ARTICLES

Observations of a Working Class Family: Implications for Self-Regulated Learning Development

Stephen Vassallo

American University

Guardians have been implicated in the development of children's academic self-regulation. In this case study, which involved naturalistic observations and interviews, the everyday practices of a working class family were considered in the context of self-regulated learning development. The family's practices, beliefs, dispositions and home structures were not aligned with conditions recognized as supporting self-regulated learning development. It is suggested that for the family to adapt or adjust home practices in a way that supports their children's self-regulation means adopting a different logic of parenting, valuing and promoting certain kinds of self-knowledge, forming different kinds of social networks, and mediating and controlling affects of occupational conditions. It is suggested that shifting home practices to teach academic self-regulation in the family's home is value-laden and reflects class-based narrowness.

Researchers link the quality and quantity of guardian involvement with differential effects on children's schooling (Epstein 2001, 2005, Epstein and Sheldon 2006; Fan and Chen 2001; Hill and Taylor 2004; Lareau 2003; Schaub 2010). Among the many ways guardians influence children, researchers suggest that guardians play a key role in the development of self-regulated learning (SRL) (Corno and Xu 2004; Evans and Rosenbaum 2008; Huang and Prochner 2004; Martinez-Pons

Correspondence should be addressed to Stephen Vassallo, American University, Teaching and Health, 119 Gray Hall, Washington 20016. E-mail: vassallo@american.edu

2002; Neitzel and Dopkins 2003; Perry, Nordby, and VandeKamp 2003; Pino-Pasternak, Whitebread, and Tolmie 2010; Strage 1998; Swalander and Karin 2007; Zimmerman 1998). This aspect of guardian involvement is significant in that SRL is identified as an important variable in academic success. Although researchers correlate specific kinds of guardian involvement with SRL development, there is little attention to the class-based values embedded in such involvement.

This research study aims to begin filling a gap in the SRL literature by examining the class-based values embedded in those home conditions that have been identified for SRL development. To explore this possibility, a combination of naturalistic observations and interviews were conducted for four months in the home of a working-class family. Their everyday practices, experiences, and interactions were considered in terms of their mis/alignment with the literature on SRL development. Analysis revealed that the home structures and practices found in the home of this family were incongruent with the conditions and practices identified as supporting SRL. For this family to adopt home practices that were aligned with the literature would have meant confronting and altering class-based practices and characteristics. Linking socioeconomic class, home practices, and SRL development encourages multiple points of reevaluation of the ethics and practices of valuing and developing certain kinds of SRL. In addition, this research study works to denaturalize certain conceptions of SRL, and begins conversations on ways that SRL can be implicated in class-based discrimination.

Self-Regulated Learning

In current definitions and conceptualizations of SRL, researchers often include situative and cognitive elements (Azevedo and Hadwin 2005; Järvelä, Volet, and Järvenoja 2011; McCaslin and Burross 2011; Perry et al. 2003; Schunk 2008; Volet, Vauras, and Salonen 2009). That is, there is attention paid to both the personal qualities of SRL and the contexts that give shape to its manifestation. SRL can be defined as the strategic pursuit of learning goals, in which individuals set goals, monitor performance, and evaluate behavioral strategies and psychological conditions (Greene and Azevedo 2007; Martin and McLellan 2008; Schunk 2005; Zimmerman 2000). These practices and processes are believed to be embedded in certain contexts. Butler (2002) captures this integration when she states, "By definition, self-regulated learning is now thought to occur when students are motivated to reflectively and strategically engage in learning activities within environments that foster self-regulation" (60).

Although embedded in contexts, SRL is considered a distinctively human function, a universal process of which all individuals are capable (Bandura 1997, 2001; Schunk 2005; Winne 2005; Zimmerman 2000). Thus, researchers reason that there is little cultural, historical, or political significance in setting goals and enacting

strategies to achieve those goals. Although SRL is construed as universal, researchers also recognize that not all individuals regulate themselves in the same way, for the same frequency, toward the same ends, or in the same contexts (McCaslin and Burross 2011; Perry 2002; Winne 2006; Zimmerman 2000). Thus, differences in SRL are thought about in terms of qualitative and quantitative differences. Such differences are captured by individualistic categorizations, such as novice and expert (Zimmerman 1998), functional or dysfunctional (Zimmerman 2000), effective or ineffective (Zimmerman 2000), strong or weak (Schmeichel and Baumeister 2004), and high or less (Abar and Loken 2010). Researchers also classify contexts (high or low) in terms of their likelihood to support and invite SRL (Perry et al. 2003).

As a result of these differences in SRL, researchers are interested in understanding how effective forms of SRL develop and ways it can be facilitated. This conversation is informed by two conceptions of SRL: disposition and event. From the former perspective, SRL is treated as something that develops over many hours of practice whereby cognitive structures are shaped in ways that enable individuals to regulate themselves across contexts and domains. From the latter perspective, SRL occurs in situations whereby individuals are motivated to engage in activities that are set up to invite self-regulation. Emphasis is placed on tasks conditions, pedagogical structures, interaction patterns, and curricula as conditions that invite the enactment of SRL. This analysis is informed primarily by a disposition perspective. Most research on guardian involvement and SRL development is aligned with this view, as it is believed that guardians shape qualities and quantities of SRL that are learned in the home and carried into the classroom. In addition, those who align with an event interpretation also include a disposition component, as they reason that what occurs during an event is believe to shape transferrable cognitive characteristics (Butler 2002; McCaslin and Burross 2011; Packer and Goicoechea 2000).

HOME CONDITIONS AND SRL

For SRL development and enactment, researchers have considered many social influences, such as national culture (e.g., Olaussen and Braten 1999), family practices (e.g., Xu and Corno 2006; Xu, Kushner Benson, Mudrey-Camino, and Steiner 2010), classroom structures (e.g., Lodewyk, Winne, and Jamieson-Noel 2009; Perry et al., 2003), technology (e.g., Azevedo and Hadwin, 2005) and patterns of interactions (Patrick and Middleton 2002). Some researchers suggest that SRL development involves a number of factors working in concert (Pino-Pasternak et al., 2010; Zimmerman 1998). Zimmerman (1998) states:

> It is unlikely that this capability [self-regulation] emerges directly from formal instruction. Rather, it appears to have its origins in a combination of parents' expectations and indirect support for their children's studying and achievement, teachers'

assignment of homework that requires students to learn outside of classroom settings, and cooperative learning with peers. (11)

Zimmerman, Bonner, and Kovach (1996) argue that SRL development happens in broad contexts that support it. According to these researchers, SRL development not only requires the support of teachers across grade levels and suitable curricula, but also home practices that are appropriately aligned with school activities. Although researchers have emphasized concerted efforts to teach SRL, there has been a great deal of attention devoted to ways parents affect it.

What Guardians Influence

Home and family practices are among the contextual variables that have been identified as shaping SRL enactment and development (Corno and Xu 2004; Evans and Rosenbaum 2008; Huang and Prochner 2004; Martinez-Pons 2002; Neitzel and Stright 2003; Perry et al. 2003; Pino-Pasternak et al. 2010; Strage 1998; Stright, Dopkins, Neitzel, and Sears 2001; Swalander and Karin 2007; Xu and Corno 2006; Zimmerman 1998). For example, Xu and Corno (2003) found that children who received help from family during homework time worked more frequently to manage their workspace, and were more careful about monitoring and controlling their emotions than children who did not receive help from family. In another research study comparing groups of children with varying degrees of homework help, Xu and Corno (2006) found that children who received help from family during homework were more self-motivated and more likely to control impulses.

Guardians who work with children on academic tasks in ways that are responsive (Salonen, Lepola, and Vauras 2007), adaptable (Mattanah, Pratt, Cowan, and Cowan 2005), and warm (Pino-Pasternak et al., 2010) are believed to be more likely to promote behaviors and psychological conditions that are necessary for SRL. Educational psychologists call this type of parenting *authoritative*, and have linked it directly to SRL, or to the development of conditions relevant for it. Other factors related to SRL that guardians influence are interest (e.g., Neitzel 2008), peer interaction patterns (Neitzel 2009), attitudes (Swalander and Taube 2007), strategy use (Martinez-Pons 2002), self-perceptions (Schunk and Zimmerman 1997), expectations (Xu et al. 2010), and goals (Pintrich 2000), to name a few. These research studies highlight correlations between family home practices and the existence of important elements of SRL, such as behaviors, motivation, control of emotions, monitoring, and environmental management.

Home Pedagogical Structures

Researchers suggest that there are different pedagogical formats related to the development and enactment of SRL: explicit modeling (e.g., Schunk and Zimmerman 1997), implicit modeling (e.g., Martinez-Pons 2002), direct instruction (e.g.,

Stright, Neitzel, Sears, and Hoke-Sinex 2001), and facilitation (e.g., Xu and Corno 2006). Modeling has been identified as an essential tool for supporting SRL development (Bandura 2001; Martinez-Pons 2002; Zimmerman 1989). Martinez-Pons (2002) argued that guardians who model and support self-regulatory behavior had children who enacted similar behaviors. He describes this support as the "hidden curriculum of the home" (Martinez-Pons 2002, 128). Martinez-Pons argues that "parental modeling and support for self-regulatory processes precede students' development of these skills, and these skills in turn are significant predictors for their success in school" (129). It is argued that guardians who implicitly and explicitly model strategies for completing and mastering academic tasks are more likely to facilitate their children's use of effective SRL. Modeling can involve explicit demonstration of thought processes and strategy use that are directed toward an academic task. It can also involve implicit illustrations through guardians' use of strategies during their own problem solving in the home; thus, modeling can be implicit, unintentional and random.

Although similar to explicit modeling, direct instruction involves stating, not demonstrating, certain thought processes and strategy use that are needed for academic tasks. This pedagogical format involves telling a child how to strategically engage with a task. The final format for developing SRL is facilitation, which involves setting up conditions in the home that support SRL development. For example, Xu et al. (2010) found that restricting television viewing fostered SRL development. Guardian interventions attuned to contingency is another example of facilitation. Pino-Pasternak et al. (2010) state that contingency involves guardians adjusting their use of scaffolding to either decrease or increase the task challenge in ways that are responsive to children's affect. Such interactions are an orchestrated dance in which evaluations of children and tasks are conducted to strategically adjust scaffolding to support task completion and produce certain psychological effects, such as high self-efficacy, volition, motivation, and interest. Regardless of the pedagogical format, Martinez-Pons (2002) argues that guardians should actively cultivate SRL because children who are left to develop SRL through self-discovery are at a significant disadvantage.

Learning to Facilitate SRL

Although researchers have identified guardians as key factors for SRL development, they have also observed that not all guardians prepare children for academic self-regulation (Corno 1989; Perry et al. 2003). This observation led Corno (1989) to suggest that guardians need to become informed about SRL classrooms. Echoing this suggestion, Perry et al. (2003) note, "For some parents and students, high-SRL teaching practices are unfamiliar. They need to learn the routines and participation structures in high-SRL classrooms" (320). These statements point to the importance for guardians to have familiarity with a particular kind of classroom structure, and for them to be able support this structure in the home.

Martinez-Pons (2002) argued that guardians could undergo training to model, facilitate, and reward those strategies, skills, attitudes, and orientations that are associated with SRL. In addition to having a repertoire of instructional strategies and knowledge of high-SRL classrooms, Martinez-Pons suggests that guardians, themselves, need to be self-regulated. Martinez-Pons stated, "Parents need to become aware that the methods they use to learn and solve problems in the presence of their children influence how their children study" (130). Guardians not only have to strategically interact with their children in ways that foster SRL, they also need to enact practices to model the skills, knowledge, and dispositions for SRL.

If guardians were not already doing so, they could learn to facilitate SRL by working with children on their homework, being authoritative, learning certain strategies of instruction, modeling certain behaviors and attitudes in their own lives, being attuned to children's affect, recognizing cognitive demands of tasks, understanding how to adjust strategies to produce particular affects, and collaborating with teachers. Guardians must see their roles as teachers who must study their children through a psychological lens with a particular purpose in mind. From the extant research on guardian involvement and SRL development, it is clear that there are many conditions and structures that must be present in the home to adequately support the kind of SRL that is valued and rewarded in schools.

SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS AND SRL DEVELOPMENT

The psychological research on SRL development makes a compelling case for the importance of shaping home practices and conditions in particular ways that support SRL. These conditions are not thought about in terms of class differences. Although the class-based values associated with home practices have been considered in other academic fields, such considerations are virtually absent in research on SRL. This absence is troublesome, given the amount of research illustrating that individuals from different class strata have specific corresponding qualities related to their backgrounds, and that these qualities differently shape home structures and child dispositions (Bernstein 1971; Bourdieu 1984; Brice-Heath 1983; Kussorow 2004; Lamont 2000; Lareau 2000, 2003; Linkon 1999; Luttrell 1989; Schutz 2008).

Bullock and Limbert (2009) argue that class tends to remain invisible in psychological research. Similarly, Murdock (2000) argues that little "has been done to further our understanding of how learning occurs within macrolevel contexts, such as social class" (113). Martin (2004) points out that psychologists who conduct *self*-studies, such as self-regulation, construct models and offer recommendations for practice that are "seemingly intended to apply across social classifications and realities" (196). Although virtually ignored in research on SRL, extant research

on class differences and guardian involvement suggests that SRL is entangled in class-based values, knowledge, and practices. As Boekearts and Corno (2005) urge, it is essential that the next generation of SRL research focus on the socio-political context of SRL. Part of this effort involves integrating analyses that can illuminate some of the class-based implications of constructing, valuing, reward-ing, and developing certain kinds of SRL. Conducting this research requires an interdisciplinary approach. Therefore, literature that draws on the sociological theorizing informed by Pierre Bourdieu (Kussorow 2004; Lamont 2000; Lareau 2000, 2003; Linkon 1999; Luttrell 1997; Schutz 2008) is important for advanc-ing research on SRL. The notions of social capital, cultural capital and habitus, which are not typically integrated into research on SRL, are interwoven into this particular analysis.

METHOD

Participants

The case study can be described as *instrumental* (Stake 2005). That is, the particular case study supported efforts to "provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization" (445). Aligned with Stake (2005) and others who have conducted instrumental case studies (e.g., Kussorow 2004; Luttrell 1989; Peshkin 1986), there is a primary interest in the case that is accompanied by a particular agenda. The agenda for this case study is to explore normative constructions and class-based values embedded in research on SRL. Given assumptions about the uniformity of class habitus (Bourdieu 1977) and the suggestion that there is an alignment with SRL and middle-class culture, a working-class family was selected without relying on predetermined qualifying criteria.

Using criteria and examples from the literature (Bullock and Limbert 2009; Lareau 2003; Luttrell 1997; Schutz 2008) to determine the status of this family, the family in this research study was considered working class based on the education level of the guardians, their income level and their occupational status. The household was comprised of five people: two guardians (Francisco and Laura[1]) and three girls, who were 16, 10, and 2 years old. The family resided in a suburban Midwestern town that was in proximity to a large state university. Thus, the community was a mix of students and families. At the time of the research study, the average cost to buy a home in the area was $120,000. The community resembled a suburban environment, and was comprised mostly of Caucasians. Data was collected during the year 2008.

Francisco was the biological father of all three children, and Laura was the bio-logical mother of the toddler. Laura identified herself as Caucasian, and Francisco identified himself as Mexican American. The biological mother of the two oldest children lived in a town 15 miles away and she had little presence in their lives.

Francisco installed residential cable television and Laura worked part-time from home as a manicurist. Both Laura and Francisco have high school diplomas and neither pursued a college education. The guardians reported that they were not strong students in high school and did not see college as an option for them. After high school, Francisco served in the military for two years, and was discharged for undisclosed reasons. Before working for the cable company, he worked in construction. Laura worked at retail stores until she obtained a cosmetology certificate. Then she started working from home as a manicurist. When her biological child was born, Laura was also a stay-at-home mom. The total household income was reported to be between $30,000–$40,000.

The academic performance of the oldest child, Karen, ranged between *A*s and *C*s. She completed her work more independently than Anna, the 10-year-old. Karen liked school and was on the cheerleading team. She had aspirations to attend college, and hoped that her cheerleading would get her a full scholarship. Karen was diligent with completing her work and often studied for tests. Anna struggled in school, and consistently received *C*s and *D*s. Anna was in the fifth grade, though school personnel determined that she was reading at a fourth-grade level. School academics were a source of frustration for Anna. She thrived in and loved to play sports, especially softball and basketball—which she played in organized teams that her father coached. Although thriving in sports, which her father feels capable of supporting, Anna disliked school and often did not complete assignments, study, do her homework, or show interest in her schoolwork.

There were several reasons for choosing one family for the case study. First, the research required close and intensive examination of the everyday practices of this family. Interviews and questionnaires alone were insufficient to consider the family's everyday practices related to SRL development. It was essential to be in the home often and consistently, because SRL development does not occur in a single event. Rather it is embedded in a system of interactions, and must be contextualized in that system. It was important to work closely with one family to see patterns of interactions and consider their potential cumulative effects. In addition, the consistent and frequent presence was needed to produce a level of comfort so that the family resumed resemblances of their daily routines.

A working-class family was selected for several reasons. Although it has not been empirically studied, extant research suggests that there is congruence between middle-class cultural practices and SRL development. Working-class culture is often treated as incongruent with the culture of schooling, and therefore, a site for reformation. Thus, the purpose was to understand the distinct educational, economic, cultural, and social realities of this working-class family and consider what it might mean for them to shape their practices around practices that are considered essential for SRL development. Careful examinations of this family

were conducted to begin a conversation about what aspects, if any, of SRL are taught in working-class homes.

Observations

In the home, a combination of "naturalistic observations" (Lareau, 2003, 8) and interviews were conducted. For a total of one hundred hours, the family was observed and recorded using both field notes and a video recorder as they went through their daily routines. Most observations occurred on weekdays when the children returned from school, in an effort to examine how Karen and Anna handled schoolwork in the home. Because SRL development can occur at times other than those immediately following the school day observations were not restricted to this schedule. The family was also followed as they went through other daily routines and random events, which included sports activities, kin visits, meals, outside play, television time, chores, and teacher conferences. Observations were also conducted on the weekends and during late night weekday hours.

Although, arguably, all social research is *participant observation* (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2004), part of the field of study, an effort was made to be an *observer* (Burgess, 1984). Because the goal was to learn about the family's everyday practices, an attempt was made to avoid further shaping (beyond the effects of my presence and interviewing) the activities in the home. This positionality was difficult to maintain. There were instances in which I was asked to participate in supporting the children's homework, playing sports, eating, and watching the toddler. Early in the research, the family made efforts to include me in their daily routines, although such instances decreased over time. Overall, participation in daily activities was infrequent and only occurred upon the family's request.

Although the entire family was observed, there was particular focus on the guardians. Reflecting the literature on SRL development, an observation protocol was used (see Table 1). In each of these moments and spaces, there was particular attention paid to patterns of interaction, direct support for children's learning, structure of activities, and resources used in activities. Using field notes and video recordings, transcripts were created that depicted daily events and dialogue. These transcripts were coded (see Table 2 for examples) using the observation protocol. In addition to these codes, there was further elaboration. Coding for moments of negotiation and directives, for example, there was attention to patterns and significant events that related to types of negotiations or directives, moments when such interactions occurred, and child responses. Observation transcripts were also interpreted phenomenologically. That is, taken as a whole and examining the configuration of actions and speech acts, entire transcriptions were coded as meaningful units. The coding was validated using interrater reliability. A research

TABLE 1
Observation Protocol

Event/Sphere	Observations	Description
Daily routines (e.g., homework time, eating, and working)	Qualities of interaction • Negotiated • Directed	Considered if and in what ways opinions were elicited, rules were negotiated and children's input shaped rules and decisions.
Random events (e.g., kin visits, shopping and home maintenance) Extracurricular activities (e.g., sports and music)	Direct and indirect self-regulated learning support • Strategy instruction • Modeling • Supplementing materials • Structuring time • Verbal encouragement	With homework, or any problems that needed to be solved, considered strategies guardians used to solve problems in front of children. Looked for direct interventions with schooling (e.g. suggesting strategy use). Considered implicit and explicit modeling (both its content and frequency).
Leisure activities (e.g., play, watching television and surfing Internet)	Familial conditions • School/home alignment • Family networks • Roles/family dynamics • Resources	Looked for timing of activities, dynamics related to activities, school materials in the home, interactions with school personnel and resources used in activities.

assistant agreed with the coding 88 percent of the time. For the other 12 percent, dialogue led to agreement.

Interviews

In the family's home, a number of planned and unplanned interviews were conducted (see Table 3). The interviews with the children were conducted both separately from the guardians and together. The guardian interviews were conducted with Francisco and Laura; Karen's biological mother did not participate. The three planned interviews with the guardians were semistructured (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). The first took place at the beginning of the research period, and focused on education history of all family members, the children's current school performance, parenting philosophy, and occupation. The second and third planned interviews took place during the middle and at the end of the research period, and were designed to (a) discuss children's school performance, (b) ask questions that emerged during the observations, and (c) give them opportunities to ask me

TABLE 2
Data Analysis

Method	Collection	Analysis	Credibility	Example Codes
Observations	Field notes; transcriptions of video recordings	Coding scheme	Interrater reliability	SRI: School-related interaction URI: Unrelated interaction PINS: Pattern of interaction/ negotiation/school-related PIDS: Pattern of interaction/directive/school-related PINU: Pattern of interaction/ negotiation/unrelated PIDS: Pattern of interaction/directive/unrelated MELS: Modeling/explicit/learning strategy/school-related MILS: Modeling/implicit/learning strategy/school-related MELU: Modeling/explicit/learning strategy/un-related MILS: Modeling/implicit/learning strategy/school-related PC: Perceptions of competence VOS: Value of school PP: Parenting philosophy
Interviews	Field notes; transcriptions of recorded interviews	Coding scheme	Interrater reliability	RPINS: Rationalization of PINS (stimulated recall and emergence) EPINS: Elaboration of PINS (stimulated recall and emergence) RMELS: Rationalization of MELS (stimulated recall and emergence) EMELS: Elaboration of MELS (stimulated recall and emergence) PC: Perceptions of Competence VOS: Value of School PP: Parenting Philosophy

questions. The unplanned interviews were informal, and at times semistructured (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). During these interviews, stimulated recall (Gass and Mackey, 2000) was used to gain insight into the reasoning behind certain decisions and practices.

The interview data was coded in relation to the observation scheme. First, the data was coded by considering statements that directly related to observed

TABLE 3
Interviews

	Planned			Unplanned		
	Total Hr	Duration	Format	Total Hr	Duration	Format
Guardians	3	45–60 min	Recorded; semistruc-tured	6	15–20 min	Field notes and no recording; semistructured
Children	3	30–45 min	Taped; semistruc-tured	4	10–20 min	Some recorded and field notes; semistructured

events (see Table 2 for examples). For example, as part of the observation scheme, attention was paid to strategies for structuring children's time. Quotations from interviews were coded in terms of their connection to rationalizations related to these observations. Interview transcripts were coded using the observation protocol, but were differentiated based on their elaboration or rationalization of an observed event. Interrater reliability with the same assistant was used and a similar level of agreement from the observations was achieved. At times, questions pertaining to reasons behind certain practices were explicitly asked, and at times, rationalizations emerged in the conversation.

FINDINGS

This family was not unlike other working-class guardians depicted in the literature (see Table 4). Francisco and Laura cared about their children's school success, but experienced class-based conditions that interfered with supporting their children's school learning. What is distinct about this research study is that these conditions have been considered in terms of opportunities for SRL development during and outside of homework time. From this case study, it is possible to empirically construct an understanding of how this working-class family's daily interactions, routines, and experiences are misaligned with conditions that have been identified as important for SRL development. It is illustrated that if the guardians were to align with the literature on SRL development, then they would have to adopt a new cultural logic, change their perceptions, improve their own learning (and model it), work consistently with children on their homework, profile their children, use the profile to adjust their home practices, learn the discourse of schooling, strategically use that discourse, and adopt a school-based agenda in their home.

TABLE 4
Family Profile

Class Distinctions	Qualities	Examples
Home and school spheres	Separated	School-related activities were not part of routines, random events, and leisure activities; did not monitor homework; did not check the classroom Web site to stay abreast of topics and assignments.
Social networks	Comprised of kin	Social visits only with family members; one interaction with school personnel.
Perceptions of competence	Believed they were not qualified to support school learning	Deferred schooling to professionals; had difficulty understanding school texts; expected children to be responsible for their learning.
Parenting logic	Natural growth	Children had independent leisure time; believed children will develop at their own pace.
Occupational conditions	Routine and closely supervised	Scripts were predetermined and nonnegotiable; problem solving on the job was not modeled in the home.

Time for Homework

Working with children during homework is an important event for SRL development (Pino-Pasternak et al. 2010; Xu and Corno 2003, 2006). This research suggests that merely working with children, even if guardians had limited self-regulatory skill or school-based knowledge, can support SRL development. Although the mere act of working with children has been linked to SRL development, researchers have associated certain home strategies and parenting styles with more effective qualities of SRL. Thus, frequency and particular qualities of interaction are implicated in guardian's role in SRL development. Guardians who are not involved in school-based activities may create disadvantages in the development of SRL.

During this case study, Francisco and Laura only on occasion worked with their children on their homework. Typically, when Anna and Karen returned home from school, they went to different places in the home to work independently on their homework (Anna worked at the kitchen table and Karen worked in the bedroom that she shared with Anna). Anna asked for, and needed, help more than Karen and, therefore, moments of guardian involvement in homework mainly involved Anna. Overall, however, there was little involvement in homework and other school-related activities. Rather than suggesting deficiencies with the home

practices, it is important to consider the class-based factors that contributed to the frequency and structure of interactions surrounding school-related tasks.

Child-Rearing and SRL

> Why isn't [Anna's teacher] doing more to help Anna? (Francisco in a frustrated tone)
>
> The school expects us to teach Anna. They want us to make sure we send her to school already knowing things ... [in a frustrated tone]. The other day, during the conference [a parent and teacher conference], Anna's teacher kept telling us how to help Anna. I stayed quiet because I wasn't sure what to say. (Francisco)

For this family, schooling was not part of what Lareau (2003) calls the *habitus of daily life* (see Table 4). Francisco and Laura did not organize their child rearing around the goal of supporting a school-based agenda. Concerned with Anna's grades, Francisco expressed frustration directed at school personnel's suggestions that the frequency and quality of interaction during homework had to change. As the first quotation reveals, Francisco wondered why Anna's teacher was not shouldering the burden of supporting Anna's success. Throughout the research period, Francisco and Laura resisted efforts to integrate and be part of schooling in various facets of family life. For example, the entire family drove 12 hours for a family vacation during spring break. At school, Anna had a supplemental packet of worksheets that was to be completed during the break. Anna did not bring it home, and Francisco and Laura did not pick it up from school. There was no expectation for integrating school-related work in their leisure activities. Having that time dedicated to school content may have been especially helpful for Anna, who was having a difficult time academically.

Implications for SRL development can be drawn from this logic. First, working with more experienced others and receiving direct feedback is an important element in SRL development. For example, gaining self-regulatory control over reading comprehension depends on working with others who can provide feedback in ways that support the analysis of, and reflection on, both content understanding and learning processes. Second, by not working with Anna, Francisco and Laura did not have the opportunity to adjust scaffolding to control for affect. In Anna's case, to alleviate her frustration, she employed task-avoidance goals and often failed to complete her homework. Working with her and adjusting her learning burden could have been instrumental for supporting reflection on self-knowledge, success with school tasks, mastery goals, and motivation. Third, not working with Anna precluded opportunities to practice and automate content standards so that cognitive energy could be used for other tasks, such as self-regulation or additional content learning.

Researchers argue that guardians must explicitly make an effort to teach and facilitate SRL. This expectation aligns with a middle-class parenting logic (Lareau,

2003). Lareau (2003) contends that middle-class parenting is informed by the logic of *concerted cultivation*, whereas poor and working-class parenting is informed by the logic of *natural growth*. Concerted cultivation is understood as the set of organized activities, such as sports teams, school, and dance and music classes, in which children participate under the direction of adults, and through which they learn a particular set of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are valued across those contexts. As Lareau (2003) contends, middle-class guardians focus on developing talents and skills by consistently monitoring and guiding their children's learning. These guardians hover over their children by remaining aware of school performance and making adjustments by incorporating resources to address academic problems.

In contrast to middle-class child rearing logic, Lareau (2003) contends that the poor and working-class families in her research operated with the logic of natural growth. According to Lareau, this means that as long as children have food, shelter, and comfort, their development is viewed as "unfolding spontaneously" (238). From this logic, children's academic development is not viewed as part of everyday life for which guardians are responsible. Therefore, children are given more autonomy during their leisure time. The aim of child-rearing is not to collaborate with others to stimulate a certain kind of cognitive growth that is aligned with school structures. Although it is possible to consider that this logic aligns with SRL development, such autonomy was implicated in SRL problems. Thus, by considering the importance of direct and consistent involvement in SRL, it is possible to draw an alignment between SRL development and a middle class parenting logic.

Research on SRL development points to a misalignment with the logic of natural growth. Although Francisco and Laura never stated that they did not want to support their children's learning, concerted cultivation was not part of their child-rearing logic. Even if Francisco and Laura believed it was their responsibility to interact with their children in ways that could be implicated in supporting SRL development, there were certain conditions that precluded their involvement with school-related activities. These conditions include constraints related to occupational conditions, perceptions of competence, and class-based differences in the construction of child profiles.

Occupational Conditions and Homework

For middle-class guardians, the boundaries between home and work are dissolved (Lareau, 2000). Many middle-class guardians bring their work home and, by the nature of their occupations, have opportunities to model organization, time management, and perseverance (Lareau, 2000, 2003). For guardians from poor and working-class backgrounds, Lareau (2000) stated, "The content of the work was more routine, closely supervised, and far less complex than the labor process in

upper-middle class jobs." Guardians from poor and working-class positions leave their jobs behind. Thus, "working-class parents never carried out work tasks in the home. . . . Their children never observed them at home doing labor linked to their occupational success" (115). Even if the boundaries were more fluid, the demands of employment may not necessarily involve using learning strategies that can be emulated and rewarded in schools. Although middle-class guardians may employ intentional pedagogical interventions to teach SRL, arguably their occupational conditions lend themselves to modeling certain kinds of problem-solving that can be emulated for school-related tasks. Thus, on some level, guardians from middle-class backgrounds may facilitate SRL through no particular explicit strategic pedagogical intervention.

A major constraint related to working directly with children on their homework involved the conditions of Laura's work. Appointments with clients were made between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., as many of them were working professionals. While Laura was working, Francisco watched the toddler, and, at times, worked on dinner preparation. The family typically ate dinner at approximately 7:00 p.m. Because of these responsibilities, Francisco and Luara were not always readily available to help their children during homework. It would have been difficult for Francisco and Laura to work with their children after dinner, which typically ended between 7:30 and 8:30 p.m, because of fatigue and the need to prepare for the next day. If working with children on homework is an essential element for supporting SRL development, then it is possible to see how this occupational condition is implicated in challenges to such development.

Researchers argue that the structures of guardians' work shape structures in the home (Lareau, 2000; Schutz, 2008). As a cable installer, Francisco's work is product-oriented, and the few times he worked with Anna, this orientation informed his interaction. In one instance, Anna was expected to build a musical instrument out of materials typically found in her home. In so doing, she was to study its parts and discern their function in the production of sound. Although she had one week to complete the assignment, she waited until the evening before the assignment was due to build the instrument. Francisco and Laura were unaware of the assignment until that evening. Francisco asked me to research designs on the Internet and then proceeded to gather the parts and build the instrument as Anna watched. With the time constraints and concern for Anna's success, Francisco was oriented toward completing the task. Consistent with other interactions, Francisco was concerned with the product (completing the task) and not the process (modeling, guiding, or facilitating Anna's processes as she completes the task). Although Anna had the opportunity to observe her father in the planning and implementation of strategies to achieve an outcome, which is important for SRL development, Francisco did not outwardly communicate his thought processes to model ways of thinking while engaging with a task. Although observing Francisco can be seen as supporting SRL development, Anna did not have the opportunity to engage with

the thought processes herself, nor did she have the opportunity to work with the parts of the instrument to observe their function. Although, arguably, the dominant education discourse is product-oriented, and this orientation is not specific to working-class guardians, there was a resemblance between the way Francisco described his work and how he approached his involvement in schooling.

Perceptions of Schooling Competence

I don't want to tell Anna something that contradicts what her teacher tells her. (Laura)

It [referring to school texts] *does not make sense* [emphasis added]. Sometimes she [Anna when reading] gets the words wrong. It does not make sense at all (laughs). So we [Francisco and Laura] would be confused. (Laura)

I can help Anna with math and science, but with other subjects … not so much. (Francisco)

From these quotations, it can be gleaned that Francisco and Laura found the discourse of schooling to be confusing. Even if Francisco and Laura operated with the logic of concerted cultivation, their confusion with this discourse competed with efforts to generate and support conditions for SRL development. For example, Anna had three weeks to obtain a fantasy novel chapter book, read it, and write a book report. Before beginning, Anna had to obtain approval for her book selection from her teacher and her guardians. The book that Anna had taken out of the school library was a compilation of fantasy short stories. Her guardians reviewed the book and believed that each story title was a chapter title in a novel; they approved it. Anna did not receive approval from the teacher. She had this book for two weeks before I pointed out that the book was a compilation, which was not acceptable for completing the book report assignment. Thus, Anna had only one week to obtain a new book, read it, and write the report. In an effort to help Anna complete the task as soon as possible, Francisco and Laura wanted Anna to go the public library on the Saturday preceding the Friday before the assignment was due. They requested that I take Anna because they did not have a library card and did not know how to navigate the library. As this event took place early in the research study, I did not know Anna's reading level, nor did Anna, Francisco, or Laura. The librarian provided Anna with a number of book options all at the fifth-grade reading level. Choosing one of those books, Anna had one week to read and write a report on a book that was one grade level above her measured reading competency. With these constraints and conditions, Anna did poorly on the assignment.

Francisco and Laura did not have the capital to make sense of school-related texts, nor did they have the strategies to model ways to overcome such limitations. The confusion around school texts made it difficult for Francisco and Laura

to engage with the steps and details of this assignment. As the previous quotations suggest, they were reluctant to participate with the homework because of their concern about their competence to do so. Although they had reservations about participating, Francisco and Laura were required to participate by approving Anna's book. Anna was already struggling in school, and her continued poor performance on assignments had the potential to reinforce certain perceptions of competence and efficacy levels that compete with the development and enactment of academic self-regulation.

This event is not an indictment of Francisco and Laura. The assignment required guardian participation from two people who found the discourse of the schooling to be confusing, and who questioned their competence to support their children's school learning. This pedagogical requirement can be implicated in the way the event unfolded. In addition, the teacher was also required to approve the book, but she did not follow-up with Anna. During a brief encounter with the teacher during one of my observations of the family at school, Anna's teacher reported that she wanted Anna to develop independence, and was, therefore, waiting for Anna to approach her to obtain approval. The teacher operated with an ethical imperative to foster certain characteristics in Anna by withdrawing her support.

Learning Profiles

Another significant element to this event, and others as well, was that Francisco and Laura did not know Anna's reading level and had a difficult time remembering other school-generated data related to their children. They were vaguely able to recall information about previous report cards, teaching evaluations, and standardized test performances. In addition, beyond descriptors related to confidence and independence, Laura and Francisco did not construct school-based profiles of their children. According to literature on SRL, such knowledge is essential for supporting SRL development. For example, knowledge of individuals is an important element in *contingency*. To adjust practices to support proper scaffolding of learning, guardians must "know" their children and understand how certain practices might affect motivation, personal beliefs, and affect. In the event just described, Francisco and Laura did not know Anna's reading level. Thus, they could not use that information to notify me or make their own adjustments to ensure that Anna's new book was appropriate for her level. Aside from information about reading level, there was little consideration of other learning dimensions in their interactions with and discussions about their children.

It is possible to see that constructing school-based profiles of children and using that knowledge to adjust home practices are aligned with a middle-class cultural logic of hovering over children, and adjusting home practices to stimulate and cultivate a certain kind of cognitive development. As part of this logic, middle-class guardians construct profiles of their children and are attuned to the

profiles that schools construct. This knowledge of the self is constructed through a psychological lens and informed by a technical rationality (Gallagher, 2003). All guardians might not see their roles as participating in, and buying into, such constructions of the child, nor might they see such constructions as necessary for informing parenting strategies. Although some might see constructing learning profiles as empowering, it can be implicated in a form of self-governance, exclusion of possibility, and producing amenability to institutional structures (see Rose, 1996, 1999).

Modeling, Occupational Conditions, and SRL

Supporting SRL development does not solely occur during homework time, and is not always explicit and intentional. As Lareau (2000) illustrated, certain occupational conditions can shape home pedagogy and such home pedagogy can be implicated in support for SRL. Francisco did not bring his work home. He did not enact SRL to complete his work at home and his children did not have the opportunity to observe him while working. Even if the boundaries between home and school were dissolved, the demands of working-class employment did not require Francisco to use learning strategies for home activities that were analogous to school-related ones. Thus, Anna and Karen were exposed to fewer opportunities to observe and emulate strategies that could have been adapted to school tasks. Francisco did not model SRL strategies in the home as a condition of his occupation. Laura, however, worked from home, giving her the opportunity to model strategies with her work. Instead of this being an opportunity for her children to observe SRL strategies, Laura remained isolated in a room. And even if Laura's work had been visible, she did not use SRL strategies to perform her work. Thus, her occupation did not encourage the modeling of the kinds of problem solving or strategic engagement that can be aligned with the kinds of SRL valued and rewarded in schools.

Related to Laura's occupation, there were a number of popular culture magazines in the home, including, but not limited to, *Vogue, Cosmopolitan*, and *Glamour*. These magazines were for clients who were waiting, and for Laura to read and use to generate and sustain conversation during her work. There was little presence of texts in the home that might count as official school texts. During an interview, Laura stated that there was little sense in buying books that Karen and Anna would only read once. Laura's work shaped the kinds of texts that were present and read in the home. Having school-related books was not seen as economical and, therefore, access to these types of texts was limited.

Absence of school-sanctioned texts does not mean that SRL cannot be promoted. In fact, SRL can be promoted using the magazines that were already present in the home. However, only one interaction between Laura and Anna was observed with these texts. During this instance, Laura and Anna coread an article

by taking turns reading aloud. Focusing on the content of the story, there was little reflection on comprehension strategies or modeling of reading strategies. As Zimmerman et al. (1996) note, self-regulatory control of reading comprehension is made possible by interacting with others in ways that highlight processes and strategies used when reading. Gaining self-regulatory control over reading comprehension depends on working with others who have knowledge and skills to support this effort. Building self-regulatory control depends on feedback, reflection on learning processes, and suggestions for strategy use. The interaction between Laura and Anna did not involve a focus on cultivating reading strategies and, therefore, became a missed opportunity to help build SRL.

Karen and Anna had shown interest in reading the magazines, but that interest was not harnessed to support SRL of reading comprehension. It is not enough to have texts in the home, but guardians must be disposed to use them and have the knowledge of how to support the SRL of reading comprehension—they must see these instances as opportunities to cultivate school-sanctioned knowledge and skills. Without disposition and knowledge, these texts have limited value for cultivating SRL. It is possible that even if Laura had the capital and disposition to use the magazines to foster SRL of reading comprehension, these efforts might not have been effective because neither child viewed these texts as valid. In a statement to Laura, Karen stated, "You don't read. . . . You read magazines." Because these texts were not perceived as reading, their presence in the home may have done little to support interest and motivation in reading school texts, and to show that reading is something that occurs in multiple spheres.

Technology, SRL, and Class

> We have thought about letting her use the computer for writing, and we thought she might enjoy it more, but then it would make learning more like playing a video game. (Laura)

> I am concerned about letting her [Anna] play math games [links on the class Web site]. . . . Anna may play these games to avoid doing her homework . . . and we can't monitor her Internet use. (Laura)

In a variety of content areas and across grade levels, researchers argue that technology can be a valuable tool for SRL development (e.g., Azevedo, Winters, and Moos 2004; Campbell 2009; Hadwin and Winne 2001; Nicol 2007; Puustinen and Rouet 2009; Whipp and Chiarelli 2004; Winne 2006). Researchers suggest that technology can support self-studying practices, metacognitive awareness and efficiency with learning. It is possible that technology might have been beneficial for Anna. She handwrote all of her writing assignments, and if she made a mistake, she rewrote the entire assignment, sometimes as many as three or four times. This strategy seemed like a justifiable way for Anna to avoid other tasks. Anna, who was

less motivated to engage with school tasks, found more interest and value in doing school work while using technology. The few times Anna used the computer for homework, she worked independently and more efficiently, and seemed to enjoy the work. With the potential value of SRL, the quotations illustrate resistance to integrating technology in the home for school-related activities. Some of this resistance relates to economic constraints and some were philosophical.

There was a desktop computer in the home, but there were challenges with gaining access to it. The following dialogue between Karen and Laura illustrates part of the challenge:

Karen:
Laura, can I use *your* [emphasis added] computer upstairs?

Laura:
[looked bothered when Karen made the request to use the computer] No.
[Karen looked a little uncomfortable and, for about five seconds, she continued to look at Laura as if she did not know what else to do.]

Laura:
[After a brief pause] What do you need it for? It is very messy up there. I don't think you can even get upstairs. [Karen stood still for another few seconds. It seemed like she was thinking. Laura stated in a bothered tone] I guess you can use it ... but you need to clean upstairs first.

In the home, there was a computer with a printer and Internet access. It was on the second floor of the house nestled in a tight corner amid some clutter. The house was modest-sized Cape-Cod style home, and there were few options for spatially positioning the computer. Because of its location, only one person was able to be at the computer at a time. Thus, accessibility was one obstacle to home computer use. These constraints on spatial positioning contributed to concerns about technology use. With the computer upstairs, Laura stated that she could not monitor its use. Laura was concerned that Karen and Anna might chat with their friends instead of working on homework. Although spatial positioning generated resistance, there seemed to be general disapproval of allowing and promoting computer use in the home in general, and particularly for school. Laura stated that she was reluctant to permit Karen and Anna use the computer because of the cost associated with printing. With the cost of printing and the fact that guardians could not monitor its use, there are sound reasons for limiting computer use.

There were also philosophical reasons related to its limited presence. Francisco and Laura viewed computer technology as having limited educational value and, therefore, limited their children's access to it for school-related tasks. In the previous quotation, Laura stated that using the computer for homework made the work like a video game, which Laura did not view as enhancing academic achievement. Laura prohibited Anna from playing math games that were recommended by her

teacher, who posted links for them on the class Web site. Anna liked to play the math games, but Laura considered these games as activities to circumvent homework. By not permitting Karen to use the computer to play games that were intended to provide practice with up-to-date mathematical content, Laura was missing an opportunity to help Karen develop a better understanding of content by practicing.

The position taken by Laura and Francisco makes sense considering technology has, arguably, eroded certain cognitive functions, lowered the threshold of attention, and supported the desire to continuously seek and consume more technology. In addition, researchers have argued that computer technology is not neutral and value-free (Warren, Hecht, Jung, Kvasny, and Henderson 2010). Notwithstanding, when considered from a SRL lens, it has been argued that, when used in certain ways, technology can be supportive of SRL development. I am not suggesting that Francisco and Laura should integrate technology to support school-based learning. Instead, this example illustrates how the local knowledge and wisdom of this working-class family does not align with the logic that is depicted and valued in the research on SRL development.

Social Networks

Considering class-based differences in social capital can also highlight the ways SRL development matches and misaligns with the logic of working-class family structures. Just as individuals have specific knowledge and skills related to their class position, the networks individuals construct and to which they have access are argued to be class-specific. Social capital can be thought of as resources that exist in social networks, and to which individuals who, by virtue of their membership in the network, have access (Bourdieu 1984; Coleman 1998, Putnam 2001). As Coleman (1988) writes, social capital is productive and can facilitate certain actions by actors within the network that would have not been possible without the resources of the network. The theory of social capital is that individuals from particular class backgrounds tend to form class-specific networks.

Lareau (2000, 2003) observes that middle class guardians have social networks comprised of school personnel and other guardians who are familiar with the discourse of schooling. Making a similar observation, Schutz (2008) notes that middle class guardians are more likely to make connections with relative strangers (e.g., teachers) and, because they are considered more or less equals, gain access to a different array of resources. In contrast, Lareau (2003) argues that guardians from working class backgrounds have networks comprised of kin. Schutz (2008) contends that working-class guardians form strong ties with family, and, at times, persons embedded in their communities. Thus, the resources to which they have access are those who share similar socioeconomic backgrounds and histories. It has been argued that guardians from poor and working-class backgrounds are less

likely to have teachers as part of their social networks, and, as a result, have less fluid and persistent participation in schooling, and less knowledge of schooling discourse.

Like other working class families, Francisco and Laura had a network comprised mainly of kin: All social gatherings were with family members; there was little communication with school personnel, and there was limited interaction with families within and outside their neighborhood. Although kin relationships are valuable, both Francisco and Laura's families shared similar educational and economic histories. Thus, the knowledge and resources to which the family had access resembled their own. Although I, in some sense, became part of the family's network, my integration was the result of an unlikely experience. As the research suggests, SRL development requires that parents dissolve the boundaries between home and school by continuously interacting with school personnel who can support concerted efforts to cultivate certain cognitive and behavioral characteristics. The research thus suggests that certain kinds of social capital are implicated in SRL development.

Altering social networks is not always feasible. Because social capital is tied to occupational conditions, personal history, geography, and education level (Coleman 1988), spontaneous expansions and alterations of networks are not always possible. Networks are formed and expanded based upon reciprocity and trust (Putnam 2001), and therefore, must involve others conceding to membership. Forming new networks may also mean changing perceptions about academic competence and the role of guardians in formal schooling. In forming relationships with teachers and other guardians, who have access to those resources that can assist in SRL development, middle-class guardians may: (a) have the networks in place to learn about high SRL classrooms, (b) have access to resources that support SRL development, and (c) may transition with relative ease to new pedagogical demands. It may not always be possible for working-class guardians to form those networks, and gain access to resources to support their children's SRL development. Considering differences in networks, if guardians do not have knowledge of SRL classrooms and must be familiar with them to effectively promote SRL, it is possible that middle-class families are better poised to learn about these classrooms—if they are not already implicitly and explicitly facilitating SRL.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to observe a working-class family as they went about their daily routines and draw alignments with those home conditions that researchers identify as important for developing children's academic self-regulation. It is not suggested that the practices and structures in this working class home were not set up to support SRL, or that Karen and Anna have had no opportunity to develop SRL in their home. The point is that certain home practices and conditions

identified for SRL development did not map onto the experiences and interactions of this working-class family. Drawing comparisons to extant research, it is possible to conclude that middle-class guardians already have the logic, knowledge, occupational conditions, and disposition that are linked to SRL development. Thus, according to the logic of the literature, the home structures and practices of this working class family were inadequate to support SRL. Drawing parallels to other case studies on working-class families, this case study suggests that certain values, norms, and expectations for SRL development resemble class-specific logic, knowledge, and material realities.

DISCUSSION

This case study is not about the identification and reformation of deficits in the family's home practices and structures. Rather, the case study suggests that researchers of SRL need to devote critical attention to the class-specificity of representations of SRL and its development. Although the family's home practices did not align with the literature on SRL development, it is possible to conceive that the family's practices and structures gave form to particular kinds of regulatory structures that are not validated and recognized in relation to school tasks. This study should push researchers to embed certain ideas about SRL and its development with class-based values and practices, and, therefore, avoid propagating certain home interventions, models, and strategies that are based on normative and marginalizing representations. Instead, this research should generate an imperative to examine ways that particular home practices correspond to different self-regulatory structures so that schools can work to value and validate those differences.

Although more research needs to be conducted merging SRL and socioeconomic class, this research study points to class-specificity for SRL development. If it is possible to see what middle-class guardians know and do as supporting SRL, and what working-class guardians know and do as less supportive of SRL, then it becomes possible to see that practices that value, support, and reward SRL illustrate another way in which schooling can reflect a middle-class enterprise. This research is important because SRL is typically treated as a neutral and value-free form of engagement, one that has the potential to produce social and economic equity.

Currently there is no research that explicitly states and empirically explores the possibility that class-based differences related to students self-regulatory structures exist. Up until this case study, there has been no research that illustrated ways that the literature on SRL development is embedded in class values. If SRL researchers continue to ignore the class implications embedded in SRL, then there is a danger of marginalizing cultural values, creating disadvantages and generating unfair learning burdens. To structure home environments in a particular way to better

align with the literature on SRL development is not a simple change in home practice. Adopting such pedagogy is not neutral, simple, or straightforward.

FUTURE RESEARCH

To continue examining the values and ethics embedded in SRL research, it will be essential to consider different representations of SRL across different class categories. As this research is conducted, it is essential to use the notion of SRL *sous rature*. One concern is that individuals or groups may not organize their identities, relationships, and academic engagement in terms of SRL. Continuing to uncritically use SRL as a lens can potentially contribute to the normalization and naturalization of this construct and class culture. If the notion of SRL can be justifiably construed as inclusive, it is important to construct different representations of SRL. That might mean breaking away from this particular construct. The purpose of this case study, and a more critical approach to SRL, is to create a space where diverse manifestations of SRL can be recognized, enacted, valued, and rewarded. This understanding may support the mitigation of class-based discrimination in schools that might result from expecting, rewarding, and valuing a certain kind of SRL for which guardians have been described as essential.

In addition, research is needed that links specific guardian practices with certain manifestations of children's SRL. Although a number of research studies have explored comparative differences across guardian practices and child outcomes, this work needs to be conducted through the lens of SRL or a corresponding construct. Concomitantly, there needs to be research studies that explore the interactions between different manifestations of SRL with particular pedagogical structures. Exploring these relationships can support the understanding of the ways that teachers, pedagogical structures, and curricula play a role in creating advantages and disadvantages by rewarding and valuing certain manifestations of SRL.

Note

1. All names have been changed to protect participants' identities.

REFERENCES

Abar, Beau, and Eric Loken. 2010. "Self-Regulated Learning and Self-Directed Study in a Pre-College Sample." *Learning and Individual Differences 20*:25–29.

Azevedo, Roger, and Allyson F. Hadwin. 2005. "Scaffolding Self-Regulated Learning and Metacognition: Implications for the Design of Computer-Based Scaffolds." *Instructional Science 33*:367–379.

Azevedo, Roger, Winters I. Fielding, and Daniel C. Moos. 2004. "Can Students Collaboratively Use Hypermedia to Learn Science? The Dynamics of Self- and Other-Regulatory Processes in an Ecology Classroom." *Journal of Educational Computing Research 31*:215–245.

Bandura, Albert. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.

—————. 2001. "Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective." *Annual Review Psychology 52*:1–26.

Bernstein, Basil. 1971. *Class, Codes and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Boekaerts, Monique, and Lyn Corno (2005). "Self-Regulation in the Classroom: A Perspective on Assessment and Intervention." *Applied Psychology: An International Review 54*:199–231.

Bogdan, Robert C., and Sari K. Biklen. 1998. *Qualitative research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston, MA: Ally & Bacon.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

—————. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brice-Heath, Shirley. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Class-rooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bullock, Heather E. and Wendy M. Limbert. 2009. "Class." Pp. 237–259 in *Critical Psychology: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Edited by Dennix Fox, Isaac Prilleltensky, and Stephanie Austin. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Burgess, Robert. G. 1984. *In the Field. An Introduction to Field Research*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Butler, Deborah L. 2002. "Qualitative Approaches to Investigating Self-regulated Learning: Contributions and Challenges." *Educational Psychologist 37*: 59–63.

Campbell, Chris. 2009. "Middle Years Students' Use of Self-Regulating Strategies in an Online Journaling Environment." *Journal of Educational Technology & Society 12*:98–106.

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *The American Journal of Sociology 94*:95–120.

Corno, Lyn. 1989. "Self-regulated Learning: A Volitional Analysis." Pp. 191–226 in *Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Edited by Barry J. Zimmerman and Dale H. Schunk. New York: Springer-Verlag.

—————, and Jianzhong Xu. 2004. "Homework as the Job of Childhood." *Theory into Practice 43*:227–233.

Epstein, Joyce Levy. 2001. *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

—————. 2005. "Results of the Partnership Schools-CSR Model for Student Achievement Over Three Years." *Elementary School Journal 106*:151–170.

—————, and Steven B. Sheldon. 2006. "Moving Forward: Ideas for Research on School, Family, and Community Partnerships." Pp. 117–138 *Handbook for Research in Education: Engaging Ideas and Enriching Inquiry*. Edited by Clifton. F. Conrad & Ronald Serlin. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Evans, Gary W., and Jennifer Rosenbaum. 2008. "Self-Regulation and the Income–Achievement Gap." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly 23*:504–514.

Fan, Xitao, and Michael Chen. 2001. "Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." *Educational Psychology Review 13*:1–22.

Gallagher, Suzanne. 2003. *Educational Psychology: Disrupting the Dominant Discourse*. New York: Peter Lang.

Gass, Susan, and Allison Mackey. 2000. *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gergen, Kenneth. 2009. *Relational Being: Beyond Self and Community*. New York: Oxford University Press:

Greene, Jeffrey Alan, and Roger Azevedo. 2007. "A Theoretical Review of Winne and Hadwin's Model of Self-Regulated Learning: New Perspectives and Directions." *Review of Educational Research 77*:334–372.

Hadwin, Allyson, and Phillip H. Winne. 2001. "CoNoteS2: A Software Tool for Promoting Self-Regulation and Collaboration." *International Journal on Theory and Practice 7*:313–334.

Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. 2004. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: Routledge.

Hill, Nancy Erin, and Lorraine Taylor. 2004. "Parental School Involvement and Children's Academic Achievement: Pragmatics and Issues." *Current Directions in Psychological Science 13*:161–164.

Huang, Juan, and Larry Prochner .2004. "Chinese Parenting Styles and Children's Self-Regulated Learning." *Journal of Research in Childhood Education 18*:227–238.

Järvelä, Sanna, Simone Volet, and Hanna Järvenoja. 2010. "Research on Motivation in Collaborative Learning: Moving Beyond the Cognitive–Situative Divide and Combining Individual and Social Processes." *Educational Psychologist 45*:15–27.

Kussorow, Adrie. 2004. *American individualisms: Child Rearing and Social Class in Three Neighborhoods*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lamont, Michele. 2000. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lareau, Annette. 2000. *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education*. Lanham, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.

—————. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Linkon, Sherry L. 1999. *Teaching Working Class*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Lodewyk, Ken R., Phillip H. Winne, and Diane L. Jamieson-Noel. 2009. "Implications of TaskStructure on Self-regulated Learning and Achievement." *Educational Psychology*, *29*:1–25.

Luttrell, Wendy. 1989. "Working-Class Women's Ways of Knowing: Effects of Gender, Race, and Class." *Sociology of Education 62*:33–46.

—————. 1997. *Schoolsmart and Motherwise: Working-Class Women's Identity and Schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Martin, Jack. 2004. "The Educational Inadequacy of Conceptions of Self in Educational Psychology." *Interchange 35*:185–208.

—————, and Ann-Marie McLellan. 2008. "The Educational Psychology of Self-Regulation: A Conceptual and Critical Analysis." *Studies in the Philosophy of Education 27*:433–448.

Martinez-Pons, Manuel. 2002. "Parental Influences on Children's Academic Self-Regulatory Development." *Theory Into Practice 41*:126–131.

Mattanah, Jonathon F., Michael W. Pratt, Phillip A. Cowan, and Cynthia P. Cowan. 2005. "Authoritative Parenting, Parental Scaffolding of Long-Division Mathematics, and Children's Academic Competence in Fourth Grade." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology 26*:85–106.

McCaslin, Mary and Heide L. Burross. 2011. "Research on Individual Differences Within a Sociocultural Perspective: Co-Regulation and Adaptive Learning." *Teachers College Record 113*:325–349.

Murdock, Tamera B. 2000. "Incorporating Economic Context into Educational Psychology: Methodological and Conceptual Challenges." *Educational Psychologist 35*:113–124.

Neitzel, Carin. 2009. "Child Characteristics, Home Social-Contextual factors, and Children's Academic Peer Interaction Behaviors in Kindergarten." *Elementary School Journal 110*:1–23.

—————, Joyce Alexander, and Kathy Evelyn Johnson. 2008. "Children's Early Interest Based Activities in the Home and Subsequent Information Contributions and Pursuits in Kindergarten." *Journal of Educational Psychology 100*:782–797.

—————, and Anne Dopkins Stright. 2003. "Mothers' Scaffolding of Children's Problem Solving: Establishing a Foundation of Academic Self-Regulatory Competence." *Journal of Family Psychology 17*:147–159.

Nicol, David. 2007. "Laying a Foundation for Lifelong Learning: Case Studies of E-Assessment in Large 1st-Year Classes." *British Journal of Educational Technology 38*:668–678.

Olaussen, Bodil S., and Ivar Braten. 1999. "Students' Use of Strategies for Self-Regulated Learning: Cross-Cultural Perspectives." *Scandinavian Journal of Education Research 43*:409–432.

Packer, Martin J., and Jessie Goicoechea. 2000. "Sociocultural and Constructivist Theories of Learning: Ontology, not Just Epistemology." *Educational Psychologist 35*:227–241.

Patrick, Helen, and Michael Middleton. 2002. "Turning the Kaleidoscope: What We See When Self-Regulated Learning is Viewed With a Qualitative Lens." *Educational Psychologist 37*: 27–39.

Perry, Nancy. 2002. "Introduction: Using Qualitative Methods to Enrich Understandings of Self-Regulated Learning." *Educational Psychologist 37*:1–3.

—————, Carla J. Nordby, and Karen. O. VandeKamp. 2003. "Promoting Self-Regulated Reading and Writing at Home and School." *Elementary School Journal 103*:317–338.

Peshkin, Alan. 1986. *God's Choice: The Total World of a Fundamentalist Christian School*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pino-Pasternak, Deborah, David Whitebread, and Andrew Tolmie. 2010. "A Multidimensional Analysis of Parent–Child Interactions During Academic Tasks and Their Relationships With Children's Self-Regulated Learning." *Cognition and Instruction 28*: 219–272.

Pintrich, Paul R. 2000. "The Role of Goal Orientation in Self-Regulated Learning." Pp. 452–502 in *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. Edited by Monique Boekaerts, Paul Pintrich, and Moshe Zeidner. San Diego: Academic Press.

Putnam, Richard D. 2001. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Puustinen, Minna, and Jean-François Rouet. 2009. "Learning With New Technologies: Help Seeking and Information Searching Revisited." *Computers & Education 53*:1014–1019.

Rose, Nikolas. 1996. *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power and Personhood*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

—————. 1999. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self* (2nd ed.). London: Free Associates Books.

Salonen, P., J. Lepola, & M. Vauras. (2007). "Scaffolding Interaction in Parent–Child Dyads: Multimodal Analysis of Parental Scaffolding with Task and Non-Task Oriented Children." *European Journal of Psychology of Education 22*:77–96.

Schaub, Maryellen. 2010. "Parenting for Cognitive Development from 1950 to 2000: The Institutionalization of Mass Education and the Social Construction of Parenting in the United States." *Sociology of Education 83*:46–66.

Schmeichel, Brandon, and Roy Baumeister. 2004. "Self-Regulatory Strength." Pp. 84–98 in *the Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, and Application*. Edited by Roy Baumeister and Kathleen Vohs. New York: Guilford.

Schunk, Dale H. 2005. "Self-Regulated Learning: The Educational Legacy of Paul R. Pintrich." *Educational Psychologist 40*:85–94.

—————. 2008. "Metacognition, Self-Regulation, and Self-Regulated Learning: Research Recommendations." *Educational Psychology Review 20*:463–467.

—————, and Barry J. Zimmerman. 1997. "Social Origins of Self-Regulated Learning." *Educational Psychologist 32*:195–208.

Schutz, Aaron. 2008. "Social Class and Social Action: The Middle-Class Bias of Democratic Theory in Education." *Teachers College Record 110*:405–442.

Stake, Robert E. 2005. "Qualitative Case Studies." Pp. 443–466 in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Edited by Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Strage, Amy A. 1998. "Family Context Variables and the Development of Self-Regulation in College Students." *Adolescence 33*:17–31.

Stright, Anne Dopkins, Carin Neitzel, and Kathy Garza Sears. 2001. "Instruction Begins in the Home: Relations Between Parental Instruction and Children's Self-Regulation in the Classroom." *Journal of Educational Psychology 93*:456–466.

Stright, Anne Dopkins, Carin Neitzel, Kathy Garza Sears, and L. Hoke-Sinex. 2001. "The Relations Between Five Aspects of Parental Scaffolding and Children's Academic Self-Regulatory Behaviors." *Journal of Educational Psychology 93*:456–466

Strage, Amy A. 1998. "Family Context Variables and the Development of Self-Regulation in College Students." *Adolescence 33*:17–31.

Swalander, Lena, and Karin Taube. 2007. "Influences of Family Based Prerequisites, Reading Attitude, and Self-Regulation on Reading Ability." *Contemporary Educational Psychology 32*: 206–230.

Volet, Simone, Marja Vauras, and Pekka Salonen. 2009. "Self- and Social Regulation in Learning Contexts: An Integrative Perspective." *Educational Psychologist 44*:215–226.

Warren, Jennifer R., Michael L. Hecht, Eura Jung, Lynette Kvasny, and Mae G. Henderson. 2010. "African American Ethnic and Class-Based Identities on the World Wide Web: Moderating the Effects of Self-Perceived Information Seeking/Finding and Web Self-Efficacy." *Communication Research 37*:674–702.

Whipp, Joan L., and Stephannie Chiarelli. 2004. "Self-Regulation in a Web-Based Course: A Case Study." *Educational Technology Research and Development 52*:5–22.

Winne, Philip H. 2005. "A Perspective on State-of-the-Art Research on Self-Regulated Learning." *Instructional Science 33*:559–565.

—————. 2006. "How Software Technologies Can Improve Research on Learning and Bolster School Reform." *Educational Psychologist 41*:5–17.

Xu, Jianzhong, and Lyn Corno. 2003. "Family Help and Homework Management Reported by Middle School Students." *Elementary School Journal 103*:503–518.

Xu, Jianzhong, and Lyn Corno. 2006. "Gender, Family Help, and Homework Management Reported by Middle School Students." *Journal of Research in Rural Education 21*:1–13.

Xu, Min, Susan N. Kushnner Benson, Renee Mudrey-Camino, and Richard P. Steiner. 2010. "The Relationship Between Parental Involvement, Self-Regulated Learning, and Reading Achievement of Fifth Graders: A Path Analysis Using the ECLS-K Database." *Social Psychology of Education 13*:237–269.

Zimmerman, Barry J. 1989. "A Social Cognitive View of Self-Regulated Academic Learning." *Journal of Educational Psychology 81*:329–339.

—————. 1998. "Developing Self-Fulfilling Cycles of Academic Regulation: An Analysis of Exemplary Instructional Models." Pp. 1–19 in *Self-Regulated Learning: From Teaching to Self-Reflective Practice*. Edited by Dale Schunk and Barry Zimmerman. New York: Guilford.

—————. 2000. "Attaining Self-Regulation: A Social Cognitive Perspective." Pp. 13–41 in *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. Edited by Monique Boekaerts, Paul Pintrich, and Moshe Zeidner. San Diego: Academic Press.

—————, Sebastian Bonner, and Robert Kovach. 1996. *Developing Self-Regulated Learners: Beyond Achievement to Self-Efficacy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.