Researchers have concluded that while most administrators would like to involve families, many do not know how to build partnerships and are fearful of trying.

ENHANCING FAMILY–SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS: An Administrator's Role

**Mary DeLuccie and Sally Yahnke
and Janice R. Wissman**

A distraught parent calls her child's former Head Start teacher and tells her of an experience she had the evening before at her son's first grade Open House. "In front of a group of other parents and children," she says, "the teacher told me and my son that he was not ready for school because he didn't bring two notebooks with him the first day. She didn't give me a chance to explain that the school box we received through social services only contained one notebook, and I couldn't afford to buy a second one yet. I'm so mad and embarrassed that I really don't care if my son even goes to school. I know I'm not going back. This teacher sure doesn't care about me or my son—not the way you did."

This may not be an isolated incident. "The sad fact is that in many instances parents don't feel as if we welcome them in school" according to Anthony Geiger, past President of the National Education Association (Education Daily, 1994). Yet, schools that help families feel welcome and show them how to improve learning at home are likely to have more support from parents and more highly motivated students (Epstein, 1991).

Mary DeLuccie is an Assistant Professor and Coordinator of Early Childhood Education in the School of Family Studies and Human Services, College of Human Ecology at Kansas State University.

Sally Yahnke is an Assistant Professor of Family and Consumer Sciences Education in the Department of Secondary Education, College of Education at Kansas State University.

Janice R. Wissman is Associate Professor and Associate Dean of the College of Education at Kansas State University.

Observations from Research

A significant body of research has documented the importance of parent involvement in their child's educational experiences. In a thorough review of the research, Meier (1978) reported benefits for both parents and children achieved through parent participation in the child's education. Parents who participated in their child's early education program exhibited a greater sensitivity to their children's emotional, social, and intellectual development and needs; higher levels of acceptance and understanding of their child as an individual; greater enjoyment in rearing their child; demonstrated more warmth and affection in childrearing; used less restrictive language; and, appealed to children through encouragement and reasoning rather than demands and threats. Correspondingly, children with involved parents were reported to be more aware and responsive; better able to solve problems; and, more advanced in language, social, emotional and cognitive development than other children.

Children have also been described as more well-behaved and more diligent in their attempts to learn (Lyons, Robbins, & Smith, 1983), earning better grades, having higher homework completion rates, holding more positive behavior and attitudes, and enrolling in post-secondary education at higher rates (Henderson & Berla, 1994) when parents participated in their child's school activities.

Although most of the studies of parent involvement have focused on parents and younger children, the benefits of involvement extend far beyond the preschool and elementary years (Henderson, 1987). Research has shown that factors that parents can control—student absenteeism, accessibility of reading materials in the home, and extent of television viewing —account for nearly 90% of the difference in the average state-by-state performance of eighth-graders' mathematics test scores among 37 states and the District of Columbia (Barton & Coley, 1992).

Nearly twenty years ago, a Gallup (1979) poll assessed the relationships among parents, communities, and schools. The recommendations for improving these relationships by enhancing communication, offering more parent–teacher conferences, inviting parents and other community members to volunteer in the schools, and planning special community-wide occasions are still valid today. And, more than decade after the "Nation at Risk" report stressed the vital role that parents play in their children's development, parent–school partnerships still haven't received the attention merited (U. S. Department of Education, 1994). More recently, an eighth National Education Goal was added to the Goals 2000 project: By the Year 2000 . . . every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.

The importance of effective linkages of home and school has prompted professional organizations as well as the U.S. Department of Education to promote home–school collaboration. According to the Association of Childhood Education International, "We believe that teachers and parents need to establish a stronger bond with one another. . . . Closer contact between parents and teachers will give each a more complete picture of the child's abilities and improve consistency in working toward desired goals. Most important perhaps, the child will identify both the school and the home as places to learn, and parents and teachers as sources of learning" (Urmansky, 1983, pp. 263–4).

The U.S. Department of Education's book 'What Works' emphasizes a curriculum for the home, specifically identifying things parents can do at home to help their children succeed in school. It states: "Conversation is important. Children learn to read, reason, and understand things better when their parents read, talk and listen to them; tell them stories, play games, share hobbies; and discuss the news, television programs, and

special events" (U. S. Department of Education, 1986, p. 7). The report continues that enrichment of the home environment can occur through the provision of books, a special place for studying, observing a daily routine for meals, bedtime, and homework, and monitoring the child's use of time. According to the report, parents can stay informed about their children's lives at school by discussing what happens at school, helping children meet school deadlines, and talking with children about school issues.

The NASBE Early Childhood Education Task Force (1988) emphasizes that partnerships with parents are multilateral relationships in which both teachers and parents share information in a reciprocal fashion. "Only through a sincere respect for the parental role can teachers begin to see parents as a source of support for their work and will some parents overcome the suspicion and resistance to approaching educators that they may have developed from their own school experiences" (p. 19). They recommend promoting an environment where parents are valued as essential partners in education; enhancing parents' self-esteem through positive school interactions; and, assuring opportunities and access for parents to volunteer and observe in the classroom.

Parent involvement in education is not a new trend. Our public school system was founded by parents and civic minded allies in community and national leadership positions. Preparing educated children able to build and maintain a strong society and providing education for all children, even those of poor immigrant families, were early goals of public education. Not only were these early schools developed by parents, they were run by local community school boards consisting of lay people. Yet only recently has contemporary parent involvement practice expanded to include parent participation in school planning and governance, and in parent education programs, reflecting the trend toward more interactive forms of parent involvement, in which parents both initiate school policy and receive school services (Murphy, 1991).

The legal mandate for parent participation in their children's education became clear with the passage of Public Law 94–142 which required parental input and approval in the development of Individualized Education Plans for special education students. In 1986, P.L. 99-457 provided incentive grants to states to develop early intervention programs for children aged 0–3 years with special needs. An interdisciplinary team, including parents, is required to provide individualized family service plans (Heward & Orlansky, 1988).

This broadened focus on the family's role in a child's education acknowledges that the child's development can be affected both directly and indirectly by what happens outside the school. Bronfenbrenner's (1989) ecological framework considers children's environments as nested within interconnected settings which in turn are embedded in increasingly larger contexts. In this perspective, relationships across children's settings (e.g., home, school) and even settings not directly experienced by the child (e.g., parent's workplace) are important influences on child development. The model postulates that all these settings are nested within the larger cultural milieu. Increasingly, the schools are acknowledging the potential impact of these multiple, connected systems on children's development. Schools are now becoming more integrated into communities (e.g., community resource centers by providing access to health clinics, child care, and parenting programs). It is not uncommon for schools to refer students and their families to social service agencies when external factors affect a child's ability to learn in school.

Relying on theory and their own professional experiences, teachers are calling for more parental involvement. Many educators have identified greater parental involvement as the number one priority for improving education (Chira, 1993). In a survey of more than 21,000 elementary and secondary teachers, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1988), 90% of the respondents felt that they received little parent support and that the lack of support contributed to students' poor performances. Teachers reported a desire for parents to attend parent–teacher conferences, supervise homework, stress the importance of education to their children, read to children frequently, take their children on outings to cultural facilities and museums, visit the classroom, and volunteer for school activities.

In the Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher (Harris, 1987), a randomly selected sample of more than 1,000 teachers and 2,000 parents recognized the need for home–school partnerships. Three-fourths of the teachers wanted parents to be more involved with their child's school activities and nearly the same number of parents reported wanting to be more involved in their child's education. In this research, higher SES parents, those with some college education and parents having elementary school-aged children, reported the highest level of involvement with their children's school. Inner-city parents, single parents, and parents of secondary school children desired a more active role in school but felt they did not receive enough attention from the schools. Overall results showed a decrease in parent involvement in their child's school as children progressed from elementary to secondary schools. There was a concomitant rise in levels of parent dissatisfaction about the amount of contact they had with the schools. Illustratively 60% of the parents, especially low income and minority parents, expressed interest in the development of newsletters and hotlines to keep them informed about the school and children's homework. Yet fewer than half of the teachers believed these strategies were helpful. According to Harris, "home–school links strongly affect teachers' job satisfaction, and job satisfaction strongly impacts on the likelihood of staying in or leaving the profession" (p. 1).

Parents also benefit from being involved in their child's education. Involved parents develop a greater appreciation for their role in their child's education, a heightened sense of self-esteem, stronger social networks, and even the desire to continue their own education. They also come to understand more about their schools and teaching and learning in general (Henderson & Berla, 1994).

Research shows that, regardless of race, class, or educational background, parents believe their children will benefit from their involvement with the children's schools (Martilla & Kiley, 1995). It has also been demonstrated that school practices are more influential than family characteristics (e.g., parental education, socioeconomic status, marital status, family size, or student grade level) in determining whether or not parents get involved (Dauber & Epstein, 1993). Nevertheless for many reasons (Finders & Lewis, 1994) most parents do not regularly participate in school activities, communicate regularly with teachers, or attend parent–teacher conferences.

Today, fewer than 70% of the young people in the United States graduate from high school; minority children have even lower graduation rates (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny, & Pardo, 1992). Furthermore, many children who do complete high school may not be able to read beyond the eighth grade level (Kozol, 1991). While the reasons for such outcomes are varied, it is certain that parents and teachers working separately will not be able to solve the problems.

Parents know their children intimately and have much valuable information to share with teachers. Teachers are knowledgeable about child development and have experiences with children which makes them important resources for parents. Both are primarily concerned with the optimal growth and development of the child, and this common bond makes teachers and parents important allies. Home–school collaboration is

more likely to achieve positive results when teachers bear the responsibility for developing and fostering this collaboration because parents often wait to be approached by the schools (Rotter, 1987).

Barriers to Partnerships

If parental involvement does make a difference, then why haven't partnerships to encourage this involvement been formed? There are several barriers to the development of parental involvement in school, many relating to aspects of modern life. Shartrand, Kreider, & Erickson–Warfield (1994) identified the following barriers:

- **School environments may discourage parental involvement.**

    Historically, schools have placed little value on the views and participation of parents (National Task Force on School Readiness, 1991). Teachers do not systematically encourage parent participation and parents do not always participate when they are encouraged (Shartrand, Kreider, & Erickson–Warfield, 1994). This is especially problematic at the secondary level. The quality and quantity of parental involvement decreases as children get older and contacts become negative as students enter secondary school. Also, teachers do not have the time and training to develop partnerships with parents. Most teachers say that although they would like to work more with families and parents, they simply do not have the time (U.S. Department of Education, 1994).

- **Not all types of parent involvement are equally acceptable to both parents and teachers.**

    Teachers and administrators have become more comfortable with traditional parent involvement activities, such as having parents support school programs and attend meetings, while parents are more often interested in advocacy and decision making (Chavkin & Williams, 1985). Strong home–school partnerships will be further inhibited with these differing expectations.

- **Teachers and parents often have negative attitudes toward parental involvement.**

    Teachers often believe that parents are not qualified or interested in the education of their children. Historically, educators have viewed parents as the source of their children's problems (Sussell, Carr, & Hartman, 1996). In the 1880's, advocates of public education argued that public schools were necessary to counteract the negative influence of families (Ferguson and Ferguson, 1987). Parents may be intimidated by the schools and not able to help educate their children. Teachers can also be intimidated by the prospect of working with parents, especially if they lack experience and training in developing partnerships with parents.

- **Changing demographic and employment patterns may further complicate the development of strong home–school partnerships.**

    The changing student population in many of our schools may mean that parents and teachers come from different cultural and economic backgrounds therefore, making the partnership difficult from the beginning (Murphy, 1991). Also, the changing structure of today's families and the need for dual income families may mean there is less time for school involvement (Swap, 1990; Elkind, 1994).

- **There is evidence of a lack of teacher preparation to effectively involve parents.**

    Concrete skills, knowledge, and positive attitudes about parental involvement are needed for teachers to be effective in developing partnerships with parents. Few teachers come to their positions prepared to work with parents. According to a 1994 study by the Harvard Family Project, Shartrand, Kreider, & Erickson–Warfield found that the majority of state departments of education do not mention parent involvement in their teacher education certification requirements. The study also surveyed the largest teacher preparation programs in 22 (out of 51) states where parental involvement was mentioned in preservice certification requirements. The investigation revealed that in these cases, the majority of courses were traditional in definition, teaching methods and delivery.

These barriers that exist in our schools today can be eliminated if parents and schools begin to work together to provide the best educational experience for students.

Models for the Development of Partnership Programs

Educational reform has contributed to expanding the definition of parent involvement. Goals 2000 emphasized the importance of expanding these roles and encouraging the development of school and parental partnerships. Parent involvement varies depending on the community, the school, and the relationship between them. Traditionally, parents have provided children with support, supervision, and instruction at home; communicated with the school; attended parent teacher conferences and school events; and volunteered in the classroom (Epstein, 1986). Various programs have been developed to redefine the involvement or the development of partnerships with parents.

James Comer has worked to reform schools that serve poor and minority students. Comer believes for these schools to be effective, parents must play a major role in all aspects of school life (Davies, 1991). This must take place in a democratic setting with teachers, specialists, parents, and students working together to promote the social, emotional, and academic growth of students.

Based upon nearly two decades of research at Johns Hopkins University, Joyce Epstein has proposed a research-based framework of six types of parental/family involvement. This framework includes parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making and collaborating with the community. The framework helps educators develop comprehensive programs of school and family partnerships (Epstein, 1995).

Harry Levin developed an accelerated school model that sets specific achievement goals for all children to meet by the end of elementary school (Davies, 1991). The program emphasizes a comprehensive change in curriculum, instruction organization, and school management. Parents play central roles both as resource people and decision makers in Levin's model.

Don Davies (1991) has identified three common themes that have central importance to all programs developing school and parental partnerships. They are:

- **Providing success for all children.** No child should be labeled as a failure because of the social, economic, or racial characteristics of their families or communities.
- **Serving the whole child.** To develop cognitive and academic development, all facets of development (social, emotional, and physical) must be addressed by schools, families and other institutions that impact the child.
- **Sharing responsibility.** In order to promote the social and academic development of children, parents, schools and communities must work together to change their practices and relationships with one another for the best interest of children.

These themes have been addressed in programs across the country to provide the best learning opportunity for all students. They are themes that should be remembered as parents, schools, and communities begin to work together in the development of partnerships.

There is no one formula for success. Each community and school must find the connections that respond to the complexity, demographics, history, and needs of their students (Wiley, 1994). An environment needs to be created in schools where teachers and staff make parents feel like full partners who are recognized for their strengths and potential. For partnerships to work, there must be mutual time and respect developed between teachers, administrator, staff, students, parents and the community. These stakeholders in education need to develop an ongoing exchange of information, work together to reach agreement on goals and strategies, and develop shared rights and responsibilities as the partnership is developed.

The Administrator's Role

The role of administrators in the development and implementation of school–family partnerships cannot be overemphasized. Before implementing specific strategies, however, administrators first must be committed to partnerships as a way to enhance educational opportunities for all children, recognize that the development of partnerships is a process, and be proactive in removing barriers that inhibit partnerships.

Some say the way schools care about children is reflected in the way schools care about the children's families. While it is possible for a school with an excellent academic reputation to ignore families, it is also possible to find a school that involves parents and families to be academically ineffective. The former school builds barriers between teachers, parents, and children; the latter school shortchanges students' learning. A truly caring educational environment is characterized by academic excellence, positive communication, and productive interactions involving the school, family, students, and community (Epstein, 1995; U. S. Department of Education, 1994).

Administrators who think of partnerships as a process rather than a single event will be patient when assessing the results. Epstein (1995) reminds educators that positive partnerships, like other school enhancement initiatives including science, math, and reading programs, take time to develop, require periodic review, and should be continuously improved.

As previously discussed, there are a variety of barriers that inhibit positive family–school partnerships. Since many of the barriers are associated with long-standing rules and traditions, those administrators who understand the nature of change within a system (the school in this case) will have an advantage in designing strategies that address these barriers. Take, for example, two administrators who wish to increase the number of parents attending school functions. One principal who perceives that parents never pay attention to communication from school, asks teachers to send parents reminders in addition to the usual invitations. If the attendance is poor, the principal may conclude parents are apathetic and go on to use the same strategy year after year. Another principal, on the other hand, changes the event from a week-day evening to a Saturday morning, provides child care, arranges transportation, and designs a buddy system whereby parents invite other parents. Rosenthal and Sawyers (1996) describe the first example where the reminders were added to the usual action as "first-order change" in that it only appears that something different was tried while the same basic rules or methods were used. The last example is called "second-order change" or real change in that it required alteration of the rules or methods of doing things. In this case, the principal was required to recognize parents' strengths that can be tapped by being flexible with rules and methods instead of thinking of parents as having faults.

Researchers have concluded that while most administrators would like to involve families, many do not know how to go about building partnerships and are fearful of trying. Epstein (1995) describes this situation where administrators express support for partnerships without taking any action as a "rhetoric

rut." At the same time, administrators working alone cannot create lasting, comprehensive partnerships that involve families.

Partnership Strategies

One useful structure that has proved successful for planning partnerships is an Action Team for School, Family, and Community Partnerships in each school. In some schools, the Action Team is actually an "action arm" of a school council. The team is responsible for reviewing current partnerships and practices, organizing new partnerships, implementing new activities, and coordinating and evaluating partnerships. Those who have worked with action teams recommend that the team include teachers from differing grade levels, parents with children in different grade levels, an administrator, and an at-large community member. Students from different grade levels are suggested for middle and senior high school teams. At least one team member should serve on the school council, school improvement team or other such body. Overall, the Action Team serves to improve and systematize haphazard patterns of parental involvement (Epstein, 1995).

Among the various partnership strategies and programs described in the literature, Epstein's framework of six major types of involvement appears to be one of the most comprehensive partnership programs for administrators to consider. Following a general description of each type of involvement, we have included examples of practice and implementation challenges.

- *Parent Education* is built upon the premise that schools must provide families with information about topics such as parenting approaches, nutrition, health, safety, discipline and guidance. Some schools offer parent education through workshops, information-sharing groups, and video tapes. The challenge is to provide information to all families who need it and want it and not just to those who can attend a workshop.
- *Communicating* focuses on designing effective school-to-home and home-to-school communications about school programs and student progress. Examples include conferences, notices, memos, phone calls, newsletters, open-house functions and report cards. The challenges are to develop and clarify a two-way system of communication, get rid of jargon, address language barriers, and use new technology.
- *Volunteering* emphasizes recruiting and organizing assistance and support. Classroom volunteer programs and mentoring programs for students and other parents are examples. The challenges are to change the definition of volunteers to mean anyone who supports student goals or school learning any time, any place, and make hours flexible for volunteers who work during school days.
- *Learning at Home* focuses on providing information and ideas to families about how to help children at home with learning activities. Examples that encourage students and families to talk about school work at home include family math programs, interactive homework, and long-term projects. The challenge is to design a regular schedule of interactive work that encourages students and families to talk about homework.
- *Decision Making* involves parents in school decision making. Some schools have parent–teacher–student organizations, school advisory councils, or school site-based improvement teams. The challenge is to include students and parents from all racial, ethnic, geographic, and socioeconomic groups.
- *Collaborating with Community* focuses on identification and integration of resources and services from the community to strengthen school programs, family practices,

and student learning and development. Sample practices include students, families, and schools providing service to the community. The challenges are to solve turf problems, find funding sources and staff, locate places for collaborative activities and inform families of community programs for all students (Epstein, 1995; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1992).

Summary

Effective schools are characterized by strong leadership, an emphasis on academics, ongoing evaluation, a safe school climate and positive teacher–child relationships (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny & Pardo, 1992). Yet, good home–school relations are also a primary ingredient of high quality schools (Epstein, 1995). A true partnership is "an association between a family and one or more professionals who function collaboratively using agreed upon roles in pursuit of a joint interest or a common goal" (Dunst & Paget, 1991, p. 25). The relationship is collaborative, with parent and teacher providing expertise; the partnership is based on mutual respect and involves complete sharing of information; and the powers of the partnership and the focus of decision-making are clear from the onset. The challenge is for administrators to create a climate that welcomes families into the school.

References

1. Barton, P. E., & Coley, R. J. (1992). *America's smallest school: The family*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
2. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). *Ecological systems theory*. Annals of Child Development, Vol. 6 (pp. 187–249). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
3. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). *The conditions of teaching*. Princeton, NJ: Author.
4. Chavkin, N. F., & Williams, D. L. (1985). *Parent involvement in education. Final report, December 1984–November 1985*. Austin, TX: Southwest Education Development Laboratory.
5. Chira, S. (1993, June 23). What do teachers want most? Help from parents. *The New York Times*, p. 7.
6. Dauber, S. L., & Epstein, J. L. (1993). Parents' attitudes and practices of involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. In N. Chavkin (Ed.), *Families and schools in a pluralistic society* (pp. 53–72). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
7. Davies, D. (1991). Schools reaching out. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(5), 376–382.
8. Dunst, C. J., & Paget, K. D. (1991). Parent professional partnerships and family empowerment. In M. Find (Ed.), *Collaboration with parents of exceptional children*. Brandon, VT: Clinical Psychology Publishing Company.
9. Elkind, D. (1994). *Ties that stress: The new family imbalance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
10. Epstein, J. L. (1995). School-family-community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(9), 701–712.
11. Epstein, J. L. (1991). Effects on student achievement of teacher practices of parent involvement. In S. Silvern (Ed.), *Advances in reading/language research. Vol. 5. Literacy through family, community, and school interaction*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
12. Epstein, J. L. (1986). Parents' reaction to teacher practices of parent involvement. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*, 277–294.
13. Ferguson, P. M., & Ferguson, D. L. (1987). Parents and professionals. In P. Knoblock (Ed.), *Understanding exceptional children and youth* (pp. 346–391). Boston: Little, Brown.
14. Finders, M., & Lewis, C. (1994). Why don't parents come to school? *Educational Leadership, 51*(8), 50–54.
15. Gallup, G. H. (1979, September). The eleventh annual Gallup poll of the public attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 31–45.
16. Garbarino, J., Dubrow, N., Kostelny, K., & Pardo, C. (1992). *Children in danger*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.
17. Harris, L., and Associates (1987). *The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American teacher: Strengthening links between home and school*. New York: Author.
18. Henderson, A. T. (1987). *The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves student achievement. An annotated bibliography*. (Report No. ISBN 0-934460-28-0). Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 199)
19. Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*. Washington, DC: National Committee for Citizens in Education.
20. Heward, W. L., & Orlansky, M. D. (1988). *Exceptional children* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
21. Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown.
22. Lyons, P., Robbins, A., & Smith, A. (1983). *Involving parents in schools: A handbook for participation*. Ypsilanti, MI: The High Scope Press.
23. Martilla & Kiley, Inc. (1995). *A study of the attitudes among the parents of primary-school children*. Boston: Martilla & Kiley, Inc.
24. Meier, J. H. (1978). *Found: Long term gains from early intervention*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
25. Murphy, J. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomenon*. New York: Teachers College Press.
26. NASBE. (1988). *Right from the start: The report of the NASBE Task Force on Early Childhood Education*. Alexandria, VA: NASBE.
27. National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1992, June). School and family partnerships. *The Practitioner: A Newsletter for the On-Line Administrator, 28*(4), 1–8. (ISSN 0912-6160).
28. National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
29. NEA kicks off effort to get parents involved in school. (1994, July 11). *Education Daily*.
30. Rosenthal, D. M., & Sawyers, J. Y. (1996, Summer). Building successful home/school partnerships: Strategies for parent support and involvement. *Childhood Education*, 194–200.
31. Rotter, J. C. (1987). *Parent–teacher conferencing: What research says to the teacher*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
32. Schweinhart, L. J., & Weikart, D. P. (1986). Early childhood development programs: A public investment opportunity. *Educational Leadership, 44*(3), 11.
33. Shartrand, A., Kreider, H., & Erickson–Warfield, M. (1994). *Preparing teachers to involve parents: A national survey of teacher education programs*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

ERRATA. Page #6 missing.