

Family-school liaisons in Cyprus: an investigation of families' perspectives and needs

Loizos Symeou

Introduction

The recognition that families are important in influencing their children's educational achievement has stimulated major efforts to improve family-school relationships in educational systems. Hence, nowadays, the family is considered a significant stakeholder in school enterprises.

The rubrics 'parental involvement' and 'parental participation' in schools have often been used by international literature interchangeably in order to describe a broad spectrum of family-school contacts and relationships. Nonetheless, the two terms embed two different concepts. Parental 'involvement' refers to procedures which allow parents to have a role in what is happening in the school, but where the nature and extent of this role is predetermined by the professional staff of the school, the teachers. In this case, the parents' role is confined to spectators of events or activities which schools organize for parents (Davies & Johnson, 1996; Tomlinson, 1991), or of activities that can be described as 'parental duties' (Vining, 1997) or 'voluntary labour' (Reeve, 1993). Parental 'involvement' practices are maintained to be concerned mainly with the well-being of the parent's own child (Munn, 1993). The term 'participation' signals a shift to a broader and different range of relationships between families and schools in both content and intent. In this case, both parties share responsibility and authority on a continuous basis. This shift places parents explicitly within

the collective well-being of the whole school and all the children in it (Munn, 1993). It is more likely to presuppose a revitalization of the administration and operation of schooling through procedures that allow parents to take an active part and full-scale participation in school governorship and decision-making at all educational levels (Soliman, 1995; Stapes & Morris, 1993). When family-school relationships reach the level of participation, one can refer to a 'partnership' (Martin, Ranson, & Tall, 1997).

Despite the vivid debate among international researchers in relation to the outcomes of relative innovations, there is currently a widely accepted agreement that a school culture which supports active family engagement in the school can bring about specific improvements in pupils' performance, behavior and motivation, general teacher functioning, and parental confidence and self-efficacy (Becker & Epstein, 1982; Henderson, 1987; Hoover-Dempsey, et al., 1987; Epstein, 1986; 1987; 1992; Reeve, 1993; Bourmina, 1995; Connors & Epstein, 1995; Benito & Filp, 1996; Davies & Johnson, 1996; Krumm, 1996). Strong family-school liaisons have also been suggested to develop a general family and community support for the schools (Epstein, 1992; Townsend, 1995) and have been cited as one of the prerequisites for school effectiveness (Hopkins, Ainscow, & West, 1994; O'Connor, 1994; Sammons, Hillman, Mortimore, 1995; Ainley, 1995; Coleman, 1998; Pasiardis, 1998).

In Cyprus, a country with a highly centralized educational system, families and schools seem to be largely operating independently from each other and keeping their communication to a minimum. Indicative of the extent of the paucity of substantial family-school liaisons is the lack of any recent relative legislative action.

Correspondingly, the available literature on the existing relationships between schools and families and the boundaries of family involvement in schools is still extremely limited. Moreover, the attitudes of families concerning this issue have not yet been explored in depth.

The purpose of the study

This paper presents the findings of a nation-wide study, which aimed at investigating Cypriot families' perspectives as far as the ways family-school nexuses have been set up in the state primary education of Cyprus, and whether, and if so how, these should be transformed.

Additionally, it draws conclusions on differences in practices of different school settings and differences in the attitudes of the sub-groups comprising families. Finally, the paper tries to generate a framework for future innovations in the field of family-school liaisons in Cyprus.

Addressing these issues is extremely important, due to paucity of previous research in the area of family-school liaisons Cyprus. A nation-wide study which would provide generalisable results, could underpin broader theoretical considerations and initiate debate on the issue, thus render it a question valid for further research and future investigations. This may apply particularly now that educational reforms are an issue of vivid debate in Cyprus and that the educational status quo of the country might be influenced by the likelihood of Cyprus's full membership in the European Union. Investigating families' thoughts and understandings, and revealing their 'cultural models' in relation to the area would be of extreme significance for introducing any relevant innovation and change (Fullan, 1991).

The second aspect of the research's importance is broader. At an international level, where family-school relations appear prominently on the agendas of policy-makers, professionals and parents, the outcomes of this research would constitute a reference for the current realities concerning the issue in Cyprus. As Davies and Johnson (1996) suggest, such attempts contribute to the international exchange of ideas and practices in the area across national boundaries.

Methodology

In order to achieve the research objectives and achieve generalisable results, a survey was conducted among a random sample of the families of Cyprus state funded primary schools. The survey took place from March to May 2000. The selection of the sample was based on a multi-staged proportionate stratified process. A total of 348 family members (0.58% of the families' population having a child at a state primary school) from 173 schools (out of an overall population of 343 Cyprus state primary schools) participated in the research.

For the research's purposes, a questionnaire was constructed. This was pre-tested and piloted before the actual survey took place. The research device enquired in its first section the respondents' demographic characteristics. Its second section was asking the respondents to indicate the frequency specific practices aiming at linking families with their child's school were put into action in their school during the school-year 1999-2000, whereas the third section inquired whether respondents would actually like the respective practices to be further pursued. Questions in the latter two sections were presented in a structured, pre-coded format with ordinal coding. A question followed asking the respondents to indicate the most important practice/s of all the practices they were previously presented. The questionnaire's last section was an open-ended question inviting respondents to express comments and further ideas in relation to family-school relationships. The last two

questions served mostly for checking and assuring data reliability. The collected quantitative data was analyzed with the statistical package SPSS. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were derived from the quantitative analysis, whereas qualitative analysis was used to analyze the content of the last open-ended question.

Results

a. Answers to the first research question: Current realities

Respondents' statements on the most frequent practices currently established to link families with their child's school underwent factor analysis in an attempt to group and categorize these practices. Seven factors were extracted, explaining 63% of the variance and a mean score for each factor was calculated. Table 1 presents a breakdown of the seven factors.

The first factor/grouping of practices, 'All families formal outreach' practices, consists of formal practices the school initiates and aim at informing families about its function, demonstrating its work and training families on school-related issues in a formal way. The second grouping, 'Teacher-family close contact' practices, consisted of practices bringing families in close contact with their child's teacher in a mode which allowed the establishment of more informal relationships. The third and sixth grouping of practices consisted of practices aiming at providing families with oral information about their specific child, the former in relation to the child's working habits and attitudes, and the latter in relation to the child's in-school attainment. The fourth grouping, 'Families' voice' practices, is comprised of practices that might introduce a participatory mode in family-school liaisons and put across family's needs and priorities. 'Written informing' grouping consists of practices established by the teachers aiming at providing written information to families about their specific child, the class or

the schoolwork. Finally, 'Labour' practices consist of practices that demand families to offer their voluntary labour in mundane school jobs.

As indicated by the mean score for the above factors, the factors that received the highest means were both groupings relating to the school providing oral information to the families about their specific child. These were followed by 'All families formal outreach' practices, whereas the remaining factors/groupings received very low means, in particular 'Teacher-parent close contact' and 'Labour' practices.

In order to investigate differences in the ways the extracted groupings are being currently set up in different school and class settings, analysis of variance was conducted. This revealed a number of significant differences. Families in rural schools were found to experience significantly more close contact with teachers in comparison to families in urban and semi-urban areas (factor 2: $f=1,58$, $df=254$, $p=0,001$), to receive more oral information about their child's studying habits (factor 3: $f=2,00$, $df=253$, $p=0,027$), to receive more written information (factor 5: $f=3,06$, $df=252$, $p=0,021$), and to be invited more often to offer their voluntary labour (factor 7: $f=19,23$, $df=248$, $p=0,005$). Families of schools with a small number of pupils, i.e. with less than 80 pupils, were found to experience significantly more teacher close contact than in larger schools (factor 2: $f=4,42$, $df=256$, $p=0,013$), to have their voice heard more (factor 4: $f=4,90$, $df=252$, $p=0,008$), and to be more often invited to offer labour in their child's school (factor 7: $f=15,73$, $df=250$, $p=0,00$). Additionally, families in schools with a low SES and low educational background catchments area were found to experience statistically more frequent invitations to offer their voluntary labour (factor 7) in comparison to schools with more middle and high class families ($f=15,97$, $df=244$, $p=0,049$) and secondary and tertiary educational background families ($f=8,08$, $df=241$, $p=0,027$), respectively.

Table 1 - Factors/Groupings of currently established practices (loadings)

Statement:	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th
During the current school year my child's teachers or school have...	All families formal outreach	Teacher-family close contact	Oral informing for a specific child (1)	Families' voice	Written informing	Oral informing for a specific child (2)	Labour
B13: Organized a workshop/seminar on parenting skills	0,81						
B12: Organized a workshop/seminar on how parents should help their child with their schooling	0,74						
B14: Invited me to events or gatherings during the afternoon or the evening	0,67						
B11: Invited me to a morning event in the school at which all school families were invited	0,63						
B6: Sent home a letter or memo concerning all families	0,43						
B9: Invited me to help during a lesson in the child's classroom		0,77					
B18: The teacher phoned us at home		0,65					
B17: The teacher visited us at home		0,57					
B8: Invited me to attend a lesson in the child's classroom as a viewer		0,53					
B10: Invited me to a morning event in the child's classroom		0,40					
B2: Provided me with oral information on how children should study at home			0,81				
B1: Provided me with oral information on how children should work at school			0,80				
B21: Asked families to participate in committees which deal with issues that concern the school (apart from the PA)				0,70			
B22: Asked families to inform the school about their child's needs				0,67			
B5: Sent me a report informing me about the child's progress and needs					0,68		

Statement:	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th
During the current school year my child's teachers or school have...	All families formal outreach	Teacher-family close contact	Oral informing for a specific child (1)	Families' voice	Written informing	Oral informing for a specific child (2)	Labour
B20: Sent us a report on the specific aims of a particular teaching period					0,67		
B19: Sent us a newsletter or a bulletin					0,57		
B7: Sent home a notice concerning the child when there was a need					0,41		
B4: Informed me when we met about the child's behavior at school						0,82	
B3: Informed me when we met about the child's achievement						0,76	
B16: Asked families to assist with student supervision on class trips, performances, or sport events							0,81
B15: Asked families to assist with school maintenance							0,73
Mean*	1,20	0,28	1,63	0,32	0,41	2,35	0,25
Standard Deviation	0,70	0,42	1,00	0,59	0,57	0,69	0,55
Reliability Alpha	0,76	0,66	0,89	0,58	0,62	0,73	0,58
% of variance	12,03	9,59	9,30	9,11	8,39	7,89	7,11

*Scale: 0=Never, 1=Once or twice, 2=Sometimes, 3=Many times

As far as the pupils' class-level, significant differences were found in the case of factor 3, namely the oral information teachers provide on pupils' studying habits. It was revealed that families having a child in the first two grades tend to receive significantly more such information in comparison to families with a child at the upper classes ($f=5,71$, $df=255$, $p=0,004$). The child's class size was also found to be a significant variant. Teachers of classes with a large number of pupils, (i.e. more than 25), in comparison to teachers of classes with a smaller number of pupils seem to establish less contact with families (factor 2: $f=12,00$, $df=253$, $p=0,00$), to provide less oral information to families about their

child's studying habits (factor 3: $f=3,87$, $df=253$, $p=0,02$), to send families less written information (factor 5: $f=21,47$, $df=251$, $p=0,00$), and to involve them less in voluntary labour activities (factor 7: $f=9,01$, $df=249$, $p=0,00$).

Another variable which was found to introduce differences in the ways different families were experiencing their relationships with their child's school was whether or not the family was participating in the school's Parents' Association (PA). T-test analysis revealed that family's membership in the school's PA signaled significantly more experience of close contact with their child's teacher (factor 2: $f=9,73$,

df=249, p=0,004), more opportunities of having their voice heard (factor 4: f=14,87, df=245, p=0,05), and more often invitations to offer their voluntary labour (factor 7: f=17,90, df=244, p=0,011).

b. Answers to the second research question: Attitudes toward future changes

Families' responses to whether they would like to see a further pursuit of these practices underwent also factor analysis. Once more, a mean score for each factor was calculated in an attempt to group the statements and understand more families' priorities for future changes. Five factors were extracted, explaining 58,61% of the variance (Table 2).

Factor 1, 'Families' enculturation' practices, consisted of practices initiated by the school and aiming at training and demonstrating families' how to cultivate habits that would align families'

work with the work done at school. The second factor contained practices that could be classified as those involving parents with the 'Class's/school's collective well-being', whereas the third comprises practices that signal a more informal contact among the two agents. The next factor was comprised by 'Oral information for the family's specific child' practices and the last factor was extracted from 'Direct line information for the family's specific child' practices.

The mean score to these factors reveals that families desire all the above groupings of practices to be further pursued in a high degree. Their main concern, though, is to be provided with a direct line of information concerning their own child. Families seem additionally to embrace practices initiated by the schools that aim their 'school' enculturation, so that they can be able to align their efforts to enhance their child's schooling with the school's efforts.

Table 2 - Attitudes towards changes in practices (loadings)

<i>Statement:</i>	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
My child's school should...more in comparison with what they do now	Families' enculturation	Class/school collective well-being	Informal contact	Oral information for a specific child	Direct line information for a specific child
C2: Explain to me when we meet the way children should work at home	0,78				
C1: Explain to me when we meet the way children should work at school	0,77				
C13: Organize training workshops/seminars for the parents on parenting skills	0,76				
C12: Organize training workshops/seminars for the parents on how parents should help their child with their schooling	0,68				
C21: Send to pupils' homes a report on the specific aims of a particular teaching period	0,53				
C8: Invite me to attend a lesson in the child's class as a viewer	0,50				
C9: Invite me to help during a lesson in the child's classroom	0,49				

<i>Statement:</i>	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
My child's school should...more in comparison with what they do now	Families' enculturation	Class/school collective well-being	Informal contact	Oral information for a specific child	Direct line information for a specific child
C15: Ask families to assist with school maintenance		0,73			
C20: Send home a classroom newsletter or a bulletin		0,70			
C22: Ask families to participate in committees which deal with issues that concern the school		0,65			
C14: Organize events or gatherings during the afternoon or the evening		0,60			
C24: Conduct research to explore families' perceptions of the school		0,55			
C10: Organize morning events or gatherings for the class's parents in the child's classroom		0,50			
C18: The teacher to come to our home to pay a visit			0,72		
C17: Ask families to assist without being paid with the supervision of students who remain at school until their parents come to pick them up			0,63		
C16: Ask families to assist with student supervision on class trips, student performances, or sport events			0,57		
C11: Organize morning events or gatherings in the school for all school families			0,50		
C6: Send me home notices concerning all the families			0,49		
C4: To provide me with oral information on the child's behavior at school				0,83	
C3: To provide me with oral information on the child's school achievements				0,82	
C19: The teacher to phone me in order to inform me about something that concerns the child					0,78
C7: Send me home a notice concerning the child when there is a need					0,68
C5: Send me reports informing me about the child's progress and needs					0,55
Mean*	1,65	1,54	1,33	1,19	1,66
Standard Deviation	0,37	0,41	0,48	0,36	0,41
Reliability Alpha	0,77	0,71	0,69	0,79	0,56
% of variance	27,74	11,78	6,92	6,71	5,43

* Scale: 0=Less than now/Not at all, 1=As now, 2=More than now

The above findings were validated by the analysis of the responses to the question asking families to identify the most important of the practices they were presented in Section 3. The practices found to be comprising the two most significant groupings described above were also found to be the most highly valued by families, alongside with practices comprising the 'Oral information for a specific child' grouping. The latter, even though received the lowest mean score of all the groupings of practices considered as needed to be further pursued, were the practices rated more highly in terms of importance to families, thus indicating that currently this is succeeded at a high and satisfactory degree.

Investigation of differences in attitudes towards future changes between sub samples of the families' population revealed variance in priorities only in one case between low SES families and high and middle class families. More particularly, analysis of variance suggested that low SES families demand more than families with a higher status to receive oral information about their own child's schooling (factor 4: $f=18,69$, $df=254$, $p=0,015$).

Discussion

The main conclusion of the data analysis is that currently implemented practices trying to link families and schools in Cyprus are restricted, a finding that has been also demonstrated by small-scale relevant Cyprus research studies (Georgiou, 1996; 1998; Phtiaka, 1994; 1996; 1998). These were found to be limited mainly to practices aiming at providing families information about their own child, about the schools' function and how families can support the school's work. Conclusively, primary schools in Cyprus appear currently to be establishing procedures, practices and activities, which they, themselves, initiate and predetermined, what has been claimed to be parental 'involvement' and not 'participation' (Tomlinson, 1991). At the same time, practices that might bring families in close contact with

professionals or of a non-professional-like nature are rarely established.

Additionally, it can be claimed that families tend to express a desire for a variety of practices to be pursued more, thus indicating a gap between their needs and their schools' programmes and practices. Such a gap between established practices and families individual beliefs is identified by both international (Cutright, 1994; Epstein & Dauber, 1991) and Cyprus literature (Georgiou, 1996; 1998).

Nonetheless, families' evaluation of specific practices aiming linking them with their child's schools and their query for modifying these relationships imply mild modes of involvement. Cypriot families – to use Munn's (1993) relevant distinction- are mainly concerned with being 'involved' in practices that secure the well-being of their own child, and not getting engaged in 'participation' practices relating to the collective well-being of the whole school and all the children in it. Findings suggesting that families in Cyprus favor their involvement in schools at 'the various aspects of school governing' (Georgiou, 1996, p.35) cannot be supported by this study. A significant conclusion of the current study is that the nature and the extent of family-school nexuses in Cyprus primary schools are likely to be related to a number of external variables. At the school-level, it appears that the school's size and its location introduce significant differences. Schools with a small pupils' population and rural schools, as opposed to bigger and non-rural schools, respectively, seem to be experiencing a more general vivid link with families, with significantly more teacher-family contacts, opportunities for exchanging information and invitations to families to offer voluntary labour. These findings might contradict international studies, which have showed that schools in urban areas use more parental involvement techniques (e.g. Epstein, 1987).

At the teacher's-level, it was found that teachers of lower grades tend to exchange more information with families than teachers of upper grades, whereas teachers of smaller classes seem to be currently linked with their pupils' families in more of a variety of ways, something that corresponds to findings outside Cyprus (Epstein & Dauber, 1991). Finally, at the family's level, the variable of being a member of the school's Parents' Association was found to have a great impact on the way a family is involved in its child's schooling. Families which were members of this association are likely to be more involved with in-school activities, namely to have more close contact with their child's teacher, to have their voice heard more and to be offering more frequently their voluntary labour. This privilege for PA's members and their own children was also demonstrated in some of the families' answers to the questionnaire's open-question. One mother who was not a member of her school's association said:

I'm concerned very much about the behavior of most of the teachers, who, due to their regular contact with children's parents who are either members of the Parents' Association or have a high-said social position, favor their children at the different school activities, even in the teaching and, thus children with more abilities are overlooked.

Related might be the findings that, while families' views as far as future changes are homogeneous, families of low SES request more oral information for their child than their counterparts (thus indicating that currently they might not be experiencing such an informing in a satisfactory degree), as also that schools in low SES catchments areas were found to invite more often families to offer their voluntary labour than schools in higher SES catchments areas. All these issues direct attention to the social inequalities to family-school liaisons described in many international studies (Epstein, 1987; Lareau,

2000; Epstein & Dauber, 1991; Finders & Lewis, 1994; Vincent, 1996).

Concluding suggestions

If the aim of schools in Cyprus is to establish stronger nexuses with families and optimally to develop a partnership in educating pupils, it is primarily required to change and reconstruct expectations and perceptions of the family and the school, in order to achieve their mutual understanding. This will be the first step towards the road of 'participation'.

This study revealed families' current constructs and models, which are prerequisites of such a change. The identification of families' needs for a direct and immediate line of information about their child's schooling, and their readiness for their 'school' enculturation and their surge for more information on pedagogical and educational issues, might be the starting point of any small or large scale innovative attempts. The fact that families appear to be more or less homogeneous in their queries dictates the wider and generalisable readiness of families for the particular changes. The school, as professional educators, planners and system managers if family involvement, or even better participation, is to occur, must be able to take this initiative to facilitate and encourage such a process.

During any such innovations, special attention should be paid to the differences currently appearing in the ways families and school are linked. Urban and larger schools, as well as professionals teaching at the upper-class levels and larger classes will need to put a stronger effort in achieving such an aim, since it appears that their circumstances hinder vividness in liaising with pupils' families. Of a more ethical consideration and attention deserves the way schools relate to families of a different SES background, and particularly the current discrepancies in the way schools relate to families which are members of the Parents' Association.

References

- Ainley, J. (1995). Parents and schools: Changing relationships. *Journal of Christian Education*. 38 (2), 33-43.
- Becker, H. J. & Epstein, J. L. (1982). *Influences on teachers' use of parent involvement at home* (Report No. 324). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Benito, C & Filp, J. (1996). The transition from home to school: A socioeconomic analysis of the benefits of an educational intervention with families and schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 25 (1), 53-65.
- Bourmina, T. (1995). Research and development on home-school relationships. *Oxford Studies in Comparative Education*. 5 (1), 143-158.
- Coleman, P. (1998). *Parent, student and teacher collaboration The power of three*. California: Corwin Press, INC.
- Connors, L. J., & Epstein, J. L. (1995). Parent and school partnerships. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 4. Applied and practical parenting* (pp. 437-458). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cutright, M. (1984, November). How wide open is the door to parent involvement in the schools? *PTA Today*, 10-11.
- Davies, D. & Johnson, V. R. (1996). Crossing boundaries: An introduction. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 25 (1), 3-7.
- Epstein, J. L. (1986). Parents' reactions to teacher practices of parent involvement. *Elementary School Journal*. 86, 227-294.
- Epstein, J. L. (1987). Parent involvement. What research says to administrators *Education and Urban Society*. 19 (2), 119-136.
- Epstein, J. L. (1992). School and family partnerships. In M. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Educational Research* (pp. 1139-1151). New York: MacMillan.
- Epstein, J. L. & Dauber, S. L. (1991). School programs and teacher practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. *The Elementary School Journal*. 91 (3), 289-306.
- Finders, M. & Lewis, C. (1994). Why some parents don't come to school. *Educational Leadership*. 51 (8), 50-54.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of education change* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Georgiou, S. N. (1996). Parental involvement in Cyprus. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 25 (1), 33-43.
- Georgiou, S. N. (1998). A study of two Cypriot school communities. *The School Community Journal*. 8 (1), 73-91.
- Henderson, A. (1987). *The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves school achievement*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Bassler, O., & Brissie, J. S. (1987). Parent involvement: Contributions of teacher efficacy, school socioeconomic status, and other school characteristics. *American Educational Research Journal*. 24, 417-435.
- Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M., & West, M., (1994). *School improvement in an era of change* (Ch.9). Great Britain: Redwood Books.
- Krumm, V. (1996). Parent involvement in Austria and Taiwan: Results of a comparative study. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 25 (1), 9-24.
- Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage. Social class and parental intervention in elementary education* (2nd ed.). Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.

- Limerick, I. B. (1989). *Community involvement in schools: A study of three Queensland schools*. Brisbane: University of Queensland. [Online]. Abstract from: Australian Education Index.
- Macbeth, A. (1989). *Involving parents: Effective parent-teacher relations*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Martin, J., Ranson, S., & Tall, G. (1997). Parents as partners in assuring the quality of schools. *Scottish Education Review*. 29 (1), 39-55.
- Munn, P. (1993). *Parents and schools: customers, managers or partners*. London: Routledge.
- O'Connor, M. (1994). *Giving parents a voice. Parental involvement in policy-making*. London: RISE.
- Pashiardis, P. (1998). Researching the characteristics of effective primary school principals in Cyprus. A qualitative approach. *Educational Management & Administration*. 26 (2), 117-130.
- Phtiaka, H. (1994). *Them and us? School and home links in Cyprus*. Paper presented at the Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (C.E.D.A.R.) International Conference. University of Warwick, 15-17 April, 1994.
- Phtiaka, H. (1996). Each to his own? Home-school relations in Cyprus. *Forum of Education*. 51, 1, 47-59.
- Phtiaka, H. (1998). 'It's their job, not ours!': Home-school relations in Cyprus. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies*. 3 (2), 19-51.
- Reeve, P. (1993). Issues in parent participation. *The Australian Administrator*. 14 (4-5), 1-11.
- Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key Characteristics of School Effectiveness*. London: Institute of Education/OFSTED.
- Soliman, I. (1995). From involvement to participation: Six levels of school-community interaction. In B. Limerick & H. Nielsen (Eds.), *School and community relations: Participation, policy and practice* (pp. 159-173). Sydney: Harcourt Brace.
- Stapes, K. & Morris, W. (1993). Parent participation revisited. In ACSA (Ed.), *The ACSA '93 collection conference papers: Curriculum in profile: Quality or Inequality'* (V. 3, pp. 1107-1119). Belconnen: ACT.
- Tomlinson, S. (1991). Home-school partnerships. In IPPR (Eds.), *Teachers and parents (Education and training paper No. 7)*. London: IPPR.
- Townsend, T. (1995). School effectiveness and school-base decision-making: Themes for Australian education in the 1990's. In B. Limerick & H. Nielsen (Eds.), *School and community relations: Participation, policy and practice* (pp. 101-115). Sydney: Harcourt Brace.
- Vincent, C. (1996). *Parents and teachers: Power and participation*. London: Falmer Press
- Vining, L. (1997). *Managing the volunteer workforce in schools*. Sydney: University of NSW.