The teachers were already evaluating the purpose, power, and practice of home visits.
They had recognized that this practice had an effect on their students and were now
working to decide how to make it efficacious for a broader group of students. This
reflection was another indication that the teachers’ perceptions had changed.

Summary

The school principal provided context for the study as well as his reasons to
attempt teacher home visits. He also elucidated the procedures for the implementation of
home visits at his school. Academic and attendance data, provided by the school, from before and after the visits occurred allowed the researcher important confirmation of effects. The researcher analyzed the data revealing that teacher home visits appeared to have a positive effect on the perceptions and relationships of each of the stakeholders. It is recognized that the reports of these effects came primarily from teacher perspectives.

Data to answer the research questions were compiled from the survey and from interviews. While the data generated from the survey and interviews were disappointing in both the representation of planned participants and the amount of data generated, it did yield information for each research question. Teacher data was the nearly exclusive repository of information for each research question.

Two processes of theme development occurred: deductive and inductive. Through the deductive coding process the following codes were generated from the research questions: student perceptions, parent perceptions, and teacher perceptions. These codes in both separate and combined instances yielded the themes: changes in perceptions and relationships and teacher confidence. Through the inductive coding process the following codes were generated: learned about home visits, in lieu of parent/teacher conferences, chosen students, increased communication, purpose of home visits, limitations to home visits, and perception of home. Through analysis of these codes the following themes became evident: principal influence and teacher confidence. These themes are explored in Chapter V. Additionally, social validity, introduced in Chapter II is examined.
Chapter V

Discussion and Implications

This dissertation began with a discussion of two key elements that independently promote student academic growth: positive student-teacher relationships and family engagement. This discussion included the important reminder that students at-risk of failing or dropping out of school respond to these elements. After a look at relevant research; the promising practice, teacher home visits, was proposed as a strategy that builds both positive student-teacher relationships and family engagement.

As noted previously, the teacher home visit does not ameliorate the underlying societal issues that exist in the lives of many of our students, factors that if left unaddressed leave students at-risk. What teacher home visits appear to do is provide a foundation of improved attendance, academics, and behavior upon which families, teachers, and the individual student can build. It enhances the protective factors of relationships and engagement (McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015).

Study Goals

The researcher began with a desire to fill a gap in the teacher home visit research.

As noted by McKie et al. (2021)

Little evidence exists on the effectiveness of these school policies and programs. Some research indicates that structured relationship-building teacher home visits show promise for improving parent engagement and student outcomes. But the evidence is sparse and rarely drawn from high-quality study designs. (p. 1)

There exists an important opportunity for additional research.

The home visit research has primarily been done among underserved
communities, at the elementary level, and from the perspective of adults. Positive student results of home visits include: improved academic performance, attendance and classroom behavior (Sheldon & Jung, 2018; Stetson et al., 2012; Venkateswaran et al., 2018). This research hoped to add to this burgeoning field by looking at teacher home visits from two new perspectives: the setting and the perspective. First, the setting was a suburban junior high and its community which differs from the more common urban elementary setting. If the researcher could demonstrate that home visits have a broader applicability and still demonstrate previously seen results, the teacher home visit research could be expanded. Second, the researcher chose to pursue the perspective of the student. Specifically, the researcher sought to understand:

1. How do students’ perceptions of and relationships with their respective teachers change for at-risk students who experience a home visit?
2. How do family’s perceptions of and relationships with the child’s school and teacher change for families of at-risk students who experience a home visit?
3. How do teachers’ perceptions of and relationships with at-risk students and their families change for teachers who engage in home visits with at-risk students and their families?

Very little of the extant research on home visits has attempted to understand student perspectives. The present research was also unable to provide any direct, additional insight. Answers to question one and question two are very limited and drawn primarily from teachers’ perspectives. There are other important insights both expected and unexpected that resulted from this research.
Salient Findings

As the data were evaluated from the school report and surveys and the interviews were coded and themed, findings from each of these sources provided insight into the research questions. These findings cut across each of the research questions and point to the efficaciousness of the teacher home visit.

Results Generalize

When researchers speak of being able to generalize findings or results, it is often in the context of the research being replicable. As noted previously, very little of the home visit research has been done at the secondary level (McKnight et al., 2017) and even less among secondary suburban communities. Although the present research was done at a suburban junior high, as shown in Chapter IV, student results appear consistent with other research on teacher home visits. Those students who were visited showed a general increase in academic performance and attendance as noted in Table 4.1. Teacher interviews indicate improvement in relationships with students. There were also indications that behavior improved. The current research provides confirmation of the previously done research and it provides indications that the results seen in previous studies continues to both a secondary setting and to a non-urban setting.

The Principal’s Influence

In their seminal work on school leadership, Leithwood et al. (2004) conclude that “leadership not only matters: it is second only to teaching among school-related factors in its impact on student learning” (p.3). This finding was confirmed by the recent review done by Grissom et al. (2021) in which they determine that “Effective principals are at
least as important for student achievement as previous reports have concluded—and in fact, their importance may not have been stated strongly enough” (p. xviii).

In the present case study, each interviewee indicated that the principal was the driver for teacher home visits. This contrasts with some previous models. Venkateswaran et al. (2018) indicated in their implementation study that the beginnings of their studied program began with a meeting of “a group of teachers and families in a low-income neighborhood in south Sacramento, California” (p. vii). While school visits could certainly be instigated by other stakeholders, the principal position provides a systematic and consistent approach to whole school programs. This was recognized by the Family Engagement Partnership (FEP). Sheldon and Jung (2015) note that the FEP, run primarily in the District of Columbia public schools, deliberately chose principals that “are deeply committed to family engagement and have the skills to manage a school-change initiative” (p. 8). The FEP was the driving force in home visit implementation and sought principals that agreed with their methods and ends. The principal is in a position to allocate the necessary resources, find time for trainings, and ensure compliance. The present case illustrated the importance of the principal in teacher home visit implementation yet diverged from previous literature (Sheldon & Jung, 2018; Stetson et al., 2012; Venkateswaran et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018) as the principal was the driver and decision maker in the implementation process.

**Teacher Confidence**

Although seen in research about teacher home visits (McKnight et al., 2017), it remains remarkable that a single visit can affect perceptions, relationships, and behaviors
(Ilhan et al., 2019; Sheldon & Jung, 2015; Stetson et al., 2012; Venkateswaran et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018). Perhaps some of those effects can be explained by the change that teachers experience as a result of their visits. Hattie, in his work on influences related to student achievement found that collective teacher efficacy had an effect size of 1.57 making it one of the most significant influences. Defining collective teacher efficacy as “the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students,” (Waack, 2021) this factor appeared in its embryonic state as teacher confidence in the present study during the teacher interviews. The survey also provided indications of teacher belief.

Tamra related the following when thinking about a teacher that made a difference for her sister, “I want to go make them feel special and let them show me their life.” Tamra knew the power of the visit and recognized that influence could be Tamra’s as well. Continuing, “I felt like I was really making an impact.” Debi reported,

the whole process of being able to be more strategic about what I need to connect with this kid or these parents has really um, changed the way that I do things in a lot of ways in my class…. I mean in just, in just that one 15 minute visit, this class period he got to work, he did what he was supposed to do…. the home visit and the phone calls did a reset for me on like the relationship I need to be developing with parents.

The teachers in each of their interviews attributed their actions or their visits to positive changes in student behaviors and to building positive relationships with students and their families. In short, they believed their actions had positive effects.

While not directly studied in this research, teacher confidence was a theme that appeared during the coding process. The teachers’ confidence or belief that they can positively affect students appeared in all sources of data. After a single visit to an
individual student, school data showed (see Table 4.1) that over half of the visited students improved their attendance. Nearly all of these same students showed improved academics as measured by their grades. The teacher survey showed that after the visit(s) the teachers were more willing to perform a visit, had a greater belief that the visit showed they cared about the student, and had a greater belief that the visit improved their relationship with their visited students (see Tables 4.4-4.7). The teachers during their interviews described cases where the visited students changed their in-class behavior. Given this evidence, the teachers had a sense that their actions had a positive effect on their students.

The teachers also believed that their efforts continued to have positive effects during the pandemic contrary to what the principal believed. The relationships established during their home visits enabled both the teachers and the families to reach out to ensure students continued to progress even during online schooling. In their recent article, Cunningham and Pfleging (2021) state,

The pandemic clearly influenced teachers' instructional practices, capacity to set goals, and stress levels, resulting in challenges both personally and professionally. This extended period of adversity required a particular type of self-efficacy—crisis efficacy—or the belief in one's ability to succeed, not just during everyday life but also during a crisis. (p.)

While this was a trying time for all involved, the teachers in this study seem to believe that their efforts mattered.
Teacher confidence may be the key that allows educators to ameliorate the negative effects of being at-risk. This research is a step in approaching the change in perceptions of teachers that effected their actions. They found their efforts to be efficacious and believed that students were better for it.

**Social Validity**

As noted in Chapter I, Wolf (1978) provided three areas in which social validity may be evaluated: the social significance, appropriateness, and importance of the goals, procedures, and effects respectively. Both the surveys and the interviews provide indications that in all three areas teacher home visits have social validity. The goals of these teacher home visits as stated by the principal were to increase student school attendance, stronger school/home connection, and that the visits would provide evidence that teachers cared about their students beyond their academic grades. Each of these goals are positive societal ends. As demonstrated in the survey and interviews, all participants that provided a report found the procedures acceptable and appropriate. Finally, the participants indicated that the effects of the teacher home visits were important and they were satisfied with the results. These findings confirm those found in extant research as described in Chapter II (Ilhan et al., 2019; Kronholz, 2016; Sheldon & Jung, 2015, 2018; Stetson et al., 2012; Venkateswaran et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018).

**Implications for Research**

As noted in the review of literature, it is important to collect data in which students describe their own perceptions of their experiences. The teacher home visit research has yet to address this fundamental component of the home visit. This current
research, although attempting to fill this gap in the research, did not contribute to this important piece. Again, as Zaslow and Takanishi (1993) report, “The failure to take such a step may lead to a flawed understanding of normal development; it may also limit the effectiveness of interventions” (p. 190).

Beyond the critical component of student perceptions, coming to a greater understanding of why a single visit from a teacher to a student’s home can be transformative remains beyond the scope of present research. Current research has described shifts in teacher’s mindsets (McKnight et al., 2017); has shown academic, attendance, and behavioral changes in students (Sheldon & Jung, 2018; Stetson et al., 2012); and has described increased avenues of communication between the home and the school (Kronholz, 2016; Lucas, 2017; Venkateswaran et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018) yet we remain uniformed of the fundamental change that has occurred in these stakeholders to arrive at these foundational changes. Perhaps this research begins to answer a portion of that question with the recognition of increased teacher confidence as a result of the home visit. This confidence may be an emergent form of self-efficacy. This question deserves and demands greater exploration.

**Implications for Practice**

As noted in Chapter I, proponents of the teacher home visit have generally subscribed to five practices which they have deemed nonnegotiable. These practices or components are that the home visit must be voluntary for educators and families and arranged in advance; be implemented by trained and compensated educators; have relationship-building as its focus; not be targeted to a specific population; and be done in
pairs of educators (Venkateswaran et al., 2018). While those five components may constitute best practice, the current research demonstrated that some success can be found without a strict adherence to those procedures. The teachers were trained and compensated for their time, they did focus on relationship-building, and they did go in pairs to the homes of their students. However, the visits were not arranged in advance and they did seek a specific population.

The teachers’ interviews indicated that they saw a prescheduled appointment as an opportunity for the family to deliberately avoid the meeting. Admittedly, the teachers do not have a point of comparison as all of their appointments were unscheduled. Several of the teachers also shared their disappointment in going to a home in which the family was not present.

The teachers did believe that a targeted visit was beneficial. They seemed to believe that having a specific student to visit, one chosen because of their attendance, academics, or behavior was a key reason to do the visit. They seemed less inclined to spend the time doing the visit without reaching a student (and the student’s family) who they might otherwise not see at an event like parent/teacher conferences.

The principal deliberately used time previously set aside for parent/teacher conferences to both compensate the teachers and to put that time to a different use. Each teacher expressed the sentiment that although they may see more students and families at a regular parent/teacher conference, the teacher home visit allowed them to see the students and families that don’t normally come. They furthered indicated that they these are the students and families that they “need to see.” They did understand that the
purpose of each type of visit, although similar, is different. Each teacher said they preferred the teacher home visit in lieu of the regular parent/teacher conference. Again, this may stem from the greater efficacy the teacher feels as the results of the home visit are more pronounced than the parent-teacher conference.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

This research has attempted to broaden the field by looking at a secondary school in a suburban setting. Specifically, this was a suburban, junior high school in a large school district in the Western United States. As previously noted (see Table 3.2) this school was predominately made up of Caucasian students. This differs from much of the home visit research which generally looks at urban settings at the elementary level (Sheldon & Jung, 2015, 2018; Stetson et al., 2012; Venkateswaran et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018).

While proponents of the teacher home visit profess to adhere to the five non-negotiables (the home visit must be voluntary for educators and families and arranged in advance; be implemented by trained and compensated educators; have relationship-building as its focus; not be targeted to a specific population; and be done in pairs of educators (Venkateswaran et al., 2018)), research on this topic remains focused on underserved, urban populations. While there is not a targeted population in the school, the schools in which the work is done are targeted, that is home visits in the research are typically done at the same types of schools. To understand how teacher home visits may truly work will require a continued look at the many populations our schools serve.
For instance, by broadening the scope of its use beyond populations which may be underserved, researchers would be able to determine if home visits can benefit all students, and if so, are the gains equal? In other words, if everything is fine between the home and the school and in the performance of the student does a teacher home visit make a difference? Can the teacher home visit be an accelerator of academic performance for those who are already performing well? McKnight et al. (2017), Venkateswaran et al. (2018), and Sheldon and Jung (2015) as part of the studies commissioned by the Parent/Teacher Home Visit Project did attempt to look at some different settings but did not disaggregate the data in a way that can meaningfully answer these questions as the purpose of their research was to validate and provide suggestions to the practice of home visits.

The present case illustrates the importance of the principal in teacher home visit implementation yet diverges from previous literature as the principal was the driver and decision maker in the implementation process. Future research might consider whether the principal, the district, or another entity provides a greater impetus to establishing teacher home visits in a school. Additionally, the role of the principal may be studied to determine what makes that role effective in the implementation of teacher home visits.

For this researcher, the greatest unanswered question remains: How do students’ perceptions of and relationships with their respective teachers change for at-risk students who experience a home visit? Research, including the present study, continues to provide and add insight into the perspectives of teachers and the perspectives of the family but the
student remains unaddressed. The researcher is particularly concerned about at-risk students yet this question can be rightly addressed to all students.

**Study Limitations**

Not since the Spanish flu of 1918 has there been a global disruption on the scale that we have seen with Covid-19. This pandemic has affected nearly every context of our lives from the social to the emotional, from the religious to the educational, and from the relational to the political. No news report happens without a mention of this plague and no life has been untouched. What is true in the world is true in research. From the biomedical (Omary et al., 2020) to the educational research field (Harris & Jones, 2020), the Covid-19 pandemic has changed how research is done. As this current research has been done in the midst of this pandemic, it has clearly been affected. The most notable effect has been on the participation rates of the intended participants. This effect has been exacerbated by the allowed procedures in doing this work. In particular, as the pandemic has raised the stress, anxiety, and depression levels of educators, families, and students; their ability and their willingness to engage in daily life has decreased (a simple Google Scholar search using the keywords “covid related stress depression among families and students” yielded thousands of studies across the world) and the researcher suspects that this has had a marked effect on their engagement with research studies. As the focus of this research was the teacher home visit to students at-risk of school failure, this research appears to have been affected disproportionally.

Therefore, caution should be used in seeking to generalize results from this study. While the school reported data, the survey results, and teacher interviews do indicate a
correspondence to previous teacher home visit studies, the response rates of the stakeholder groups cause concern. Also, with a focus on at-risk students, the researcher increased the scrutiny of the IRB and the stringent requirements for working with this important population. These requirements likely increased the probability of poor response rates and did result in the absence of responses. The results should not deter future research into these important questions.

**Low participation rates.**

The requirements of the IRB and Covid-19 protocols under which this research was done necessitated a digital approach to both participant recruitment and data gathering. Fan and Yan (2010) indicate that “it is estimated that the response rate in the web survey on average is approximately 11% lower than that of other survey modes” (p. 132). While not strictly a web survey, the response rates in the present research were clearly affected by the digital delivery format.

As Covid-19 appears to be creating lasting changes in society and therefore in research, it is recommended that consideration be given to the four phases of surveys to increase response rates and the quality of the responses. Fan and Yan (2010) provide suggestions for each phase. For survey development, they recommend attending to the format of the survey and performing pilots of the survey outside of the digital world. For survey delivery, they recommend a focus on improved contacts with prospective participants. It is not enough for the survey to reach the intended participant, they must want to open it. For the survey completion stage, a knowledge of human behavior and psychological propensities of the studied group can enhance the design and increase the
likelihood of completion. Finally, to enhance the survey return stage, it is important to consider how the data comes back, so that it is both usable and accessible to the researcher.

In any attempt to recreate this research or to reach student voices, the researcher recommends that this research not be done during a pandemic. Or, as Gutierrez et al. (2020) noted, “COVID-19 can be a catalyst for us to jettison old, school-centered ways of doing things that haven’t worked well” (p. 3). A more pertinent recommendation is to ensure that the researcher has planned to reach participants in ways that do not appear to use undue influence (i.e. using teachers to recruit students or families) and that do not require an upfront disclosure of at-risk status. While this can be difficult, the information gained is critical to further this work.

**Inclusion of at-risk populations**

Some of the very characteristics that cause a student to be categorized as at-risk also increase the difficulty in doing research with them or their situation. The requirements placed on the present research by the IRB and the Covid-19 protocols made mandatory the use of electronic means of communication. In their research on middle level students who are at-risk for dropping out, Hutchison and Henry (2010) found that both their access and their ability to use electronic means of communication fell below that of their non-at-risk peers. This limitation may have proved detrimental to the current study.

Beyond the communication issues, research reviews document the difficulty in recruitment and retention of at-risk or underserved populations. These issues arise in
medical, social sciences, or generally in research involving human subjects who are at-risk (Botchwey et al., 2020; Paskett et al., 2008; Roosa et al., 2008; Spears et al., 2011).

By not being represented in research, this difficulty presents two distinct issues: the result of the research is untenable as it is not encompassing and those most in need of the benefits of research live outside its selection process. Populations at-risk or underserved remain so.

Not only was the present research affected by difficulties in recruitment, the visits themselves suffered from issues related to at-risk populations. As noted in the research, at-risk populations demonstrate high levels of mobility (Rumberger, 2003), likewise several teachers who participated in this study reported that the addresses the families provided to the school were not correct. Some parents were not found at home as work hours were quite disparate. At one home the parents were absent as they cared for a disabled child. While these situations created difficulties for the visits, they did provide additional insight for the teachers into their students’ lives.

**Conclusion**

The teacher home visit has been used as a tool to create greater connection between the home and the school (Sheldon & Jung, 2015). Evidence from this research also confirms previous studies that indicate better student attendance, better student academic performance, and better student relationships (Ilhan et al., 2019; Sheldon & Jung, 2018; Stetson et al., 2012). This research has stretched the boundaries of the possible effective use of this strategy by specifically locating this study in a suburban, junior high among a predominately Caucasian population. This research also addresses
“the how” of teacher home visits by specifically looking at the change in perceptions of the critical stakeholders. Yet, the researcher still awaits additional research on student perspectives. The researcher finds confirmatory evidence, as viewed from the perspective of the responding teachers, that teacher home visits are a promising practice that can provide educational practitioners with the ability to simultaneously strengthen student-teacher relationships, increase attendance, improve academic performance and engage families.
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Appendix A

Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS)

Adapted for a student evaluation of a teacher home visit

In an effort to strengthen the home/school relationship, you experienced a teacher home visit. The visit conformed to five tenets: the home visit was voluntary for educators and families, and arranged in advance; was implemented by trained and compensated educators; had relationship-building as its focus; was not targeted to a specific population; and was done in pairs of educators. First, please circle to what extent you remember the home visit:

1- Not at all 2- Somewhat Well 3- Well 4- Extremely Well

Then, below evaluate the home visit you received by circling the number which best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Please attempt to answer each question.

For this first section, please think back to the time before receiving the teacher home visit and answer each question based on your thoughts and feelings prior to receiving the visit.

1. I would have suggested participation in a teacher home visit to other students.
2. I would have been willing to accept a teacher home visit in my home.
3. The teacher home visit seems consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.
4. I believed that a home visit from a teacher would demonstrate that the teacher has an interest in me.
5. I believed the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit would be necessary for a good teacher home visit (see the introductory paragraph to this survey).
6. I believed that a teacher home visit would produce an improved relationship over the course of the school year.
7. Other relationships (e.g. teacher/family or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit would improve as well.
8. A teacher home visit should produce enough change in my relationship with my teacher that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.
9. I believed that a strong relationship with my school/teacher was important for my success.

For this second section please think about your thoughts and feelings after receiving the visit and answer each question from that perspective.
1. I would suggest participation in a teacher home visit to other students.
2. I would be willing to accept a teacher home visit in my home.
3. The teacher home visit is consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.
4. A home visit from a teacher demonstrates that the teacher has an interest in me.
5. I believe the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit are necessary for a good visit (see the introductory paragraph to this survey).
6. I believe that the teacher home visit produced an improved relationship over the course of the school year.
7. Other relationships (e.g. teacher/family or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit improved as well.
8. A teacher home visit produced enough change in my relationship with my teacher that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.
9. I believe that a strong relationship with my school/teacher is important for my success.
10. The teacher home visit did NOT result in negative side-effects for me.
11. Overall, a teacher home visit was beneficial for me.
12. The teacher home visit improved my relationship with school personnel (i.e. administration, secretaries, aides, etc.) overall.
13. The visit from teachers strengthened my relationship with them beyond my relationship with teachers who did not visit my home.

(Used with a 6 point Likert Scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
Appendix B

Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS)
Adapted for a family (parent) evaluation of a teacher home visit

In an effort to strengthen the home/school relationship, you experienced a teacher home visit. The visit conformed to five tenets: the home visit was voluntary for educators and families, and arranged in advance; was implemented by trained and compensated educators; had relationship-building as its focus; was not targeted to a specific population; and was done in pairs of educators. First, please circle to what extent you remember the home visit:

1- 2- 3- 4-
Not at all Somewhat Well Well Extremely Well

Then, evaluate the home visit by circling the number which best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Please attempt to answer each question.

For this first section, please think back to the time before receiving the teacher home visit and answer each question based on your thoughts and feelings prior to receiving the visit.

1. I would have suggested participation in a teacher home visit to other parents.
2. I would have been willing to accept a teacher home visit in my home.
3. The teacher home visit seems consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.
4. I believed that a home visit from a teacher would demonstrate that the teacher has an interest in my child.
5. I believed the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit would be necessary for a good teacher home visit (see the introductory paragraph to this survey).
6. I believed that a teacher home visit would produce an improved relationship over the course of the school year.
7. Other relationships (e.g. student/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit would improve as well.
8. A teacher home visit should produce enough change in my relationship with my child’s teacher that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.
9. I believed that a strong relationship with my school/teacher was important for my child’s success.

For this second section please think about your thoughts and feelings after receiving the visit and answer each question from that perspective.

1. I would suggest participation in a teacher home visit to other parents.
2. I would be willing to accept a teacher home visit in my home.
3. The teacher home visit is consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.
4. A home visit from a teacher demonstrates that the teacher has an interest in my child.
5. I believe the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit are necessary for a good visit (see the introductory paragraph to this survey).
6. I believe that the teacher home visit produced an improved relationship over the course of the school year.
7. Other relationships (e.g. student/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit improved as well.
8. A teacher home visit produced enough change in my relationship with my child’s teacher that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.
9. I believe that a strong relationship with my school/teacher is important for my child’s success.
10. The teacher home visit did NOT result in negative side-effects for my student.
11. Overall, a teacher home visit was beneficial for my student.
12. The teacher home visit improved my relationship with school personnel overall.
13. The visit from teachers strengthened my relationship with them beyond my relationship with teachers who did not visit my home.

(Used with a 6 point Likert Scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
Appendix C

Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS)
Adapted for a teacher evaluation of a teacher home visit

In an effort to strengthen the home/school relationship, you conducted a teacher home visit. The visit conformed to five tenets: the home visit was voluntary for educators and families, and arranged in advance; was implemented by trained and compensated educators; had relationship-building as its focus; was not targeted to a specific population; and was done in pairs of educators. First, please circle to what extent you remember the home visits:

1- Not at all 2- Somewhat Well 3- Well 4- Extremely Well

Then, evaluate the practice of home visits by circling the number which best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Please attempt to answer each question.

For this first section, please think back to the time before conducting the teacher home visits and answer each question based on your thoughts and feelings prior to conducting visits.

1. I would have suggested participation in a teacher home visit to other teachers.
2. I would have been willing to perform a teacher home visit.
3. The teacher home visit seems consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.
4. I believed that a home visit from a teacher would demonstrate that the teacher has an interest in the child.
5. I believed the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit would be necessary for a good teacher home visit (see the introductory paragraph to this survey).
6. I believed that a teacher home visit would produce an improved relationship over the course of the school year.
7. Other relationships (e.g. parent/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit would improve as well.
8. A teacher home visit should produce enough change in my relationship with the student that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.
9. I believed that a strong relationship with my student was important for my student’s success.

For this second section please think about your thoughts and feelings after conducting home visits and answer each question from that perspective.

1. I would suggest participation in a teacher home visit to other teachers.
2. I would be willing to perform a teacher home visit.
3. The teacher home visit is consistent with other ways teachers seek to build relationships.
4. A home visit from a teacher demonstrates that the teacher has an interest in the student.
5. I believe the 5 tenets of the teacher home visit are necessary for a good visit (see the introductory paragraph to this survey).
6. I believe that the teacher home visit produced an improved relationship over the course of the school year.
7. Other relationships (e.g. parent/teacher or parent/child, etc.) related to the teacher home visit improved as well.
8. A teacher home visit produced enough change in my relationship with the student that I believe I have a good relationship with him/her.
9. I believe that a strong relationship with my student is important for my student’s success.
10. The teacher home visit did NOT result in negative side-effects for my student.
11. Overall, a teacher home visit was beneficial for my student.
12. The teacher home visit improved my relationship with other students and their families.
13. The home visit strengthened my relationship with my student beyond my relationship with students I did not visit.

(Used with a 6 point Likert Scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree)
Appendix D

Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS)

Original Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS)

You have just read about a child with a classroom problem and a description of an intervention for improving the problem. Please evaluate the intervention by circling the number which best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement. You must answer each question.

1. This would be an acceptable intervention for the child’s problem behavior. (acceptability)
2. Most teachers would find this intervention appropriate for behavior problems in addition to the one described. (acceptability)
3. The intervention should prove effective in changing the child’s problem behavior. (acceptability)
4. I would suggest the use of this intervention to other teachers. (acceptability)
5. The child’s behavior problem is severe enough to warrant use of this intervention. (acceptability)
6. Most teachers would find this intervention suitable for the behavior problem described. (acceptability)
7. I would be willing to use this in the classroom setting. (acceptability)
8. The intervention would not result in negative side-effects for the child. (acceptability)
9. The intervention would be appropriate intervention for a variety of children. (acceptability)
10. The intervention is consistent with those I have used in classroom settings. (acceptability)
11. The intervention was a fair way to handle the child’s problem behavior. (acceptability)
12. The intervention is reasonable for the behavior problem described. (acceptability)
13. I like the procedures used in the intervention. (acceptability)
14. This intervention was a good way to handle this child’s behavior problem. (acceptability)
15. Overall, the intervention would be beneficial for the child. (acceptability)
16. The intervention would quickly improve the child’s behavior. (time)
17. The intervention would produce a lasting improvement in the child’s behavior. (effectiveness)
18. The intervention would improve the child’s behavior to the point that it would not noticeably deviate from other classmates’ behavior. (effectiveness)
19. Soon after using the intervention, the teacher would notice a positive change in the problem behavior. (time)
20. The child’s behavior will remain at an improved level even after the intervention is discontinued. (effectiveness)
21. Using the intervention should not only improve the child’s behavior in the classroom, but also in other settings (e.g., other classrooms, home). (effectiveness)
22. When comparing this child with a well-behaved peer before and after use of the intervention, the child’s and the peer’s behavior would be more alike after using the intervention. (effectiveness)

23. **The intervention should produce enough improvement in the child’s behavior so the behavior no longer is a problem in the classroom.** (effectiveness)

24. Other behaviors related to the problem behavior also are likely to be improved by the intervention. (effectiveness)

**Bolded** questions are those with the greatest factor loadings and on which the researcher’s survey questions are based.

Appendix E

Semi-structured Interview Family
The following questions will be used with selected students, families, and teachers to provide additional understanding following the administration and evaluation of the survey. (Questions will be adjusted to apply to the participant. The following are directed to the family/parent.)

1. How did you learn about teacher home visits?
2. How were you approached to participate in the teacher home visit?
3. Please describe how the visit went.
4. Please describe how you felt about your child’s school/teacher prior to the teacher home visit.
5. Following the teacher home visit did you notice any changes in your feelings towards the school and/or the teacher? Please describe.
6. Do you believe that the teacher visit affected how you responded to teacher requests during the time your student was home as a result of the Covid epidemic? Why or why not?
7. Would you like to receive a teacher home visit in the future? Why or why not?

Semi-structured Interview Teacher
The following questions will be used with selected students, families, and teachers to provide additional understanding following the administration and evaluation of the survey. (Questions will be adjusted to apply to the participant. The following are directed to the teacher.)

1. How did you learn about teacher home visits?
2. How were you approached to participate in the teacher home visit?
3. Please describe how the visit went.
4. Please describe how you felt about your student prior to the teacher home visit.
5. Following the teacher home visit did you notice any changes in your feelings towards the student and/or the family? Please describe.
6. Do you believe that the teacher visit affected how you responded to the student and family during the time your students were home as a result of the Covid epidemic? Why or why not?

7. Would you like to do a teacher home visit in the future? Why or why not?

**Semi-structured Interview Student**

The following questions will be used with selected students, families, and teachers to provide additional understanding following the administration and evaluation of the survey. (Questions will be adjusted to apply to the participant. The following are directed to the student.)

1. How did you learn about teacher home visits?

2. How were you approached to participate in the teacher home visit? Did you participate in the visit?

3. Please describe how the visit went. (If the student participated.)

4. Please describe how you felt about your school/teacher prior to the teacher home visit.

5. Following the teacher home visit did you notice any changes in your feelings towards the school and/or the teacher? Please describe.

6. Do you believe that the teacher visit affected how you responded to teacher requests during the time you were home as a result of the Covid epidemic? Why or why not?

7. Would you like to have a teacher home visit in the future? Why or why not?

**Semi-structured Interview Principal**

The following questions will be used with the principal to provide the context for the implementation of the home visit, expected results, and purpose.

1. How did you learn about teacher home visits?

2. Why did you want to use the strategy of teacher home visits with your school and community?

3. What did you hope would be the results of this strategy?

4. What training was provided to teachers prior to the home visit?
5. Did you see changes in teachers, students, or families because of these visits? If so, what were those changes?

6. Do you believe that the teacher visit affected how you responded to the teachers, students and families during the time your students were home as a result of the Covid epidemic? Why or why not?

7. Would you like to do a teacher home visits in the future? Why or why not?
Appendix F

$t$ tests - Means: Difference between two dependent means (matched pairs)

**Analysis:** A priori: Compute required sample size

**Input:**
- Tail(s) = Two
- Effect size dz = 0.5000000
- $\alpha$ err prob = 0.05
- Power (1-$\beta$ err prob) = .8

**Output:**
- Noncentrality parameter $\delta$ = 2.9154759
- Critical t = 2.0345153
- Df = 33
- Total sample size = 34
- Actual power = 0.8077775

$t$ tests - Means: Difference between two dependent means (matched pairs)

**Analysis:** A priori: Compute required sample size

**Input:**
- Tail(s) = Two
- Effect size dz = .29
- $\alpha$ err prob = 0.05
- Power (1-$\beta$ err prob) = .8

**Output:**
- Noncentrality parameter $\delta$ = 2.8414081
- Critical t = 1.9852510
- Df = 95
- Total sample size = 96
- Actual power = 0.8030630
Appendix G

Document prepared for teachers to assist them in their home visit.

Home Visit Helps & Tips

Reminder Checklist

- Buddy System
- Backpack for student
- Memorized Parents/Guardians Names
- Listen Actively & Attentively -- don't keep notes during the visit. Record impressions as soon as you're done with the visit

Introductions:
Hello, I'm _________________________ and this is _____________________________ . We’re from your child's Middle School. I teach your child’s ____________________ class. We stopped by today because we are concerned and care about _______________________. Recently, we’ve noticed that they’ve been missing school a lot, and it is affecting his/her learning and ability to succeed in my class. Do you have a few minutes to chat with us about how we can help _______________?

Possible Open Ended Questions to Ask:

➢ Tell me about ________?
  ○ What do they like to do?
  ○ When they’re not at school, what do they enjoy doing?
➢ Are they involved in any activities or sports outside of school?
➢ Who are some of ________’s friends?
➢ What’s the hardest thing about school for ________?
➢ How can we help ______________ do better in school?
➢ Where does your child usually do their homework?
➢ What are some of the things your child struggles with at school?

Supporting and Recognizing Strengths:

➢ We’ve noticed that your child is very good at _____________________________
➢ I’ve seen how your child excels in _____________________________. Where did they learn this?
➢ I am amazed at how your child can _____________________. It’s clear that they work very hard and have put in a lot of time learning this. Did he/she learn this from you?

Setting a goal:
This can be an easy goal, the important part is that it will set them on a course so they’ll be able to succeed
➢ Would it be okay if we set a goal with you and your child to help them with ______________?

➢ What is an attainable goal that we can set with you and your child to help them with ______?

➢ What is something that you would like to see your child accomplish? How can we help achieve that goal?
Appendix H
Recruitment Emails

Student Recruitment Script
My name is Kevin Thomas and I am a doctoral student from the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University. I'm emailing you about participating in my research study about teacher home visits. (I have already spoken to a member of your family about this.) I want to understand if you think that things changed at school and with your teacher after a home visit. Whether you think anything changed or not, your insight is important to this research. What you share can help make home visits better or help decide if they are worth doing. Please consider participating.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a survey and may be asked to engage in a follow-up interview. The survey would be online and would take about 10-15 minutes. If you are selected to do a follow-up interview, that would take about half an hour and would be recorded. (The interview would be done using Google Meet). You can choose to do the survey and decline to do the interview. You will receive a $5.00 Amazon gift card for completing the survey and another $5.00 Amazon gift card if you are selected to do an interview.

This is completely voluntary. You can choose to be in the study or not. No one at the school will know if you participate or not and they will not know your individual answers. If you'd like to participate, please follow the link below to the form that indicates you are willing to do this. If you are not interested in participating please let me know so that I make no more attempts to contact you.

If you need more time to decide if you would like to participate or if you have any questions about the study, you may also call or email me: kevinthomas@aggiemail.usu.edu or (801) 360-7630. Please reference IRB Protocol #11860.

The form is also attached to look over if you would like to know details about this research study. The consent form is a document that tells you what your rights are as a participant, what the study is about, and the risks and benefits of participating.

Thank you so much.

Kevin Thomas

{LINK to Consent forms and Survey}
Family Representative Email Recruitment Script

My name is Kevin Thomas and I am a doctoral student from the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University. I am looking for families that received a teacher home visit from their student’s junior high teacher to participate in a research study. The purpose of the study is to understand better how the participants’ (teacher, student, and family representative) perceptions and relationships change as the result of teacher home visits.

If you did NOT receive a teacher home visit since your student has been in junior high, please disregard and delete this email.

If you did receive a teacher home visit please consider participating in my research study about teacher home visits. You and your child are eligible to participate in this research study if you received a teacher home visit from your student’s junior high teacher AND at least one of the following is true:

- Your child attends school less than 85% of the time
- Your child has failed one or more core classes
- Your child qualifies for free or reduced lunch
- Your child is in special education.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a survey and may be asked to engage in a follow-up interview. The survey would be online and would take about 10-15 minutes. If you are selected to do a follow-up interview, that would take about half an hour and would be recorded. (The interview would be done using Google Meet). You can choose to do the survey and decline to do the interview. You will receive a $5.00 Amazon gift card for completing the survey and another $5.00 Amazon gift card if you are selected to do an interview.

I am also asking for permission to contact your student. As I am looking for perceptions from all involved in the home visit, I would like to have your student complete a survey and possibly be interviewed as well. Your student would also be eligible for the Amazon gift cards. It is possible to participate and not have your student involved although the research is greatly helped by views from all stakeholders.

This is completely voluntary. You can choose to be in the study or not. The decision to participate in the study will have no effect on your student’s treatment at school (teachers won’t know who decides to participate). If you’d like to participate, please follow the link below to the consent forms. The consent form is a document that tells you what your rights are as a participant, what the study is about, and the risks and benefits of participating. (The consent form is also attached so that you can review it.) If you are not interested in participating, please let me know so that I make no more attempts to contact you.
If you need more time to decide if you would like to participate or if you have any questions about the study, you may also call or email me: kevinthomas@aggiemail.usu.edu or (801) 360-7630. While I will be your primary contact you can also reach out to the principal investigator, Dr. Lavigne at alyson.lavigne@usu.edu. Please reference IRB protocol #11860.

Thank you so much.

Kevin Thomas

{LINK to Consent forms and Survey}
Teacher Email Recruitment Script

My name is Kevin Thomas and I am a doctoral student from the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University. I understand that teachers at Willowcreek Middle School participated in teacher home visits. I am emailing you about participating in my research study about teacher home visits. The purpose of the study is to understand better how the participants’ (teacher, student, and family representative) perceptions and relationships change as the result of teacher home visits.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a survey and may be asked to engage in a follow-up interview. The survey would be online and would take about 10-15 minutes. If you are selected to do a follow-up interview, that would take about half an hour and would be recorded. (The interview would be done using Google Meet). You can choose to do the survey and decline to do the interview. You will receive a $5.00 Amazon gift card for completing the survey and another $5.00 Amazon gift card if you are selected to do an interview.

This is completely voluntary. You can choose to be in the study or not. If you’d like to participate please follow the link below to the consent forms. The consent form is a document that tells you what your rights are as a participant, what the study is about, and the risks and benefits of participating. (The consent form is attached so that you can review it.) If you are not interested in participating please let me know so that I make no more attempts to contact you.

If you need more time to decide if you would like to participate or if you have any questions about the study, you may also call or email me: kevinthomas@aggiemail.usu.edu or (801) 360-7630. While I will be your primary contact you can also reach out to the principal investigator, Dr. Lavigne at alyson.lavigne@usu.edu. Please reference IRB protocol #11860.

Thank you so much.

Kevin Thomas

{LINK to Consent forms and Survey}
Appendix I
Consent Documents

Introduction
You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kevin Thomas, a doctoral candidate in the Teacher Education and Leadership Department at Utah State University. The purpose of this research is to investigate teacher home visits. These visits provide evidence of important student outcomes including improved attendance, improved academic growth and reduced behavior issues. Investigating how the home visit changes the perceptions and relationships of these stakeholders is the focus of this research. Your participation is entirely voluntary.

This form includes detailed information on the research to help you decide whether to participate. Please read it carefully and ask any questions you have before you agree to participate.

Procedures
You have identified yourself to the researcher as an eligible participant because you engaged in a home visit with your student’s junior high teacher. You have also identified your child as meeting one of the following conditions: attends school less than 85% of the time, has failed one or more core classes, qualifies for free or reduced lunch, or is in special education. If you choose to participate in the study, participation will involve taking a survey regarding your feelings about the teacher home visit. The survey will only be given once but will ask you to recall your feelings from before and after the visit. The survey should take 10 minutes. Some participants will be asked to participate in a follow up interview. The interview will require about 30 minutes. Both the survey and the interview (using Google Meet or the phone if you are unable to access Google Meet) will take place virtually.

We would also like to have your student to participate in this research study. Participation would include completing a 10-minute survey and possibly being asked to complete a 30-minute interview (you could attend/monitor the interview). Your signature below (with the box marked) also indicates that we have your permission to contact your student about participating.

If you agree to have your student participate, the researchers will also collect your child’s attendance and academic records from both before and after the home visit (the school year prior to the visit and the rest of the school year after the visit). These records will only be accessed by the researcher and will be used to determine that your child is eligible for participation in the study and to see if your child experienced the positive benefits (like better attendance or increased academic performance) as a result of the teacher home visit.

We anticipate that 20 students, 20 teachers, and 20 family representatives will participate in this research study.

Student School Records
The specific education records that the research team will request are:
- School Attendance Records
- Grades for core classes (math, science, English, social studies)
- Special Education designation
- Free and reduced lunch status

Storage & Disposition
The research team will receive your child’s school records via a secure file transfer, and they will be stored in a secure file on Box.com, an encrypted, cloud-based storage system. Next, your child’s name will be replaced with a pseudonym to de-identify the data. A coded identification key will be kept in a secure file on Box.com. Once the research is complete, the research team will destroy the identification key.
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Risks
This is a minimal risk research study. That means that the risks of participating are no more likely or serious than those you or your child would encounter in everyday activities. Thus, possible foreseeable risks or discomforts include the loss of confidentiality. To minimize risks and discomforts, the researcher will follow strict protocols to ensure the safety and privacy of your and your student’s information. If you or your student have a bad research-related experience, please contact Alyson Lavigne at 435-797-4144 or alyson.lavigne@usu.edu.

Benefits
Although you or your student will not directly benefit from this study, it has been designed to learn more about teacher home visits and how stakeholders (students, parents, and teachers) may change their perceptions from the experience.

Confidentiality
The researcher will make every effort to ensure that the information provided as part of this study remains confidential. Your identity and your student’s identity will not be revealed in any publications, presentations, or reports resulting from this research study. However, it may be possible for someone to recognize a particular situation/response.

We will collect information through a REDCap survey and possibly an interview using Google Meet or a recorded phone call. This information will be transferred to and securely stored in a file on Box.com, an encrypted, cloud-based storage system. Your name or your student’s name on the survey, any recorded video and/or audio collected from the interviews, as well as your student’s school records will all be destroyed 6 months from collection. This form will be kept for three years after the study is complete, and then it will be destroyed.

It is unlikely, but possible, that others (Utah State University or state or federal officials) may require us to share the information given to us from the study to ensure that the research was conducted safely and appropriately. We will only share information if law or policy requires us to do so. If the researcher learns that you are abusing/neglecting-going to engage in self harm/intend to harm another, state law requires that the researcher report this behavior/intention to the authorities.

Voluntary Participation & Withdrawal
Your participation and your student’s participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate now and/or allow your student to participate and either of you change your mind later, you may withdraw at any time by contacting the researcher, Kevin Thomas, at kevintomas@aggiemail.edu.usu. If you choose to withdraw after we have already collected information about you, we will remove your information from the study and will not contact you for a follow-up interview. With a completed survey you would be eligible for compensation. The researchers may choose to terminate your participation in this research study if it is determined that you did not actually participate in a teacher home visit. Terminated participants will not be eligible for compensation and will be notified by email or phone.

Compensation
For your participation in this research study, you will receive a $5.00 Amazon gift card. This will only be provided to those who complete the survey. An additional $5.00 Amazon gift card will be available to those who are selected and complete a follow up interview.

Findings
Your information and your student’s information identified or de-identified, will not be used or distributed for future research studies, even if all of the identifying information has been removed.
Once the research study is complete, the researcher will email or call you to determine if you would like to see the findings of the study, including aggregate results relating to your participation.

**IRB Review**

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human research participants at Utah State University has reviewed and approved this study (#11860). If you have questions about the research study itself, please contact the researcher at 801-360-7630 or kevinthomas@aggiemail.usu.edu. If you have questions about your rights or would simply like to speak with someone other than the research team about questions or concerns, please contact the IRB Director at (435) 797-0567 or irb@usu.edu.

Kevin R. Thomas  
Student Researcher  
(801) 360-7630; kevinthomas@aggiemail.usu.edu

**Informed Consent**

By signing below, you agree to participate in this study and that your student may also participate. You indicate that you understand the risks and benefits of participation, and that you know what you will be asked to do. You also agree that you have asked any questions you might have, and are clear on how to stop your participation in the study if you choose to do so. By signing below, you also agree that you understand which education information may be released to the research team. You may revoke this Consent upon providing written notice to Kevin Thomas any time before the records have been destroyed. You understand that until this revocation is made, this consent shall remain in effect and your child’s educational records will continue to be provided to the researcher for the specific purpose described above. Please be sure to retain a copy of this form for your records.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Signature</th>
<th>Participant’s Name, Printed</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Email*</th>
<th>Participant’s Phone Number*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Child’s Name</th>
<th>Your Child’s Email**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ ] Check here if you consent to have your child participate.

[ ] Check here if you do NOT want to be interviewed.

*Please provide either your email or phone number as some participants will be asked for a follow up interview. This will also enable the researcher to contact you with study findings.

**Emails sent to your student will only be for the purposes of this research and you will always be copied on those emails.
Introduction
You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kevin Thomas, a doctoral candidate in the Teacher Education and Leadership Department at Utah State University. The purpose of this research is to investigate teacher home visits. These visits provide evidence of important student outcomes including improved attendance, improved academic growth and reduced behavior issues. Investigating how the home visit changes the perceptions and relationships of these stakeholders is the focus of this research. Your participation is entirely voluntary.

This form includes detailed information on the research to help you decide whether to participate. Please read it carefully and ask any questions you have before you agree to participate.

Procedures
You have been identified by the researcher as an eligible participant because you led the process of implementing home visits at your school. If you choose to participate in the study, you will be asked to be interviewed. The interview will require about 30 minutes (using Google Meet or the phone if you are unable to access Google Meet) and will take place virtually. In addition to you, we anticipate that 20 students, 20 teachers, and 20 family representatives will participate in this research study.

Risks
This is a minimal risk research study. That means that the risks of participating are no more likely or serious than those you encounter in everyday activities. Thus, possible foreseeable risks or discomforts include the loss of confidentiality. In order to minimize risks and discomforts, the researcher will follow strict protocols to ensure the safety and privacy of your information. If you have a bad research-related experience, please contact Alyson Lavigne at 435-797-4144 or alyson.lavigne@usu.edu.

Benefits
Although you will not directly benefit from this study, it has been designed to learn more about teacher home visits and if and how the perceptions of students, parents, and teachers may change in relationship to home visits.

Confidentiality
The researcher will make every effort to ensure that the information you provide as part of this study remains confidential. Your identity will not be revealed in any publications, presentations, or reports resulting from this research study. However, it may be possible for someone to recognize your particular situation/response.

We will collect your information through a recorded interview. This information will be saved and then transferred to and securely stored in a file on Box.com, an encrypted, cloud-based storage system. This recording will be transcribed, and your name will be replaced with a pseudonym. This name key, your email address, and the video recording of the interview will be destroyed 6 months from collection. This form will be kept for three years after the study is complete, and then it will be destroyed.

It is unlikely, but possible, that others (Utah State University or state or federal officials) may require us to share the information you give us from the study to ensure that the research was conducted safely and appropriately. We will only share your information if law or policy requires us to do so. If the researcher learns that you are abusing/neglecting going to engage in self harm/intend to harm another, state law requires that the researcher report this behavior/intention to the authorities.
Voluntary Participation & Withdrawal
Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate now and change your mind later, you may withdraw at any time by contacting the researcher, Kevin Thomas, at kevinthomas@aggiemail.edu.usu. If you choose to withdraw after we have already collected information about you, we will remove your information from the study. With a completed interview you would be eligible for compensation. The researchers may choose to terminate your participation in this research study if it is determined that you did not actually implement teacher home visits at your school. Terminated participants will not be eligible for compensation and will be notified by email or phone.

Compensation
For your participation in this research study, you will receive a $5.00 Amazon gift card.

Findings
Your information identified or de-identified, will not be used or distributed for future research studies, even if all of the identifying information has been removed.

Once the research study is complete, the researcher will email or call you to determine if you would like to see the findings of the study, including aggregate results relating to your participation.

IRB Review
The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human research participants at Utah State University has reviewed and approved this study (#11860). If you have questions about the research study itself, please contact the researcher at 801-360-7630 or kevinthomas@aggiemail.edu.usu. If you have questions about your rights or would simply like to speak with someone other than the research team about questions or concerns, please contact the IRB Director at (435) 797-0567 or irb@usu.edu.

Kevin R. Thomas
Student Researcher
(801) 360-7630; kevinthomas@aggiemail.edu.usu

Informed Consent
By signing below, you agree to participate in this study. You indicate that you understand the risks and benefits of participation, and that you know what you will be asked to do. You also agree that you have asked any questions you might have, and are clear on how to stop your participation in the study if you choose to do so. Please be sure to retain a copy of this form for your records.

______________________________  ________________________________  ________________
Participant’s Signature  Participant’s Name, Printed  Date

______________________________  ________________________________
Participant’s Email*  Participant’s Phone Number*

*Please provide either your email or phone number as some participants will be asked for a follow up interview. This will also enable the researcher to contact you with study findings.
Home Visit Study

Introduction
You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kevin Thomas, a doctoral candidate in the Teacher Education and Leadership Department at Utah State University. The purpose of this research is to investigate teacher home visits. These visits provide evidence of important student outcomes including improved attendance, improved academic growth and reduced behavior issues. Investigating how the home visit changes the perceptions and relationships of these stakeholders is the focus of this research. Your participation is entirely voluntary.

This form includes detailed information on the research to help you decide whether to participate. Please read it carefully and ask any questions you have before you agree to participate.

Procedures
You have been identified by the researcher as an eligible participant because you engaged in a home visit. If you choose to participate in the study, participation will involve taking a survey regarding your feelings about the teacher home visit. The survey will only be given once but will ask you to recall your feelings from before and after the visit. The survey should take 10 minutes. Some participants will be asked to participate in a follow up interview. The interview will require about 30 minutes. Both the survey (using REDCap) and the interview (using Google Meet or the phone if you are unable to access Google Meet) will take place virtually. We anticipate that 20 students, 20 teachers, and 20 family representatives will participate in this research study.

Risks
This is a minimal risk research study. That means that the risks of participating are no more likely or serious than those you encounter in everyday activities. Thus, possible foreseeable risks or discomforts include the loss of confidentiality. In order to minimize risks and discomforts, the researcher will follow strict protocols to ensure the safety and privacy of your information. If you have a bad research-related experience, please contact Alyson Lavigne at 435-797-4144 or alyson.lavigne@usu.edu.

Benefits
Although you will not directly benefit from this study, it has been designed to learn more about teacher home visits and if and how stakeholder’s (e.g., students, parents, and teachers) perceptions may change in relationship to home visits.

Confidentiality
The researcher will make every effort to ensure that the information you provide as part of this study remains confidential. Your identity will not be revealed in any publications, presentations, or reports resulting from this research study. However, it may be possible for someone to recognize your particular situation/response.

We will collect your information through a survey, and possibly an interview. This information will be transferred to and securely stored in a file on Box.com, an encrypted, cloud-based storage system. Your name on the survey and the recorded video from the interviews will be destroyed 6 months from collection. This form will be kept for three years after the study is complete, and then it will be destroyed.

It is unlikely, but possible, that others (Utah State University or state or federal officials) may require us to share the information you give us from the study to ensure that the research was conducted safely and appropriately. We will only share your information if law or policy requires us to do so. If the researcher learns that you are abusing/neglecting/going to engage in self harm/intend to harm another, state law requires that the researcher report this behavior/intention to the authorities.

School of Teacher Education and Leadership  |  (435) 797-1473  |  2805 Old Main Hill  |  Logan, UT 84322
Voluntary Participation & Withdrawal
Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate now and change your mind later, you may withdraw at any time by contacting the researcher, Kevin Thomas, at kevinthomas@aggiemail.edu. If you choose to withdraw after we have already collected information about you, we will remove your information from the study and will not contact you for a follow up interview. With a completed survey you would be eligible for compensation. The researchers may choose to terminate your participation in this research study if it is determined that you did not actually participate in a teacher home visit. Terminated participants will not be eligible for compensation and will be notified by email or phone.

Compensation
For your participation in this research study, you will receive a $5.00 Amazon gift card. This will only be provided to those who complete the survey. An additional $5.00 Amazon gift card will be available to those who are selected and complete a follow up interview.

Findings
Your information identified or de-identified, will not be used or distributed for future research studies, even if all the identifying information has been removed. Once the research study is complete, the researcher will email or call you to determine if you would like to see the findings of the study, including aggregate results relating to your participation.

IRB Review
The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human research participants at Utah State University has reviewed and approved this study (#11860). If you have questions about the research study itself, please contact the researcher at 801-360-7630 or kevinthomas@aggiemail.edu. If you have questions about your rights or would simply like to speak with someone other than the research team about questions or concerns, please contact the IRB Director at (435) 797-0567 or irb@usu.edu.

Kevin R. Thomas
Student Researcher
(801) 360-7630; kevinthomas@aggiemail.edu

Informed Consent
By signing below, you agree to participate in this study. You indicate that you understand the risks and benefits of participation, and that you know what you will be asked to do. You also agree that you have asked any questions you might have, and are clear on how to stop your participation in the study if you choose to do so. Please be sure to retain a copy of this form for your records.

________________________________________  ______________________________________  ___________
Participant’s Signature                       Participant’s Name, Printed                 Date

________________________________________  ______________________________________
Participant’s Email*                          Participant’s Phone Number*

☐ Check here if you do NOT want to be interviewed.

*Please provide either your email or phone number as some participants will be asked for a follow up interview. This will also enable the researcher to contact you with study findings.
Youth Assent

My name is Kevin Thomas and I am a doctoral student at Utah State University. I am doing a research study about teacher home visits and how students, teachers, and parents may change because of the visit. Research studies help us learn more about people. If you would like to be a part of this research study, you will be asked to complete an online survey that will take about 10 minutes. We will also need to access your student records from before and after the teacher home visit to see if the visit helped improve your grades or attendance in school. You may also be asked to do a virtual interview that would take about half an hour.

When the researchers do thing like have participants complete a survey, do an interview, or look at your school records, some other things could happen. For example, it is possible that someone will recognize your response in an interview. We will do everything we can to prevent those things from happening and maintain your privacy, but there is still a chance, so we want you to know that first.

Not everyone who is a part of research studies receives a something good from it. In this study, nothing directly good will happen to you, but you will help us learn more about people like you. Also, we will tell other people about what we learned from doing this study with you and the 60 other people who are in the study, but we won't tell anyone your name or that you were in the study. For your efforts in our study, we will give you a $5.00 Amazon gift card for completing the survey. If you are asked to also do an interview and complete that interview you will receive another $5.00 Amazon gift card.

If this sounds like something you would like to do, we will ask you to indicate that you understand what we talked about, and that you do want to participate. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you decide to stop after we begin, we will allow you to stop participating and we will not contact you for a follow up interview and that’s okay, too. No one will be upset if you don’t want to do this or change your mind later.

You can ask any questions you have, now or later. Your parents know about this research study, and they have said you can participate, if you want.

If you would like to be in this study, please sign your name and write the date.

Name ___________________________  Date ___________________________
Appendix J
Institutional Review Board Approval

Institutional Review Board
Expedite #7
Letter of Approval

From: Melanie Domenech Rodriguez, IRB Chair
Nicole Vouvalis, IRB Director
To: Alyson Lavigne
Date: May 24, 2021
Protocol #: 11860
Title: Teacher Home Visits: Changes in Perceptions

Your proposal has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board and is approved under expedite procedure #7 (based on the Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS] regulations for the protection of human research subjects, 45 CFR Part 46, as amended to include provisions of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, January 21, 2019):

Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

This study is subject to ongoing COVID-19 related restrictions. As of March 15, 2020, the IRB has temporarily paused all in person research activities, including but not limited to recruitment, informed consent, data collection and data analysis that involves personal interaction (such as member checking and meaning-making). If research cannot be paused, please file an amendment to your protocol modifying procedures that are conducted in person. The IRB will notify you when in person research activities are once again permitted.

This approval applies only to the proposal currently on file for the period of approval specified in the protocol. You will be asked to submit an annual check in around the anniversary of the date of original approval. As part of the IRB’s quality assurance procedures, this research may also be randomly selected for audit. If so, you will receive a request for completion of an Audit Report form during the month of the anniversary date of original approval. If the proposal will be active for more than five years, it will undergo a full continuation review every fifth year.

Any change affecting human subjects, including extension of the expiration date, must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation by submitting an Amendment request. Injuries or any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or to others must be reported immediately to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board. If Non-USU Personnel will complete work on this project, they may not begin until an External Researcher Agreement or Reliance Agreement has been fully executed by USU and the appropriate Non-USU entity, regardless of the protocol approval status here at USU.

Prior to involving human subjects, properly executed informed consent must be obtained from each subject or from an authorized representative, and documentation of informed consent must be kept on file for at least three years after the project ends. Each subject must be furnished with a copy of the informed consent document for their personal records.

Upon receipt of this memo, you may begin your research. If you have questions, please call the IRB office at (435) 797-1821 or email to irb@usu.edu.

The IRB wishes you success with your research.

435.797.1821 | 1450 Old Main Hill | Logan, UT 84322 | MAIN 155 | irb@usu.edu | FWA#00003308
Kevin Richard Thomas  
4518 W. Downing Drive  
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