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ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTS/FAMILIES AND STAFF IN THE MIFTANIM

Miftanim is the plural of Miftan, a Hebrew acronym for Vocational Training Scheme for Youth. The Miftanim are schemes that use a therapeutic day, with vocational and academic orientation.

This study explores the areas and levels of the involvement of parents/families in their child’s education in the Miftanim including the needs and contributions of both parents and staff to the relationship. It also explores the reasons parents are involved and the reasons staff involve the parents; who the initiators of the involvement are and in what issues; the influence of the involvement on the stakeholders, the child, the parents and the staff, the issue of benefits and harms in the involvement; the barriers to involvement of both parents and staff and the attitude of the staff towards involvement. The study ends with recommendations, presents a model for involvement in the Miftanim and suggests further research in this area.

Quantitative and qualitative methodologies were used in the study, including a survey which encompassed 17 Miftanim and two cases studies. The methods used were questionnaires, interviews and analysis of documents. There was a 71 percent response rate to the survey, and 21 participants were interviewed.

The findings of this study show that the parents are slightly involved in their child’s education, mostly by phone calls made when behavioural problems arise. Parental involvement in the Miftanim is mostly “to put out fires”. The main reason for parents to be involved is the child’s success, while the involvement is mostly initiated by staff. Involvement influences the child, the parents and the staff and it is both beneficial and harmful. Barriers to involvement, mostly found by the staff, stem from the demographic details of the parents.
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CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

Rationale
This thesis examines the relationship between the parents/family of trainees and the staff of Miftanim in Israel. Miftanim is a plural of Miftan, a Hebrew acronym for Vocational Training Scheme for Youth; the word ‘Miftan’, in Hebrew, also means threshold. The aim of the scheme is to lead to a new way/path and give new hope for the future to the at-risk children studying in the Miftanim (Youth Rehabilitation Services, 1979).

During the course of her work as a homeroom teacher, training teachers and being in charge of the children and the staff timetables, the author acted as an internal change agent in the Miftan in respect of timetables. In view of the various dilemmas and questions which arose on the issue of parental involvement, the author selected this subject for enquiry in an effort to gain further insights into the reciprocal relations that exist between the parents and the staff. This study is a pioneer in its focus on the issue of parental involvement in the Miftanim; it aims to cast light on the issue and understand it fully.

Theoretical Context

Relationships and involvement
Relationship is a state in which the educational system and the home system benefit from mutual acceptance: “Relationships are implicit contracts for the mutual exchange of psychological satisfactions” (Sergiovanni, 1995, p.39). Although there are many possible relationships that can exist between the child’s home and school, most parents see the school as the setting for their child’s education; a stepping stone to future economic and social well-being, and ascribe great significance to success in this setting (Cullingford, 1985). One demonstration of parents’ relationships with the school is their involvement.

There are numerous definitions of parental involvement, and these change and assume different guises depending on the country and culture, type of school and school policy, the character of the school administration, staff philosophy, and type of parent and student population. Involvement implies different things to different people, and is reflected in and affected by different factors:
“Family involvement practices could take into account that families—given their occupations, income, racial or ethnic background, and education access resources would develop different dispositions toward becoming involved in their children’s education.” (de Acosta, 1996, p.12)

The general definition of parental involvement is described as a changing process between the parents and the school, in which the parent’s involvement takes the form of many different activities whose purpose is to fuse the two domains (Jowett and Baginsky, 1988). There are contradictory approaches in the way schools regard parental involvement. Some view it as a nuisance and disruption of the school’s routine; others adopt a more positive stand, welcoming and encouraging parental contributions. Advocates of involvement have espoused methods and programmes for advancing greater involvement in an effort to enhance pupil achievement (Johnson and Slotnik, 1985; Noy, 1992; Goldring et al, 1995).

History of involvement

Relations between the family/parents and the educational establishment have changed over the years. Before the 1960s, no relationship existed between the school and the child’s parents. The interaction between the two domains was mostly based on the traditional concept of drawing boundaries regarding how involved parents could be in the school. Decisions concerning issues such as funding and school curriculum were the exclusive preserve of the professionals, such as the principal and the teaching staff. The parents’ job was limited to the responsibility for ensuring that their children attended school punctually, clean and properly equipped. As a result, there was a disposition towards unidirectional communication between schools and parents (Beattie, 1985).

In the sixties and seventies a radical change in attitude, including better treatment of parents, occurred. Various studies and reports appeared on the issue of parental involvement and collaboration in education. In 1959 The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child declared the importance of the parents’ role in their children’s education and instructed:
“The best interest of the child shall be the guidance principle of those responsible for his education and guidance. That responsibility lies in the first instance with his parents.” (quoted in Marrsfield, 1994, pp.6/7)

The Central Advisory Council for Education in the UK commissioned committees of inquiry to examine the links between school and home. The Newsom Report in 1963 encouraged parents to involve themselves in certain activities. The Plowden Report followed this in 1967, and urged all schools to implement programmes to encourage links with parents. The Taylor Report in 1977 accentuated these earlier reports, and added that parents should be encouraged to become involved on governing bodies. The Warnock Report in 1978 discussed the importance of parental involvement in the education of children with special needs (Marrsfield, 1994). The Education Acts in 1980, 1981, 1986 and 1988 led to a shift in the relationship between the two domains (Jowett et al, 1991) and encouraged schools to be more open towards parents. Over time, a wide system of links in many different spheres developed between the parents and the schools (Marrsfield, 1994). There is a growing trend in parental involvement in schools, expressed in various ways, levels and areas.

**The effect(s) of parental involvement**

Various studies have pointed to the way schools have changed in different ways following the rise in the levels of parents’ involvement with their children’s education (Munn, 1993). There is a greater readiness for parents to become involved, on the part of both the parents and the schools. The changes that result from parental involvement in schools can be seen in the improvements in their children’s school performance, encouraging their children to adopt a more positive attitude toward school and helping to improve teaching and education (Feitelson, 1979; Noy, 1990; Friedman and Bendas-Jakob, 1990; Comer and Haynes, 1991; Epstein, 1992).

Although the consistent message from the literature has been that the closer parents are to their child’s education the better will be the child’s progress, both developmentally and educationally, it reflected confusion and contradiction. Nevertheless, the opposite state can also be true; excessive involvement may interfere with the child’s growth, and factors such as class and cultural and ethnic differences must be considered in the same way as the children’s age and gender (Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991). These two poles,
encouraging parental involvement on the one hand, and its deterrence on the other, originated either with the professional school staff or the parents. Although involvement benefits the child and the school and has a positive personal impact on parents (Weil, 1985; Epstein, 1992; Shahar, 1992), it might cause harm as well, and staff need to be aware of this (Lareau and Shumer, 1996; Cooper and Mosley, 1999).

**Barriers to involvement**

One of the various parameters influencing the areas, the levels, the ways and the amount of involvement is the barriers to involvement held by parents, the child and the staff. Although the child’s barriers to involvement have their importance, this study will focus on those held by the parents and the staff. In particular, parents tend to avoid involvement with the school due to personal problems and negative childhood memories (Lightfoot, 1978; Smilanski et al, 1981; Boger et al, 1986; Comer, 1986; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Leitch and Tangri, 1988; Moore, 1991; Noy, 1990; Wanat, 1992; Brink and Chandler, 1993; Moles, 1993; Centre For Educational Research and Innovation (CERI),(1997), as well as family structure, income and education (Feitelson, 1979; Comer, 1986; Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Lareau, 1987; McLaughlin and Shields, 1987; Davies, 1988; Delgado-Gaitan, 1988; Vandegrift and Greene, 1992; MacBeth and Ravn, 1994; Goldring et al, 1995; Goldring, 1997; Glover et al, 1998; Cooper and Mosley, 1999).

On the other hand, teachers resist parental involvement and prevent parents’ presence in the classroom due to concern that parents might criticise them (Musgrove, 1966; Lightfoot, 1978; Cullingford, 1985; Comer, 1986; Leitch and Tangri 1988; Marrsfield, 1994; Goldberger, 1996). Additional barriers to involvement held by parents are their lack of skills, time and expertise in the education domain (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986), and by the staff are their lack of knowledge, training and skills to work with the parents (Epstein and Dauber, 1991; Williams, 1992; de Acosta, 1996).

**Summary**

Although parental involvement is a large topic and encompasses various issues, this study focuses on the areas and the levels of parental involvement, the effect(s) of involvement, the initiation to involvement and the reasons/issues to the involvement, the barriers to involvement, the attitude towards involvement and the influence of the
families’ characteristics on the involvement, from the point of view of the staff and the parents in the Miftanim.

The next section presents the structure and the purposes of both the Israeli education system and the Miftanim in Israel; the latter is intended to better answer the needs of the at-risk youth.

National Context

Israeli education system

The State of Israel supervises and is responsible for the education system in Israel. The system covers preschool education (kindergarten), elementary education (eight years), secondary education (four years) and higher education. In 1968 there was a reform of the education system which sought to ensure equality of opportunity in education, provide integration between social and ethnic groups, and raise standards of education (Hen, 1997; Meyda, 1997). Following the reform, the education system comprises elementary school (six years), junior high school (four years), and senior school (two years).

Functions of the Ministry of Education

The state is responsible for implementing and reinforcing the statutes related to education. Most funding for education comes from the State; the rest is funded by local authority taxes. The State is responsible for the system of monitoring, which determines how implementation is carried out, focuses on content and the didactic component, and supervises their implementation. Elementary and most junior high school teachers are employed by the State, while upper high school teachers are paid by the local authorities. The system’s growth and development are implemented by the Ministry of Education and other agencies, for example, the Housing Ministry, the Jewish Agency, Mifal Hapayis (the National Lottery).

Besides the Ministry of Education’s responsibility for the education system, it is also responsible for cultural activities, the Department of Antiquities and for sport (Tzuker, 1985). The Ministry of Labour and Welfare, most of whose budget goes towards children and youth, collaborates with the education system’s work, and focuses on assistance for
divergent populations such as delinquent youth, children who have dropped out of education, and people with mental handicaps who live in residential facilities. It provides services to the education system; social work services, grants, and support for needy students such as clothing, school equipment and books (Tzuker, 1985; Katan, 1996).

Structure of the Ministry of Education
The education system consists of three streams: the State stream, the State religious stream and the independent, ultra-orthodox stream. The latter has two independent ultra-orthodox educational streams which are associated with religious/political organisations; the independent schools of ‘Agudat Ysrael’, a religious party of the ultra-religious Ashkenazi-European sector, and ‘Ma’ayan’, the religious school network of the religious ‘Shass’ party, which represents the ultra-religious Sepharadi-North African sector of the population. These schools are not under Ministry of Education jurisdiction and are not monitored by the State system (Shor, 1997).

The Compulsory Education Law, passed in 1949, makes education compulsory for every child from age five (kindergarten) to 16 (10th grade). This education is free as there is no payment for tuition, but each household pays an agreed annual sum to the parents’ committee for various services such as photocopying paper, health, insurance, school trips and ceremonies. The State Education Law, enacted in 1953, stipulates that education must be provided by the State based on a curriculum approved by the Minister of Education without recourse to other bodies or other parties or ethnic organisations outside the government and its supervision:

“The goal of state education is to establish education in the state on the basis of Jewish cultural values, scientific achievement, love of the land and loyalty to the state and the Jewish people, with a consciousness of the memory of the holocaust and Jewish heroism at the time of the holocaust, on agricultural work and industry, on pioneering training and the hope of building a society founded on freedom, equality, tolerance, mutual help and love of others.”

(Ministry of Education, 1953, p.12)
The Special Education Law was enacted in 1988; this law pertains to special education and covers teaching instruction, speech and occupational therapy, systematic learning and therapy, and additional therapies for all children with special needs between the ages of three and 21:

“*The goal of special education is to advance and develop the skills and abilities of the child with special needs, to adjust and improve his physical, mental, emotional and behavioural functioning, to provide him with knowledge, skills and habits and to demonstrate socially acceptable behaviour with a view to his/her eventual entrance into the workforce.***

(Egozi, 1988, p.22)

The Ministry of Labour and Welfare and the Ministry of Education, in conjunction with the sub-section for children with special needs, had joint responsibility for the Miftanim until 1997. Then, for budgetary reasons and as a result of a policy shift, the Miftanim were placed outside the framework of special education provision and were transferred from the Special Educational Programs sub-section at the Ministry of Education to the ‘Shahar’ division. ‘Shahar’ is an acronym for Welfare and Education Services in Hebrew (Cohen-Navot and Givon, 1998; Hovav et al 1999). The Shahar division is responsible for the academic studies of the students; it supervises the teachers and the curriculum in the Miftanim. It aims to improve academic achievements, to diminish student dropout from schools, to increase the number of graduate students, and to promote and strengthen the students (Ministry of Education, 1990).

**Institutional Context**

**Families and children at-risk**

The Miftanim are schemes that use a therapeutic day, with vocational and academic orientation, for boys and girls aged 14-21; the aim is to provide a scheme for children who are defined as ‘children at risk’. The term ‘children at risk’ is defined in several ways according to the country, the policy and the population; ‘disadvantaged pupils’ was the term used to describe children from disadvantaged backgrounds and the need to change this term to ‘at risk’ was the fact that this concept becomes optimistic and predictive:
“It is a predictive concept which assumes that children and pupils ‘at risk’ have certain characteristics which allow them to be identified ...”

(Rademacker and Evans, 1995, p.18)

The Centre For Educational And Research Innovation (CERI) defines the term ‘children at risk’ as:

“...those pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds who fail to reach the necessary standards in schools, often drop out and as a consequence fail to become integrated into a normally accepted pattern of social responsibility, particularly with regard to work and adult life.”

(CERI, 1998, p.47)

Predictive factors have been identified with failure, and characterised with the ‘at risk’ term. These factors may work in isolation or may work together and include children from poor families who tend to reach low academic achievements with a high percentage of dropout from school; the poverty and low income of the family; single parent families; low level of family education; home-school breakdown; child abuse and a lack of language (CERI, 1998).

The British government, in a Green Paper, observed the combination of factors which characterised children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD); these children are distinct from those with special education needs (SEN) (Cooper, 2001). The author would emphasise the importance of adding the “L” letter, which presents learning difficulties in this definition, thus children with social, emotional, behavioural and learning difficulties (SEBLD), as disorders in learning and behaviour are often to be found together:

“A child with a problem of learning often exhibits behavioural difficulties in the classroom, and vice versa.”

(Friedman, 1973, p. 80)

And:
“Most of these marginal children are from low income and low social status families, have high rates of social and academic difficulty, low achievement, and early school leaving.” (Davies, 1988, p.12)

As a result of a disadvantaged background, such as low SES, ethnic background or single parent families, these children do not adjust to mainstream school, they have behavioural problems, accumulate failure experiences, have low self-esteem, and have a pattern of dropping out of school (Nesher, 1996; Avikassis, 1997; Shalom, 1997; Hovav et al, 1999). In order to answer the needs of these children in the world, various programmes and alternative schools have been designed to take care of the children at risk; these have in common their small size, the particular philosophy of the staff, and unconditional acceptance of the children. Examples are outreach schools (Housego, 1999), non-mainstream settings such as ‘day special schools’ and ‘learning support units’ (Cooper, 2001), vocational education and training in Europe (Collins, 1993; CERI, 1998), and alternative schools in Texas and Florida which include vocational training for children at risk (Cohen and Givon, 1999).

The Miftanim

Three alternatives are provided in Israel to respond to the needs of these children: a care programme within regular mainstream education, technology schools and the Miftanim:

“The Miftanims’ purpose is to take in young boys and girls with adaptation difficulties after they have been excluded from regular mainstream education, as well as from technology schools.”

(Cohen and Givon, 1999, p. 12)

As a result of politics and cutbacks in the education system, 24 Miftanim out of 37 are working Miftanim. They are situated in Israel’s cities and small towns. There are 21 Miftanim in the Jewish sector, both religious and secular, two Miftanim in the Arab sector located in Arab villages, and one Druze Miftan located in a Druze village in the north of Israel (Ministry of Labour and Welfare, 1997).

The Miftanim do not enrol or cater for youth with moderate mental handicaps, emotionally disturbed youth, or handicapped youth with impairments that would limit
them in the workshops (Eini, 1997). Children who attend the Miftanim are considered trainees or apprentices rather than pupils (Dagan, 1994), since the Miftan’s emphasis is on education as a means of helping trainees acquire a profession (Shvika, 1997). The trainees are referred to the Miftan following examination by a placement board with the power, under Israel’s Special Educational Provision Law, to decide on the child’s eligibility for placement in an appropriate educational facility that can cater for his or her needs (Ministry of Education, 1999).

The approach employed by the Miftanim in Israel at the time of their inception in the 1950s was based on the philosophy of Janush Korchak, who believed that the special brand of education that he propounded had the capacity to change the world, and he chose to work with children who had special educational requirements. Korchak’s chief emphasis was respect for the dignity of the child. His credo was that children who had no problems would be able to learn “despite the schools”. He argued that a child should be treated holistically, and that individual therapy/treatment would prove effective if it met the changing needs of the child in terms of mental health, love, education and basic necessities such as food, clothing and a roof (Katz, 1994), and:

“*The child is a stranger and a foreigner, he does not know the language; he cannot read the street signs, he does not understand the laws or customs. Sometimes he wishes to look around by himself, and if this is difficult for him, he will seek instruction and advice. He needs a guide who will answer his questions politely, and respect his lack of knowledge*”

(Korchak, 1974, quoted in Kaspi and Lam, 1974, p.239)

The basis of the Miftanim is un-conditional acceptance of the trainees, social re-integration through skills acquisition in the workshops, small group teaching and respectful treatment by the staff. A personal approach is used for working with trainees: they receive individual tuition that accommodates their personal pace and level, and takes into account their changing needs (Youth Rehabilitation Services, 1979). The Miftan aims to ensure that the trainee will acquire positive work habits, learn professional and social skills, that he will not degenerate into delinquency and addiction (Cohen and Givon, 1994), remove him from the cycle of risk and deterioration, and to lead him to rehabilitation and integration within the community (Glazer,1983; Eini,
The Miftan aims to equip its graduates with the skills and abilities needed for competent functioning in the community, to prepare them to enter society and employment while taking their abilities into consideration:

“The emphasis is on maximizing the progression towards social adjustment, and motivating the individual to acquire the skills needed to cope with society's demands.” (Youth Rehabilitation Services, 1979, p.27)

The Miftanim offer the children at risk a regular formal schooling along with vocational training designed to facilitate their integration within society:

“The Miftan is a therapeutic and educational institution operating inside the community. Its goal is the complete rehabilitation of young people with adjustment problem, who the mainstream system could not advance and essentially cast out.” (Dagan, 1994, p. 34)

**Characteristics of families and trainees**

One purpose of research undertaken by the Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) in Israel was to characterise the trainees and the families in the Miftanim; it encompassed six Miiftanim and included 546 trainees; data were collected by questionnaires put to the staff, the questionnaires’ rate of return was higher than 95 percent. The findings showed that most families have economic difficulties, 66 percent live at a very low level and 30 percent have location problems; 22 percent are single parents; 59 percent have four or more children; 16 percent are unemployed or live on the Ministry of Welfare pension; 59 percent are well known to the Welfare service.

Many trainees suffered from different kinds of neglect and violence; the findings presented the percentage of those confirmed to be suffering in this way as well as those under suspicion, 35 percent suffered from physical violence; three percent of the boys and 18 percent of the girls suffered from sexual abuse; 19 percent were badly physically neglected; 20 percent had at least one of the listed problems in regard to their family. In addition, 34 percent of the trainees were disconnected from any educational framework before they attended the Miftan; 70 percent of the trainees came to the Miftan from education for children with special needs.
The findings also presented the trainees’ intelligence; three percent had high intelligence, 41 percent had medium intelligence, 32 percent had low intelligence and 10 percent were slightly retarded. Twenty-two percent of the trainees were diagnosed as having learning deficiencies and ten percent were without diagnosis. Additionally, 71 percent of the trainees had suffered from at least one of the following phenomenon: delinquency, use of drugs and alcohol, psychiatric hospitalisation, suicide attempt and pregnancy (Cohen and Givon, 1994).

**Educational features of the Miftan**

The rehabilitation and educational work is based on the interaction between the trainee and the staff; working in small groups, this is the main tool to reach the rehabilitation goal (Cohen and Givon, 1994).

> “Each member of staff has a meaningful role in their care to the trainees, and the staff’s strength depends on their ability to work in harmony, working with professionalism, respect, support and cooperation.”
>
> (Youth Rehabilitation Services, 2004, p.1)

The staff in the Miftanim include a principal, social worker, vocational instructors, homeroom teachers and subject teachers; some Miftanim employ an educational counsellor, which enables them to work as a whole professional team with regard to the trainees (Youth Rehabilitation Services, 1979; Cohen and Givon, 1994):

> “In general, the staff in the Miftanim are educated, they have a lot of professional experience in the Miftan, which is expressed by their high level of professional skill.”
>
> (Cohen and Givon, 1994, p. 38)

The principals in the Miftanim are appointed by an Appointment Tenders Committee, and are responsible for the Miftanim and its staff. Because the Miftanim are small, usually with between 60-100 trainees, there are few staff and no Assistant Principal. This confines the administrative tier to a single principal with discretionary power to delegate authority to staff according to his or her management style (Ministry of Education,
Two volunteer girls augment the staff; these girls are from the religious framework and are assigned to the Miftan as part of the National Service scheme (National Service refers to a civilian framework whereby young people volunteer to work in the community instead of serving in the Army after high school (Gal, 1997)). Their role is to assist teachers in the classroom, help trainees individually and organise in-house activities such as the school newspaper, quizzes and various events.

The Miftanim answers needs in three aspects; academic studies, vocational training and the emotional-caring aspect. Academic studies include subjects such as geography, Bible, civics, maths, and Hebrew, provided mainly by homeroom teachers but also by subject teachers in some cases. The vocational training includes carpentry, metalwork, skills for the hotel industry, catering skills/cuisine, childcare and hairdressing, as well as the production of various products for themselves, such as furniture and cakes (Youth Rehabilitation Service, 1979; Shprinzak et al., 1981; Bahiri, 1983; Cohen and Givon, 1994). The emotional-caring aspect includes intervention programmes by group and individual conversations and cover sex education, programmes against violence and addiction, and additional sensitive issues, incest for example.

The Miftanim also organise social activities, extra-mural courses, enrichment programmes and links with the community whereby trainees have projects to work on in the school workshops, or receive work opportunities in a hairdressing salon or catering firm. These lead the trainees to rehabilitation and promote the trainees’ personal and social development. In addition to the support, extra programmes and therapy, the Miftanim provides breakfast and lunch; sometimes this is the child’s only food in the day (Youth Rehabilitation Service, 1979; Shprinzak et al., 1981; Glazer, 1983).

“The dining room is a meaningful tool in the rehabilitation process of the trainee. The Youth Rehabilitation Service regard it as very important that the staff share eating with the trainees... The staff will sit with the trainees and not at separate tables.” (Youth Rehabilitation Service, 2004, p.8)

The trainees spend most of their time in the Miftan studying and working in the workshop, 5-14 trainees in each class/workshop. They usually work more than they
study. Each trainee studies with his homeroom teacher and works with his vocational instructor and both serve as the trainee’s parents (Kahana, 1971; Youth Rehabilitation Service, 1979). In addition, the vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers are compelled to make home visits at least three times a year:

“...during the year, the vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers will make at least three home visits to each trainee they are working with, and write an account according to the home visit procedure.”

(Youth Rehabilitation Service, 2004, p.4)

In order to promote and reinforce positive behaviours in the trainees, the Miftanim employ a behaviour approach based on Skinner’s ‘operant conditioning’ theory (Hilgard and Atkinson, 1976), whereby trainees are awarded points in return for behaviour which conforms to a set of specific criteria. The points, referred to as ALEH points, an acronym for work, studies and behaviour in Hebrew, are recorded on the trainee’s card and converted into money at the end of the month (Salyi, 1969; Kahana, 1971; Cohen and Givon, 1994; Cohen-Navot and Givon, 1998). The trainees receive the money each month, and an amount from it is paid for the dining room; this amount will be no more than 25 percent of the total. Each trainee has a personal file which has to include the following documents: general correspondence, personal documents, the trainee’s development in the Miftan, personal curriculum, home visit document, the document referring the trainee to the Miftan, the “secrecy renouncement” document, and the personal details’ document, which includes at least health information. This file should follow the trainee and be up-dated about the various issues; it should be kept in a locked cupboard (Youth Rehabilitation Service, 2004).

**Methodology**

**Research purpose and aims**
The principal aim of this study is to examine the perception of the parents/families and the staff in the Miftanim of the relationship between them; the staff includes principals, social workers/educational counsellors, vocational instructors and homeroom teachers. This study aims to explore the areas and the levels of parental involvement; to examine who initiates involvement and in what issues; to examine the reasons for involvement
and the reasons for non-involvement; to examine the impact of the demographic details of the families on involvement; to explore the attitude of staff towards parental involvement; to explore the effect(s) of parental involvement, both the benefits and the harms, on the parents, the child and the staff; the barriers to involvement and finally to suggest forms and ways of appropriate and compatible involvement of the parents in the Miftanim.

The specific research questions are:

1. What are the areas and levels in which parents are involved with the Miftan and with whom?

2. Why is there involvement?
   What are the parents’ reasons to be involved?
   What are the staff’s reasons to involve the parents?

3. Who initiates the contacts?
   Who are the initiators; the parents and/or the staff?
   In what areas and levels are the contacts initiated?

4. Why is there no involvement?
   What are the parents’ barriers to involvement?
   What are the staff’s barriers to parental involvement?

5. What is the attitude of staff towards parental involvement?
   Do the staff encourage/discourage parental involvement?
   How is this attitude applied?

6. What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the parents, the staff and the children?
   Is this beneficial/harmful?

7. What is the most appropriate parental involvement form compatible with the needs of the Miftanim (the parents, the child and the staff)?
The research process

To better answer the research questions, the author used a combination of quantitative (positivist) and qualitative (relativist) research approaches with the aim of collecting data by various methods and combining and integrating the findings. This study consists of two phases, a survey and case studies. In the first phase of the research, a cross-sectional survey was carried out; structured questionnaires were sent by mail to collect information through a set of pre-formulated questions, based on the research questions. The population in this research was the staff and parents in the Miftanim. The survey encompasses 17 out of 24 Miftanim in the Jewish sector in Israel. Five different questionnaires were put to the different participants: principal, social worker/educational counsellor, vocational instructor, homeroom teacher and parent. Out of a total of 206 questionnaires that were sent out (plus additional as required), 147 were returned, an average of 71 percent. Data analysis was performed using a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) programme and Excel; the data are presented by percentage, mean, median and standard deviation, in tables and graphs.

The second phase of the research was to choose two case studies from the Miftanim that had participated in the first phase. The methods used in this stage are interviews and analysis of documents. Two different interviews were designed for the participants: one interview was put to the parents and one interview was put to the staff. A total of 21 participants were interviewed; two principals, two social workers, one educational counsellor, four vocational instructors, four homeroom teachers and eight parents. Data were analysed by parameters, categories and criteria, in tables and figures. Relevant documents on the subject of the relationship between parents/families and Miftanim were also examined; informative and confidential documents were analysed in both Miftanim.

Access

The author was allowed access to the Miftanim and permission to conduct the study following applications to both bodies responsible for the Miftan network - the Nationwide Service Administration at the Ministry of Labour and Welfare and the Chief Scientist of the Ministry of Education. The study was authorized for two years. Each stage of this study, and the processes of planning, gathering, analysing and writing, was
performed as accurately as possible, in the light of the ethical issues and with respect to the rules and regulations of the family of scholars.

Summary
This study aims to focus on the parental involvement issue from the point of view of the parents and the staff in the Miftanim. The literature chapter presents the development of parental involvement, various definitions and models, the benefits and the harms in involvement, barriers to involvement, initiation and associated issues, and the attitude of staff towards involvement. The methodology chapter presents the methodologies used by the author in this research, and the different methods used to gather data. The findings and analysis data chapter is divided into three sections: quantitative data, which presents the survey findings; qualitative data, which presents the case study findings; and the combination of them both. The fifth chapter presents the discussion of the research; the sixth chapter presents the conclusions and the limitations of the research and concludes with the author’s recommendations and reflections.
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction
Parental involvement in education is an issue of increasing and growing concern all over the western world. What is involvement? How is involvement implemented in schools? If involvement of parents is so important, why is there so little involvement in most schools? What influences the quality, the levels and the areas of involvement? Who are the involved parents and why? Who are the parents who are not involved and why? Who motivates the involvement, the parents, the staff or both? Is involvement beneficial or harmful, to whom? In what ways can involvement be increased? Is involvement really necessary? These questions are part of a wide set of questions asked by stakeholders.

Various terms, definitions, models, attitudes towards involvement, and suggested ways of dealing with the issue of parental involvement, have been raised as a result of the ongoing debate on the involvement of parents in their child’s education, and the different views, beliefs and credo of educational staff, researchers and politicians. This chapter presents various terms, definitions, models of parental involvement, the history and changes that have occurred, the effect(s) of involvement, both benefits and harms, and the barriers to involvement, especially with regard to the involvement of at-risk families and the families of children with special needs.

The Development of Parental Involvement in Education

Introduction
Various theories have been developed to describe relationships between the school and the education system. Such theories can be seen reflected in the different education systems. Some of them are changed or strengthened by social, economic, cultural or political change. There are different qualities of relationships between parents and schools. These may vary depending on policies, cultures and the credo of the countries, regions and schools involved. The literature raises various issues concerning the relationship between parents and schools. These relate to the quality of the relationship, the extent of parental involvement, reasons and motives for parental involvement, barriers to parental involvement, benefits/harms associated with parental involvement and the effects of involvement on parents, the community, staff and children.
Changes in parental involvement

Prior to the 1960s, decision-making and school funding were the exclusive preserve of experts, principals and teachers; parents were responsible for sending their child to school on time, making sure the child was clean, dressed and properly equipped. The education system, for its part, undertook to create a facility the children could attend (Johnson and Ransom, 1983; Beattie, 1985). The relationships between the schools and homes were based on the ‘separate responsibilities’ approach, which presents the school and the home as being entirely distinct systems. One role of the home was socialisation; the purpose of the education system was to focus on education. These respective systems were efficient and effective if each maintained and pursued its own independent goals, standards and activities. A relationship between the two distinct systems would arise if, and when, there was a problem concerning the child’s studies or behaviour (Atkin et al., 1988; Alkin, 1992).

Parents and the family have been accused of missing the point that education is the exclusive domain of professionals: this ‘two distinct systems’ approach assumed that parents relied on school staff professionalism and guidance because parents lacked the necessary relevant skills (Powell, 1989). Schools enjoyed clear autonomy owing to the natural belief that teachers were the experts. Teachers were considered to have gained their expertise through experience and practice and it was assumed that they knew better than parents what children could and should learn. Moreover, teachers had the ability to compensate for the home’s failure to supply the education needed by the child; the schools perceived themselves as belonging to a separate system which needed to maintain a distance from the parents’ failure (Cullingford, 1985; Friedman, 1989; Noy, 1992, 1997).

"The isolation of schools from the 'failure' of parents seemed necessary. The high walls and tall windows of Victorian schools symbolized this belief in the autonomy of schools...." (Cullingford, 1985, p.131)

Communication between home and school was one–way, from school to the home. In these circumstances, parents were limited to occasional local activities to support a particular school. In the UK, schools and Local Education Authorities (LEAs) often treated parents as a side issue and considered them the school’s last resort for action or
cooperation. The single contact that took place was restricted to the school sending reports providing the professional’s perspective of the child, and “that in any case, the parents would not understand” (Beattie, 1985, p. 24).

The signs of change in the relationship between the home system and the school system were discernible. The Board of Education proposed the development of closer relations between the home and the school (Centre For Educational Research And Innovation (CERI), 1997), and the trend in the educational world was to assume the existence of an embedded influence between the home and the child’s environment. The basis for this conception related to child developmental psychology and the impact that the environment and background had on other broader systems: “This model is represented as a set of concentric circles of interaction and influence - an embedded system - each contained within the next” (Bronfenbrenner, 1976, quoted in Alkin, 1992, p.1142).

In the UK, the 1944 Act required two basic duties of parents: the first duty was to ensure that their child attended the school in which they were enrolled, the second duty was to ensure that their child received an age- and ability-appropriate education (Brighouse, 1985). In 1959, this approach was strengthened by the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child, which published a declaration stressing the primary responsibility of parents in the education and guidance of children. The Central Advisory Council for Education issued numerous reports which addressed the links between the home and the school, and the Newson Report encouraged the involvement of parents in the curriculum (Marrsfield, 1994). Awareness of the importance of the child’s home increased, along with a growing recognition of the parents as the child’s first educators.

There were many and varied arguments concerning parents’ rights. According to the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), (1997) the parents and the families are the child's very first educators, the family is responsible for the child’s socialisation and, from the time they are born, children rely on their parents to meet their physical, emotional and social needs so that they can learn and grow. Thus, the home environment supports children as they learn and assists in their progress and performance at school (Clark, 1988).
The Plowden Report in 1967 was a turning point. It made recommendations for the future and gave suggestions for Educational Priority Areas (EPAs). One of these was to increase parents’ involvement on the assumption that this would spur parents to greater support for education. The Taylor Report in 1977 encouraged parents to sit on school governing bodies, arguing that every school should have its own governing body to ensure that school management considered the feelings and wishes of the parents and local community (Hewison, 1985). A school governing body is a legal body which includes, in addition to the professionals, only two to five parents. Such bodies were formed despite criticism of the relatively small representation of parents able to make decisions; hundreds of parents were unable to take an active role in this body and its work and, although most would have liked to feel part of the school, they had to accept decisions in which they had no part (Wragg, 1989). The Warnock Report in 1978 raised the importance of parental involvement with regard to special education and pinned success in education on total parental involvement. These reports, which encouraged contact with parents and parental involvement, led schools to open their doors to parents. The schools invite their assistance in the classroom and also to the development of a partnership between home and school (Cullingford, 1985).

New Approaches and Attitudes Toward Parental Involvement

In the UK the Education Acts of 1980, 1981, 1986 and 1988, addressed the importance of the relationship between the home and the school. Cullingford (1985) wrote that parental involvement is beneficial for the child’s welfare, the school and the parents. Parental involvement helps to achieve greater democracy in society and Lindsey (1994) wrote that the Children’s Act in 1989 aimed to provide a framework to ensure that child welfare included the staff notification of neglect, sexual abuse, emotional, psychological and physical harm in the child’s life.

These Acts brought about numerous changes in approach and policy with regard to parental involvement (Jowett et al, 1991). Some of these changes were with regard to parents’ rights, e.g., the parents’ right to choose a school for their child, the right to use the school outside school hours, and the introduction of community schools (Munn, 1993). The government compelled schools to relate differently to parents and consider them in the process of educating their children. The government policy was based on
studies which claimed that active support and constructive interest on the part of parents leads to gain and improves actual achievement (Epstein, 1991; Alkin, 1992; Loucks, 1992; Henderson and Berla, 1994; Macbeth and Ravn, 1994; Marrsfield, 1994; Bastiani, 1996).

The changing trend encouraged schools to develop programmes for facilitating contact with the parents (Cullingford, 1985). These included intervention programmes for teaching and improving reading competence in different levels of schools (Hewison, 1985) and the development of collaborative projects between the home and the school to strengthen the relationship and help the school to provide pupils with rewarding experiences. In the United States, the Head Start Project was a wide intervention project, while in the UK the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) and the National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT) initiated various projects (Munn, 1993).

Another consequence of the change in policy and approach regarding the home-school relationship was the emergence of Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) in the 1970s. The first examples of these had been seen in the 1950s but PTAs failed to take off at that time because school principals resisted the idea of consulting parents. Their concern was not that some parents would dominate the rest; they were not interested in what parents had to say. This changed after the various reports awarding parents power and rights were published (Wragg, 1989). The education system offered parents considerable power and influence, schools started to try to improve their attractiveness and parents began to be treated as clients (Munn, 1993). The intention behind the idea of the marketing of schools was to raise standards of education and to furnish parents with greater power. The reforms, which followed the UK's 1988 Education Reform Act, were intended to produce increased competitiveness between schools and enrich the options open to parents:

"To motivate schools to develop a closer relationship with parents as consumers... schools will raise standards and became more 'consumer responsive' in order to compete for parental custom and to maintain or increase pupil numbers, with good schools growing and bad ones closing.”

(Glatter et al, 1996, p.125)
According to Davies and Ellison (1997), the policy of marketing schools was one of the results of these changes, and one of the primary spin-offs of the marketing policy was the establishment of two-way communication between clients and school:

"Therefore marketing in schools is not just about selling the product and service but it is about identifying the nature of what is required by the clients and then ensuring that the schools give ultimate priority to supplying that product and service and to maintaining its quality." (p. 4)

The issue of cutbacks in education meant parents had to pay more for education and parents’ demands for accountability from the education system was a natural consequence. For parents, education often epitomised their hope for their children’s future. More recently, the parents’ role in the education power structure has changed and, in political terms, “they have, as a group, been placed in a more central position, having the right to be full members of school governing bodies” (Wragg, 1989, p.123). In contrast to those who consider parents’ powers as excessive, there are others who adopt a more moderate approach, and see “parent power” as two systems cooperating - not competing - rights do not necessarily mean power, and these two terms should not be confused.

"A right represents nothing more than an entitlement. Power, on the other hand, is the ability to influence action. The two may be related, but they equally may not." (Wragg, 1989, p. 125)

Marrsfield (1994) stated that many countries tried to improve standards by allowing parents to choose their child’s school and treating parents as consumers, hoping that parents would raise their demands and stimulate greater self-criticism by schools. In contrast, Hornby (2000) argued that allowing parents to have control over decision-making processes might lead to “an abdication of professional responsibility” (p. 19).

The home-school relationship had nothing to do with power. The systems were entirely separate, a ‘them’ and ‘us’, without relating to parents as consumers, donors or clients. The home-school relationship was not about ideas and strategies for involving people,
although involvement was part of it, but rather about being welcoming, contributing assistance and finding help, with openness, honesty and flexibility (Marrsfield, 1994). Parents, for their part, fought the outlook that “education is none of their concern” through a gradual process that meant organising themselves locally as well as nationally. Their activities, which were developed considerably in scope to include issues of parental interest and experience, were run by parents’ organisations in England and Wales like the National Confederation of Parent-Teacher Associations (NCPTA), The Advisory Centre for Education (ACE), and the Campaign for the Advancement of State Education (CASE) (Atkin et al, 1988; Bastiani, 1993).

"By getting more organised in national and local groups', parents have been able to exert a steady pressure upon schools and the system, to oblige them to recognise parental rights and expectations and to become more responsive to their needs and interests." (Atkin et al, 1988, p. 4)

Education experts have changed their attitude toward parental involvement, the parents’ role and home-school relationships (Bastiani, 1993; Morgan, 1996). The parents’ position has altered; they have worked their way from the fringes of education to somewhere much closer to the stage - thanks to their own and the government’s efforts (Atkin et al, 1988). The importance of the “child at the centre”, which had a professional orientation, assumed that parents required access to information in order to function well as parents; the involvement of the citizen assumed that adults had the competence and the right to participate in decision-making that affected their lives and the lives of their children (Valentine and Stark 1979).

Changes in schools were the result of some of the shifts in society at large. These changes embraced modifications in education services, continuity in learning, alterations in the learning environment, decentralisation and local autonomy and an understanding that studying would carry greater weight in future and that most people would continue learning all through their lives (Sayer, 1989). In addition, politicians have changed their attitudes; they regard parents as an important lobby and a vital source of electoral support (Atkin et al, 1988).
In Europe, education has gained access to the political agenda because parents are now seen as an important electorate, primarily as a result of concerns regarding economics and social cohesion. This has brought about policies and programmes for encouraging greater collaboration between schools and parents. Thus, parents’ rights and obligations were set out in the Charter of the European Parents Association to clarify the roles of both parents and schools. This emphasis on roles led to the idea of a contract. Even though a contract is problematic in that it is impossible to enforce on parents for various reasons, it is nevertheless constructive and stresses the importance of having an agreement *per se* (CERI, 1997).

However, a contract may demand that parents fulfil various activities, and furthermore, threaten that non-fulfilment of the contract may lead to disciplinary action. This is stated in bold at the bottom of the contract (Gerwitz *et al*, 1995). Vincent and Tomlinson (1998) claim that contracts were designed to control parental involvement since, instead of dealing with ways that parents and teachers should cooperate, they try to enforce school discipline and “recently the ‘soft’ language of partnership has taken on a ‘harder’ tone” (p.2).

In the OECD countries (Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK), this new aspect of the cooperation between parents and the school stemmed from changes in the family structure. Not all such changes were necessarily bad, and children can certainly grow under these conditions; some changes, however, such as single parent families, higher unemployment in Europe, and relocation for employment reasons, placed many families in financial difficulty. The new scenario demanded a new approach and a rethinking of family-school relations. In order to reach out to new types of families, the scope of the school’s work has broadened, and new mechanisms for coping with the different types of families have been introduced.

In many countries, such as Denmark, England, Spain and Wales, modifications in government policy have also caused schools to alter. In England and Wales, for example, schools have experimented with slight distancing from the State to allow them greater autonomy of operation. In such schools parents played an important and powerful role, and charter schooling was founded by groups of parents who sought an alternative kind of education to that previously offered by the State.
"The new forms of management also represent a shift away from bureaucratic organisations to smaller, more autonomous units where decisions are made according to local needs."

(CERI, 1997, p.24)

A transformation has been made in all aspects of parental involvement in education. Concepts have changed, and rather than seeing ‘two separate systems’, with professionalism the exclusive realm of the teachers, and parents being regarded in a negative light, involvement has become more compromising, with the focus on cooperation aimed at increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the education system to the children’s advantage. In the USA during the late 1960s and 1970s, the question of which was more important, the school or the family, was fiercely debated by scholars. The debate ended when the realisation struck that neither the family nor the school alone could educate and socialise a child (Epstein, 1995(a)).

“...The debate changed as it became increasingly clear that neither schools nor families alone can do the job of educating and socialising children and preparing them for life. Rather, schools, families and communities share responsibilities for children and influence them simultaneously.”

(p. 210)

This approach appears to be linked to the overlapping influence model which suggested that different life spheres are affected by time, developmental, environmental and behavioural changes, and recognised the link and overlap between home and school (Alkin, 1992). Parents and educators regarded parental involvement as a positive value, emphasising the contribution of school-home relations to a child’s education (Wolfendale, 1983; Epstein, 1985, 1991; Bastiani, 1987; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Davies, 1988; Sallis, 1988; Goldring, 1993; CERI, 1997) and the fact that such involvement is critical to the success of educational programmes (Bronfenbrenner, 1974; Goldring, 1990, 1993).

Some of these changes are presented in the following comparative table (see Table 2.1) and in Figures 2.1 and 2.2. The table presents the changes that occurred towards the
parent issue; the changing professional attitudes’ summary emphasises the parents’ rights and their importance on the one hand, and the schools’ commitment to the parents and to the child on the other hand (Bastiani, 1993).

**Table 2.1: Changes in the parents issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Parents are a problem (and often a nuisance); they are either 'not interested' or they are 'too interested', e.g. interfering. *The parents take up time and energy that should be spent working with children. Teachers should be allowed to get on with the real job of teaching. *Teachers/parents should get on with their own respective role.</td>
<td>*Parents have (increasingly) clearly defined rights in respect of their children’s schooling. *Schools cannot survive without the active involvement and support of parents. *Teachers and parents both have a key role in a shared enterprise. *Schools have a legal, contractual and professional obligation to work with (all) parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Home-school relations are**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Mainly for those who work with young children - or those with special needs. *Peripheral to the main business of the school. *Essentially concerned with teachers and parents. *Mainly concerned with relationships between individual families and their children's schools.</td>
<td>*Important for all schools. The long-term consequences of family-school relationships have an important bearing on young people's achievements and attitudes to further education and training. *Right at the heart of the educational process in general, and pupil achievement in particular. *Necessarily involve pupils. *Need to be supported by collective parental presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(after Bastiani, 1993, p.109)
The author would add that the strength of this comparison is in the importance of the change which involved all parents in their child’s education, not just those with young children and children with special needs; it strengthens the fact that parental involvement is a result of the needs of both teachers and parents.

**The place of the different stakeholders in schools**

Two comparative models were presented by Morgan (1996), these aimed to distinguish the parents’ place in the interaction with the schools in the past and in the present. The ‘Former Model’ (see Figure 2.1) focused on the parents’ place, which was of little concern, compared to the LEAs, who were of great importance and the main wielder of power in schools. The ‘Later Model’ (see Figure 2.2) was the result of changes in the attitude towards the parents that supported an approach involving partnership and commitment in children’s education (Morgan, 1996).

**Figure 2.1: The Former Model**
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(after Morgan, 1996, p. 9)
The Former Model emphasises the attitude towards the parents, and the power of the governing bodies, schools and LEAs on different levels. The Later Model emphasises the sharing of responsibilities and the position of the parents, schools and governing bodies at the same level seems to provide a reasonable and appropriate foundation for the activities of the different agencies working in the system. The focus on the principle of various bodies sharing responsibility for children’s education was a step towards a real partnership without having to resort to occasionally damaging militancy (Morgan, 1996).

The changes towards involvement of the parents, the parents’ effect on the child and its benefits, led to the introduction of various programmes into preschools and primary schools, from the 1960s to date, such as Head Start and Follow-Through. These programmes aimed to involve parents from disadvantaged backgrounds in preparing
their children for school entry. This led to greater parental involvement among families in middle and high socio-economic status as well (Epstein, 1995(b)), which was explained by the fact that more women had received a higher education and were employed, more mothers had educational parity with teachers, and more parents were active about taking decisions regarding their children and more opportunities were created for families to be more involved (Epstein, 1995(b)):

“Thus, there were pressures and opportunities for families with more and with less formal education to increase their awareness of the importance of their participation in children’s education and in their continuous interactions with their children’s schools.” (p.210)

Programmes to encourage parental involvement were not only implemented with a view to solving the serious problems faced by families, but to forge links between the school, the family and the community. During the mid-eighties, the Nation at Risk Report, which was published in 1983, raised the need to improve every school, not only those with serious problems. This led schools to acknowledge the need to improve education across the board, for all children. Scholars have tried to develop a more accurate definition of the term ‘parental involvement’ which until now has lacked clarity. Thus, professionals no longer spoke of ‘parental involvement’, but referred instead to ‘school and family partnership’ or to ‘school, family and community partnerships’ which helped in underscoring the fact that the responsibilities toward children are shared responsibilities.

In the 1990s a research centre was set up with over 20 researchers from different disciplines, working with different measurement methods and models. These researchers worked with parents and teachers in studying new approaches to productive partnerships. This centre grew to over 300 researchers in the United States and worked collaboratively with 40 other countries (Epstein, 1995 (a)).

The understanding that parents played an irreplaceable role in their children’s education led to the establishment of a special fund in 1988 known as FIRST (Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching). The purpose of the fund was to encourage and reward programmes designed to improve children’s school achievement. The FIRST fund involved parents, homeroom teachers, and the public in all successful
elements of programmes. This fund came under a congressional scheme that recognised the changes in family structure and that family involvement would help every child to succeed (Cross, 1991).

As a result of changes toward the issue of parental involvement over the years, by the staff, the community, the families/parents, stakeholders, politicians and children as well, various theories have been developed to describe relations between the school and the education system. Such theories can be seen reflected in the different education systems. Some of them are changed or strengthened by social, economic, cultural or political change, in many countries in the western world, including Israel.

**Parental Involvement in Israel**

**Introduction**

The history of parental involvement in children’s schooling in Israel reflects the changing needs of parents, children and the community with regard to education, culture, social and political spheres. Interaction between the home system and the school system is dynamic, undergoing change depending on the period in the country’s history - from pre-State times to the present. This section presents the relationships between parents and schools from 1948 to date, including the various approaches and attitudes towards involvement, and the changes made over that period.

**Parental involvement- from 1948 to date**

Before 1948 (when the State was established), parents sent their children to schools that were consonant with their political beliefs and leanings, on the basis of their political party membership. Parents saw schools as a precious asset, whose goal was to ensure the continuity of membership and tradition (Elbaum- Dror, 1985; Edelstein,1989):

“When they handed their children over to a teacher, they were choosing that teacher’s ideological, politico-educational stream, educational goals, curriculum and values, the teaching and learning methods, and life style. Children were formed and nurtured by their loyalty to endeavours that were characterized by love of the Jewish People and its homeland and loyalty to the Zionist path.”

(Edelstein, 1989,p.15)
There was a two-way relationship between the home and the school with a great deal of involvement. The 1950s, however, had seen the abolition of school streams based on political beliefs and affiliations, leaving two main blocks - the State secular school system and the State religious school system; upon the heels of this reform came a trend and conceptualisation based on a model that drove a wedge between home and school. The education system’s view of the child’s home as symbolising the old life and culture of the Diaspora, and its belief that a relationship between the home and the school might undermine efforts to develop a new, different world, were two main reasons for the new policy of distancing schools from parents and the family cultural milieu. Education was centralised and its main purpose was to develop a new society that did not have the mentality associated with the Jewish Diaspora and exile (Noy, 1997).

“To establish a new society from a mixed multitude of cultures and languages...The country considered family background a nuisance and the home a hindrance or even a destructive factor that could undermine the school’s efforts.”

(p.7)

The new policy was being driven by a concern for ensuring social equality, which represented a cornerstone of the democratic society, and unity that would facilitate realisation of the ‘melting pot’ vision (Elbaum-Dror, 1985; Yinon, 1997). Consequent to this egalitarian approach, and the widely accepted belief that the parental home had nothing to offer either the system or the child, the two spheres became separated, since home could not contribute to the academic performance of the children, and furthermore, it might undermine efforts to achieve equality (Friedman, 1989).

This idea of being separate was especially influenced and reinforced by the mass immigration of the 1950s. These immigrants came from disadvantaged countries where many parents were illiterate and uneducated. In addition, the system’s paternalistic and patronising stance prevented those parents who were educated from having any involvement because they lacked knowledge of the workings of the system. The problems of survival, security and adjustment that hampered parents in their parenting role was an additional reason for the separation of home and school. In view of the problems that confronted parents in their new home, it was only natural for them not to
become involved in school issues. The home-school alienation seemed ideologically justified since the parental home was thought to be unfit to meet children’s educational needs (Noy, 1992; Shachar, 1992; Sa’ar, 1995; Barak, 1996).

Educational reform started in the 1960s and early 1970s. Its goal was to encourage integration that would reinforce the egalitarian principle. The decision for change was taken at government level with no parental involvement. The new direction in education only served to perpetuate and underscore the distance between parents and the school system (Goldring, 1992):

“Often, there were fierce protests and resentment regarding the reform, and many parents actively tried to prevent their children from attending integrative schools.”

(p.23)

The vast discrepancies in school achievement that marked the Israeli population caused the Pedagogic Secretariat of the Education Ministry to decide to explore areas of interface between the parents and the school. They commissioned Professor Feitelson for the study (Friedman, 1990). The study explored the relationships between the parents and the schools, and focused on the low SES population and schools. The main finding of this study was the importance of parental involvement in children's education. There were suggestions for implementing projects in order to reach better and efficient parental involvement (Feitelson, 1979). The late 1970s were marked by a change in perception, which saw parental involvement as desirable, and led to a special programme for increased collaboration between home and school:

“We must develop schools for disadvantaged children which foster closer ties with their parents, form contacts between the teachers and the child’s home, develop relationships based on respect, mutual understanding, and encourage parents to be involved in their child’s education.”

(Ministry of Education, 1976, p.11)

It was not until the 1980s that the first signs of cooperation between parents and the education system emerged. This was due to a reform of the Education Ministry, which abandoned its traditional centralised approach to administration and opted for
decentralisation instead. Centralised control, with its lack of sensitivity to individual or
group needs, had meant that the centre, i.e. the Jerusalem head office, handled all
responsibility and problems. This entailed needless and tiresome bureaucratic
procedures, which deterred parental involvement and led to certain alienation.
Decentralised administration, on the other hand, meant devolving authority and
responsibility away from central government to local and district government, giving the
later power in areas such as funding, hours and making decisions regarding employment
positions (Goldring, 1990; Noy, 1990; Barak, 1996; Goldberger, 1996).

The transition from a centralised to a decentralised approach to education was due to the
inability of the education system to serve the public; its unwieldiness and lack of control
prevented schools from answering community needs in attaining educational goals, and
even caused alienation. Decentralised management helped schools to meet the needs of
different populations and even to help to preserve their unique social and cultural
features. It encouraged school self-government, parent and community involvement and
the utilisation of resources to raise school standards (Elbaum-Dror, 1985; Goldring, 1990;

**Changing the attitude towards parental involvement**

Following education cutbacks, the increasing trend in parental involvement became more
evident and parents’ strength grew; it led to dramatic changes in the nature and strength
of parental involvement (Goldring, 1990; Goldberger, 1998). It enabled the direct
involvement of parents in the control of resources and income, budgeting, teaching hours
and decision-making concerning education (Goldring, 1990), and forced the parents to
fund hours cut from the curriculum with their own money and battle for school
renovations and building (Goldberger, 1998). The Ministry of Education called for a
partnership relationship with parents with regard to funding for education, and the policy
toward parents was changed through a series of new concepts, such as competition,
products, clients, projects and quality control (Volansky, 1997). Important decisions with
regard to education, for example, study tracks, the social fabric of schools, curriculum
and teaching staff were taken at the national level. Various parent groups such as action
committees and local and national parent committees have been formed to achieve their
goals (Goldring, 1990).
"Apparently, one of the main reasons that spurs parents to get themselves organized and influence education, either through special organizations or existing public organizations, is if they are asked to shoulder more of the financial burden of education and pay for special subjects, such as for subjects such as arts or technological education."

Parental involvement helped to solve practical problems that schools have, such as transportation, equipment and building, fundraising events, serving as escorts on school trips and decorating schools. Parental involvement was transformed in both character and extent. Parents’ involvement today means expressing an opinion and intervening in issues like teaching methods, computerisation, integration, textbooks and streaming. The increase in parental involvement in education is due to the fact that, contrary to the past when parents who had immigrated into Israel from different countries were ignorant of the education system, could not understand Hebrew, and often had no formal education, most parents nowadays have experienced Israel’s education system, and may even be better educated than some teachers. Parents’ education has had ramifications regarding the education system (Goldberger, 1998):

“When all parents consider themselves educators, which is, to an extent, justifiable, they become involved. Their education produces greater criticism, and increased demands while contributing to a feeling of frustration and alienation concerning the education system.”

Increased democratisation in Israel on the personal and political front is the result of changes in the country in recent years; electoral rights and the right to choose opportunities in life have also encouraged deeper involvement in education by parents. However, parents lack the most basic rights in education such as the right to choose the class, the school principal, the teachers and the curriculum or their child’s preschool or school because Israel operates on the basis of catchment areas, although one change was to give parents a say in the school curriculum, which meant, in practice, that they had the power to decide 25 percent of its contents (Ministry of Education, 1976).
Compared to the 1950s and 1960s, parents today have far more spare time and money, which has allowed them to invest time in education. Increasing competitiveness and achievement-orientation in Israel has brought home to parents that education is the key to success. Parents understand that the more interest they show in different issues, and the more involved they are in their children's education, the better their children will perform in school. This involvement is affected by the more frank relationships between today’s parents and their children. Children discuss matters with parents more often, they are better educated, pass criticism on the school and need parental help and guidance more than ever. The immigration from western countries, particularly the United States, has raised levels of parental involvement and influenced veteran Israeli parents to become more involved. Debates on parental involvement in the media, local authorities and the Knesset (Israeli Parliament) have motivated parents to become involved, and one success leads to another (Goldberger, 1998).

As ideas have changed throughout much of the world, and greater importance has been ascribed to the family, the relationship between the education system and parents in Israel has also changed. Higher levels of parental involvement in education were an outgrowth of community schools. These are schools that are founded on a philosophy of reciprocal relations between the school and the child’s home, the extended family and the entire community. The community school is characterised by a partnership with community bodies regarding decision-making, involvement in planning, implementation and evaluation of school policy and programmes, all of which are affected by the nature and needs of the population, and the incorporation into the school timetable of activities involving social assistance (Harpaz, 1997).

These schools were the result of the realisation that a child’s social and geographical environment is a very significant agent of education, that ties between the school, the community and the parents needed to be increased and reinforced (Friedman, 1990). In these schools, the parents’ reasons for being involved, in addition to the various benefits, were personal reasons such as realisation of the parents’ talents, social meetings, occupation and the opportunity to be socially involved within the community (Mahter, 2001).
In recent years, institutionalised contacts have been introduced between the home and the school. It involved parents committees and a scheme operated by the Karev Foundation (Israeli foundation of parents) aimed at encouraging greater parental involvement in education. The main aim of the Karev programme was to increase parental involvement in schools. This entailed establishing steering committees that selected enrichment programmes for the school and allocated funds for activities to the parents. The Karev programme asked schools to undertake certain tasks to help increase parental involvement under the auspices of the scheme. The first, most basic, task was to tell parents about the Karev programme, and obtain their consent to allocate special funds for activities that involved parents. A steering committee was then established where parents could actively participate in choosing enrichment programmes and collect payment for activities run by the Karev Foundation at the school. In 1994, the Karev Foundation used a questionnaire to examine the attitudes of school principals to parental involvement; 93 percent of principals did not believe that parental involvement imposed on teachers; 77 percent stated that parental involvement was helpful in enhancing children’s academic performance; 62 percent said that most parents would like to be more involved at school and 79 percent said that teachers would prefer more involvement from parents (Ronen, 1996).

Israel now has a declared policy of encouraging parental involvement in education due to the recognition of parents’ responsibility for improving their child’s performance at school and, generally, the parents’ role in early education and shaping the child’s personality in early life (Sa’ar, 1995). Education officials would like the focus to be more on relations between the parents and the school regarding children’s education on the one hand, while the Ministry of Education policy has reservations from parents influencing education through involvement in decision making on the other hand (Raziel, 1994).

A Circular from the Director General of the Ministry of Education (1976) listed the rights and obligations of parents committees in terms of technical and material assistance for the school, reducing parents’ authority regarding organisational assistance, fundraising, and discussion of organisational and general issues as presented by the school principal. The parents committee has no right to discuss pedagogic issues that affect children, teachers or principals, other than in special cases where the principal will
help as much as possible. The Ministry of Education preferred parental involvement to focus on the organisational dimension rather than the pedagogical dimension where decisions must continue to be taken by the principal and the teachers (Raziel, 1994).

Although parental involvement is beneficial, those who are resistant to involvement see it as damaging the State responsibility to give a unique and equal education. They feel it will increase the gap between the different classes and races, since the parents who are involved are high SES parents (Friedman and Fisher, 2003).

Summary
In Israel, and elsewhere in the world, there is an apparently growing trend toward parental involvement in various spheres. The degree of interest in this issue can be seen from the many studies and reports seeking answers to the numerous associated questions, including the question of how much involvement is needed in education, the impact of involvement, and the search for the kind of involvement that benefits the parents, the child, the staff and the community. The interest in this issue is mostly raised by professionals where the parents are strong and powerful, especially in the high SES population, and not where the parents are less strong, or are at-risk families as in the Miftanim.

The Meaning of Parental Involvement
Introduction
Relationships between school and family are defined in terms that change due to development and reform in education and policy, as well as changes in their social milieu. Relationships in education are a wide range of relationships between schools and different bodies; communities, children’s families, voluntary bodies and authorities. Relationships with parents/families is a narrower term, focused on the relationship between the children’s families and the schools and covering ‘parental involvement’, ‘parental participation’ and ‘partnership in education’, all of which relate to the time and the credo of people. Most scholars use similar terms, although some stress one aspect or another.
Terms describing the relationship between the child’s home and the school vary in accordance with the relationship between these two systems and the educational developments and changes over time. The terms referred to in this study describe the relationships between the parents/home and the school and differ depending on which research and literature in the parental involvement area are being referred to. Parental involvement is a variable concept, subject to redefinition owing to change. Just as societies undergo reorganisation, so too do schools and communities; “Parental involvement’ is an amorphous term” (Epstein, 1995(a), p.211) and “it may mean different things to different people” (Jennings, 1992, p.434).

Definitions and models

Chrispeels (1996) wrote that the term ‘parental involvement’ changed according to whose definition was being used, the school or the parents, and it referred to the socio-economic status of the parents and the schools. Morgan et al (1992) claimed that, although it was changed according to the type of school and school life, it was defined in conventional terms, which was parents and teachers working in close collaboration for the good of the child. John et al (1997) claimed that parental involvement included activities in the families and volunteering in the school; “It encompasses the time, interest, and energy of being involved in children’s education” (p.36).

Although Vandegrift and Greene (1992) stressed the lack of parental concern, parents with no interest in their child’s education, or those who did not see education as important, it was commonly assumed that all families felt concern for their children and almost all families cared about their children (Epstein, 1995(a)). Families wished their children to succeed and desired more information from the school (Coleman, 1998; Epstein, 1995(b)). Families loved their children and wanted the best for them, but often did not know how to translate this concern into constructive involvement in their child’s education (Epstein, 1992; Marrsfield, 1994). They were not indifferent; they were interested in their child’s educational progress and wished to be more informed, however, they did not always know how to achieve this (Marrsfield, 1994). Moreover, the findings of the myth which stated that some parents and children did not care about school or education was refuted, and the definite conclusion was that all parents were concerned about their child’s education, and therefore children cared and regarded education as important (Coleman, 1998).
Hoover-Dempsey et al (1987) saw the parties in the relationships in education as the child as an individual, the family, the school and the community. These all consider themselves partners in the quest for the satisfactory implementation of educational programmes which are one of the community’s expectations. Valentine and Stark (1979) stated that the different perspectives of different groups with different values and assumptions influenced the development of involvement while Atkin et al (1988) claimed that home-school relationships are of a “developmental nature” and affected by what the parents and the teachers “bring” to these relationships with the child as mediator, influenced by the quality of his relationships with parents and teachers. These relationships changed according to each participant’s view, his expectations and his ability to contribute.

The role of the parents was one variable which influenced and changed the involvement image; this view of the parents’ role was examined by Hester (1989) who looked at parents as teachers, parents supporting activities, parents as learners and parents as advocates. It was also examined by Vincent (1996,2000) who focused on the role of the parents in their involvement in education. She identified four roles: the parent as supporter/learner, they support and adopt the professional’s approaches and concerns by being passive; the parent as consumer, they aim to encourage high standards and school accountability; the independent parent, they prefer to have minimal contact with the school; and the parent as participant, they are involved in the child’s education as well as in the governance of the school. Although parental involvement in this study refers to the perspectives of the parents and staff, it must be said that the children influence parental involvement as well. According to Edwards and Alldred (2000) who looked at the issue from the child’s perspective, four categories of their influence over the involvement and un-involvement of parents were found: children as active in parental involvement, children as passive in parental involvement, children as active in parental un-involvement and children as passive in parental un-involvement.

Watson (1979) claimed that parental involvement existed at all levels; from the basic level that is expressed in an unwritten agreement between parents and the educational system by sending the children to school in order to receive primary, fluent knowledge, through various types of advising that occur between home and the school system. This
level of participation did not involve control or a desire for more active involvement, and constituted marginal parent involvement. For many parents and schools this level of involvement was sufficient. Furthermore, this ‘protective model’ aimed to avoid conflict between the parents and the teachers. Involvement was seen as unnecessary and damaging, it was the most common model in education (Swap, 1993). Parental involvement was defined as having two poles and was concerned with the idea of controlling parental involvement from the staff’s point of view: one pole represented a welcome, an ideal involvement in which the involvement was controlled by the staff and took predefined paths on predefined occasions, i.e., “only when they need it”, while the opposite pole was when parents tried to administer the school. This included controlling school results, hiring and firing staff, and curriculum selection. Reality comes somewhere between the two extremes (Coulombe, 1995).

Others saw parental involvement as influence on the part of people who are outside the system in which decisions are made. They are involved in activities that allow them to influence the decision-makers (Frank, 1970). They saw the relationship between parents and schools as characterised by the type of militancy that this interaction expresses, and differentiate between militant and non-militant involvement. Militant involvement is when parents influence the system and is reflected in parents’ ability to convince and express an opinion on different processes. Non-militant involvement, on the other hand, consists of voluntary activities by parents in response to the school’s needs and demands (Saxe, 1975). The term ‘interference’ can be found in the earlier years of this issue, with a clear distinction between “involvement” and “interference”. Parental involvement is to participate in activities such as fund raising, baking cakes, helping with school renovations, accompanying school trips and being present at parents’ meetings while ‘interference’ is what the school perceives when parents seek involvement in policy setting, the educational process or decision making. The former is the parents’ term while the later is the school’s term (Noy, 1990).

The factor of the influence exerted by parental involvement was added by Gordon (1979), who noted three models: the home impact model, where the direction of impact moved from the school to the parents based on the concept that the school supplies parents with services and tools in order to improve academic achievement; the school impact model, where the influence was exerted in the opposite direction and where
parental involvement was calculated to affect the school’s life and professional staff; and the community impact model, which described the reciprocal impact of the two systems.

Petit (1980) defined parental involvement by levels and by direct and indirect bonds. He presented three levels of active involvement by the parents who responded to the school’s initiation, low, medium and high. ‘Monitoring’, a formal and indirect bond between the school and the parents, was applied by giving out information, circulars and invitations; ‘informing’, a direct bond, was applied through parent-teacher conversations, written communication; and ‘participation’, a direct bond, was applied through assistance and volunteering.

Parameters of the interaction defining parental involvement were identified as governance, communication, support of the school and fund raising, assistance in the classroom and education for parents by Lyons et al (1982). Friedman (1989) identified four categories of interaction between the parents and the school which were expressed by various activities: passive involvement, such as participating in events, affirmative responses to invitations to observe lessons, attend plays, parties, receiving regular information about their child’s progress at school and the curriculum; active involvement in the education process, such as attending meetings to discuss problems regarding education, running information centres, parents lecturing to classes; providing and receiving services the school supplied, services to parents such as culture and art enrichment, family outings and extra-curricular courses, and parents offering the school services such as catering for parties, improving the school environment, security work and maintenance; involvement in policy consolidation, where parents take part in decision making on issues such as disciplinary rules and regulations, splitting into groups, curriculum enrichment and teaching methods.

Friedman (1990) emphasised the wakefulness and identification dimensions which influenced the level of parental involvement. Parents’ wakefulness as opposed to indifference; being sensible of what is going on in school and being concerned about parents’ identification with the schools’ goals and values. Five levels of parental involvement in schools, alienation, avoidance, moderate involvement, over involvement and involvement without identification, resulted from the combination of these dimensions (see Figure 2.3).
Parents with low levels of wakefulness and identification towards the school will be very distant from the school and are alien to school (alienation); parents who have high identification with low wakefulness to the school have a sympathy with the school but will avoid being involved in the educational process (avoidance); parents who have medium identification together with medium wakefulness are partially involved in the school (moderate involvement); parents who have high identification together with high wakefulness are very much involved (over involvement) and parents who have high wakefulness and low identification, which is a rare phenomenon, are involved without identification (Friedman, 1990). The author would add that the strength of this model is that, by representing five possible states as a result of the wakefulness and identification
dimensions, it aims to include various populations with at-risk families among them and is a contribution in developing programmes for working with families on wakefulness and identification issues.

A wide spectrum of activities, whose purpose was unity and closeness between home and school, was defined by Jowett and Baginsky (1988), related to the various connections between the child’s home and the school. This reciprocal relationship was based on the parents’ right to influence education with the aim of participation in decision-making processes in education, being involved in whatever concerned their children and educational questions at large (Goldring, 1990; Friedman and Bendas-Jakob, 1990; Sa’ar, 1995). Parental involvement described a continuum of activities ranging from parents’ evenings and open days to parents providing classroom assistance. Three aspects of traditional parental involvement were identified; the first addressed the child’s well being, the second aspect was the parents’ support for the school’s taken for granted value system and the third aspect related to funding (Munn, 1993).

The parents as volunteers approach was developed by Weisz (1990) who emphasised parental activities such as communicating with other parents, helping with teaching instruction, working with small groups, public relations for the school to outside agencies, assisting on school trips and school fundraising. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) distinguished between personal involvement and group involvement; personal involvement is when parents work voluntarily for the school and help their children with their home studies. Group involvement pertains to relations between the child’s home, the school and the community regarding control and supervision. Parental involvement was divided into instructional forms of parental involvement, which included involvement at school such as assistance and participation in activities, and non-instructional forms of parental involvement, which included communication and governance. The former had a higher impact on the child’s studies than the later.

Moore (1991) identified three types of parental involvement: in policy making, as volunteers and as facilitators of childhood development. The USA National PTA supported three kinds of parental involvement - parents as the child’s first educators, parents as the school’s partners and parents as children’s advocates in society (National PTA, 1992), while the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of School Councils
(NLFSC) distinguished between involvement outside school, such as meeting physical, emotional, developmental and intellectual needs, and the parents’ roles in schools, such as fundraising, volunteering, parenting skills, parent-teacher communication, advisory councils and school councils (NLFSC, 2003).

According to Morgan et al (1992), parental involvement entails two independent elements: parents as support givers and parents as active partners. It is inadequate to focus on one element alone, since parents can be active and yet non-supportive, just as parents can be supportive but yet inactive. Ideally, parents should be both supportive and active, and the new meaning of parental involvement is:

"More complex, representing a close partnership between parents and teachers, which enables both to bring their unique insights and experience to the joint task of educating children. It stressed in particular the fact that parents and teachers can learn from each other." (Morgan et al, 1992, p.23)

Changing terms in involvement

In the past decade, researchers have tended to refer to ‘partnership’; this was a new term, which, together with the term ‘citizenship’, was introduced in the 1990s. It was used to describe the relationship between the parents and the school. The introduction of these terms reflected an effort to encourage involvement, commitment and responsibility while safeguarding the individual’s personal interests (Crozier, 1998). There was a recognition of the need for support and the importance of early childhood, based on communication, with emphasis on the support that the parents need, while respecting the independence of the family at the same time (Kagan, 1991).

Various terms representing the relationships between family and school, such as ‘community involvement’, ‘parent participation’ and ‘partnership in education’ have been suggested in education literature. ‘Community involvement’ was found on a variety of levels; the basic level demanded no initiative but involved such activities as sending children to school, counselling and giving information (Sallis, 1988). ‘Parental participation’ was used along with ‘parental involvement’ since it was: “…an umbrella term to describe all the models and types of liaison between parents, schools and other community institutions that provide for children” (Wolfendale, 1983, p.10). Contrary to
the simultaneous use of these terms, Beattie (1985) defined ‘parent participation’ as the reciprocal relations that exist between parents and teachers when the parents play an active role in the school’s educational work: “the legally required association of parents with the schools their children attend through systems of elected representatives and committees” (p.19).

Noy (1997) wrote that participation in education was parental involvement in the school’s efforts to educate which aimed to buttress the school and bolster the effectiveness of its educational effort. It was a two-way relationship; both sides contributed and received. On the one hand, parents participated in activities such as parents’ days, home visits, parties, parents’ meetings and communicating in writing with the school, on the other hand, school enabled the parents to influence the educational work in many ways. ‘Patterns of participation’ referred to the differences between schools and discussed the patterns of parent participation in community schools. The participation patterns were characterised mainly by collaborative effort stemming from a desire and ability to develop the school staff, pupils, parents and community residents (Harpaz, 1997).

The parents’ definition of ‘parental involvement’ was based on the activities that the parents engaged in with their children, while the schools’ definition of ‘parental involvement’ focused on the parents’ roles, which were limited to activities on specific days and fulfilling duties at home like assistance with the child’s studies (Wanat, 1997).

The term ‘home-school-community partnership’ was used by Chrispeels (1996), who defined it as:

“...the mutual collaboration, support, and participation of families, community members and agencies, and school staff, at home, in the community, or at school, in activities and efforts that directly and positively affect the success of children’s learning and development.” (p.299)

The term ‘home’ in this definition referred not only to parents but also to adults with responsibility toward the child (Chrispeels, 1996). According to the definition of a parent in the 1989 Children’s Act, this concerns not just the child’s biological parents but
also a person who cares about the child and holds parental responsibilities (Lowe, 1993). Moreover, the term ‘family’ is a wider and more appropriate word following changes in the family fabric in recent years, since significant people in a child’s life may be grandparents, uncles or aunts, siblings and even neighbours (Davies, 1991).

**Models in involvement**

Following numerous changes in parental involvement, various models have been proposed aimed at providing school staff with a working framework and different programmes for working with parents. Although some of the models are similar, others are overlapping and related to the changes that occurred in parental involvement from the point of view of the different participants. These models aimed to serve different purposes and relationships in different populations.

Haynes and Ben-Avie (1996) criticised Eccles and Harold’s (1996) approach to parental involvement as being focused on “specific types of activities” which consisted of monitoring, volunteering, involvement, progress and extra help in parental involvement. Haynes and Ben-Avie (1996) presented the School Development Program (SDP), which included parent participation in the School Planning and Management Team (SPMT), helping in classrooms or sponsoring and supporting school programmes and general participation. This model is focused “on permitting parents to play meaningful roles with staff approval and support in school and with clear direction and purpose” (p. 47). With respect to Haynes and Ben-Avie, and to Eccles and Harold, the author would add that, although the former model was focused on parents’ meaningful roles and included parents’ participation, parents’ resource and parents supporting the school, and the later model was focused on parental activities, these two models were focused solely on parents’ contributions and ignored parental needs, which is a vital component in relationships.

Atkin et al (1988) presented a framework of home/school links, which incorporated a range of various parental activities in schools. This model aimed to develop partnership with parents, as shown in Figure 2.4.
Atkin et al (1988) presented six areas of home/school links; support, education, resource, policy, collaboration and information. With respect to the writers, the author would add that it is unclear why ‘informing parents’ is not included in the ‘dialogue with parents’ since the children’s progress and development are an integral part of the curriculum, events and classroom life, unless it is a very passive involvement.

In 1989, Bastiani added ‘support and understanding for the work of the school’, ‘communication of information’, ‘active involvement with, and support for, family and community life’ and ‘providing opportunities for parents’ own education and development’ to this figure (p. 36). The author considers the strength of the second figure, which raised the parents’ needs issue and emphasised the importance of active
involvement, lies in it being a two-way involvement. Both the ‘information’ and ‘support’ parameters were added/changed; ‘informing parents’ was changed to ‘communication in information’ and ‘supporting parents’ was changed to ‘active involvement’, supporting the parents on the one hand and the parents being supportive on the other hand.

Bastiani (1993) argued that the phrase ‘working towards partnership’ would be more correct than ‘partnership’ in this context. It is worthwhile and positive rather than something ordinary and superficial. He put forward Pugh’s (1989) definition of ‘partnership’ in terms of essential information, attitudes and skills and ‘working relationship’ as involving mutual respect. This included responsibilities, skills, sharing information, decision-making and accountability. This term had different meanings for different people. The process can be anything from a simple partnership between the home and the school to participation in planning, teaching and curriculum evaluation (Bastiani, 1993).

To many writers partnership meant sharing power, responsibility and ownership, which did not have to be divided equally. Partnership implied reciprocity arising from mutual listening, constructive dialogue, ‘give and take’ and shared aims and objectives based on common ground. It also meant partners recognising the importance of their differences, and a commitment to parents, pupils and specialists working together to achieve the goals (Bastiani, 1993; Macbeth and Ravn, 1994). Furthermore, partnership was based on sharing the expertise and control of the teachers and the parents; where the teachers were considered as experts on education and parents were considered as experts on their child, the parents and the teachers also have to contribute their strengths in the relationship (Hornby, 2000).

The following model presents a framework that aims to assist schools to build partnerships with the family and the community. This model includes parents’ activities divided into six major types of involvement: parenting; the school assists and supports families in improving the home environment, which aims to support the children as students, communicating; the contact between the school and the child’s home with regard to school programmes and the child’s progress, volunteering; to help support the
staff and other parents, learning at home; to provide information and support in the child’s studies, decision-making; to develop parents’ leaders and encourage their participation in taking decisions, and collaboration with community; to strengthen the schools by community resources and services (Epstein, 1995 (a)). In addition to the activities, challenges, such as providing information to all families and not only to those who can attend the school’s activities, redefinitions, such as communication being not one way, but two-way or three-way, and the expected results of this relationship for the parents and the teachers were added (Epstein, 1995 (b)). The author would add that the strength in this model is in the inclusion of a wide spectrum of activities, various levels and links; this model is more congruent to parents of children who are studying in regular institutions.

Chrispeels (1996) reinforced the importance of two-way communication and, in her conceptual model of partnership, she added the word ‘co-’, which is the basis of any partnership since the foundation of any partnership is the base of this pyramid, the Co-Communicator, as shown in Figure 2.5.

**Figure 2.5: Partnership in education**
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The author would add that one of the strengths in this model is the importance of the two-way communication as a conditional basis and the importance of the mutual work of the schools and the parents-families-community. Although the purpose of the word ‘co’ is to participate equally in these processes, the inequality in the different roles is indeed prominent, since they are not equal, either in power or resources.

Although the theoretical “Model for Parent Involvement”, as shown in Figure 2.6, aimed to serve all teachers, it was built with teachers of children with special needs in mind. This model aimed to provide a framework for teachers:

“...to formulate overall policy and plans for working with parents. The model will also enable each school to conduct an audit of its current practice of parental involvement in order to ensure that, as far as possible, parents’ needs are being met and their potential contributions are being utilized.”

(Hornby, 2000, p.22)

The model consists of two pyramids: one relates to hierarchy and presents the parents’ needs while the second presents the parents' contributions. Each pyramid contains four different parameters that present different levels referring to the number of parents who participate in each parameter and parents’ and teachers’ time and expertise. The parameters in the parental contributions’ pyramid include policy, resource, collaboration and information, while the parameters in the parental needs’ pyramid include communication, liaison, education and support (Hornby, 2000):
Figure 2.6: Model for parental involvement
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(Hornby, 2000, p.23)
One of the strengths in this model is that it is multi-dimensional; it encompasses contributions and needs, parents’ time and expertise, teachers’ time and expertise, with a different number of participants in each level. This model clearly emphasises the link between the time and expertise and the levels and number of participants. It was, in the first place, built for special needs education, but it is also suited to general education. In fact, all parents have needs nowadays, particularly with regard to the changes in the families. The level and the measure of the various parameters have to be implemented according to the parents’ needs. With respect to Hornby (2000), in order to match to special education and at-risk families, the author would suggest that the word ‘parents’ should be changed to ‘family’, since the later includes involvement of other peoples who are not ‘mother’ and ‘father’, and the word ‘teachers’ should be changed to the word ‘staff’, since the families are involved with therapeutic staff, which includes vocational teachers, principals, educational counsellors, social workers, homeroom teachers and others as well.

Involvement is a two-edged sword and a two-way direction; on the one hand, the staff involve parents and parents are involved on the other hand; thus, parents’ contributions might be the staff’s needs, as well as the parents’ needs being the staff’s contributions. For example, giving information to the staff about the child is both the family’s contribution to the staff and the staff’s need. The author would emphasise the importance of the word ‘co-’ in each parameter, as Chrispeels (1996) did, in order to present each parameter as a two-way relationship. For example, the school/staff get resources from the parents, such as fundraising; equally, the parents get resources from the school/staff, such as back-up/support. Although parental involvement in the various models is not tied to parameters such as activities there is no “pure” parameter, since each of them incorporates others. For example, although liaison is an activity of a home-visit, it includes giving mutual information, informal education and support as well.

The Effect(s) of Parental Involvement on the Stakeholders

Introduction

The changes that occurred in parental involvement led the way to various studies which aimed to explore the effect(s) of parental involvement on the parents, the children, the school, the staff and the community. Most scholars claimed that there was a direct link
between involvement and benefits; however, others claimed that involvement might be harmful to all those involved. The literature concerning parental involvement has, in recent years, addressed the importance of parental involvement and its positive impact on educational outcomes. Parental involvement had a positive and visible effect on the children, their parents, the community, the staff and the school, although direct connections are not to be found between specific activity in involvement and the benefit. Various questions were asked, such as ‘What are the benefits in parental involvement?’ ‘What kind of involvement is beneficial?’ ‘Who is/are the stakeholders who benefit from involvement?’ ‘What is the highest benefit for the different stakeholders?’ ‘If involvement is beneficial, why are parents not more involved?’ ‘Is/are the benefit(s) influenced by the families characteristics?’ ‘Is involvement harmful?’ ‘If so, to whom?’ ‘Is/are the harms influenced by the families characteristics?’ The following section presents the various questions concerning the issue of the effect(s) of parental involvement on the different stakeholders.

The benefits of involvement
Relationships between parents and the school were reflected by different types of involvement, in different areas and in varying amounts. The importance of parental involvement is not new; it is one of the important variables associated with effectiveness generally and student achievement in particular: “The more involved parents are with their children’s schooling, the greater it seems are the chances of their children doing well” (Munn, 1993, p. 1).

Effective schools are schools that have come to realise the importance of parental involvement and to translate it into practical measures, providing opportunities for parents to be supportive and cooperate in their children’s education (Murphy, 1992; Goldring et al, 1995). Moles (1996) emphasised the conclusion drawn from the White Paper called “Strong Families, Strong Schools”, published in 1994 by the US Department of Education, which showed “that family involvement is a critical link to higher quality education” (p.252), and schools have to invest in this issue, although it required a shift in public attitudes to the importance of education and required the educators to rethink the cooperation and relationships between schools and parents.
In a study conducted by Lee (1993) the level of parental involvement was one of the variables which influenced the student outcome and misbehaviour in schools, related to the structure of the family. The study compared between traditional families and non-traditional families and the findings showed that there was a positive link between a high level of involvement and the student achievement and behaviour in traditional families, and in two types of non-traditional families, mother-only families and mother-stepfather families. These findings were strengthened by Zill (1996), who reinforced the fact that involvement of parents in school-related activities is beneficial to students from all kind of families, both traditional and non-traditional, and suggested that schools should involve parents in activities to encourage these families.

Parents and educators regarded parental involvement as a positive value, and emphasised the contribution of school-home relations to a child’s education (Wolfendale, 1983; Epstein, 1985, 1991; Bastiani, 1987; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Davies, 1988; Sallis, 1988; Goldring, 1993; CERI, 1997) and that such involvement was critical to the success of educational programmes (Bronfenbrenner, 1974; Goldring, 1990, 1993). There appeared to be a direct correlation between parental involvement and the child’s performance and it was stated that the relationship between parents and teachers, and between the school and the community, could affect the child’s school performance across the board (Comer, 1980; Epstein, 1982, 1987, 1990; Comer and Haynes, 1991; Alkin, 1992; Bobango, 1994; Chrispeels, 1996; Karther and Lowden, 1997; Coleman, 1998; Hornby, 2000).

According to Marrsfield (1994), regular information exchanged between the school and the child’s parents can contribute to the child’s development and progress and help to solve minor problems before they grow larger. The more involved the parents are, the better their child’s chance of doing well (Coleman, 1987; Henderson, 1987; Lareau, 1987; Loucks, 1992; National PTA, 1992; Walberg and Wallace, 1992; Munn, 1993; Katz, 1997). Children with parents who supported and encouraged school activities benefited the most (Coleman et al, 1966; Majoribanks, 1979; Epstein, 1983, 1987), this last aspect was the most beneficial parental involvement (Coleman, 1987; Lareau, 1987; Loucks, 1992).
Benefits to the child

Parental involvement benefits children by helping to raise their academic performance levels, enhancing their self-image, helping them to take responsibility for their studies, improving their learning habits and skills, reducing disciplinary problems, enhancing their ability to develop partnerships, and improving their school attendance levels (Feitelson, 1979; Epstein, 1982, 1984, 1989; Wolfendale, 1983; Comer, 1984; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987, 1992; Friedman and Bendas-Jakob, 1990; Goldring, 1990; Noy, 1990, 1992; Moles, 1993; Brian, 1994; Henderson and Berla, 1994). The child’s world is enriched as a result of meetings with parents from different backgrounds (Noy, 1990). School drop out rates are reduced (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990), there is less absenteeism (Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987), a higher standard of homework, (Epstein, 1982, 1987; Bauch, 1989; Rasinsky and Fredericks, 1989; Chapman, 1991), improved attitudes and behaviour toward the teachers and the school (Rasinsky and Fredericks, 1989; Chapman, 1991; Epstein, 1991; Fullan and Stiegelbauer 1991; Macbeth and Ravn, 1994; Sussell et al, 1996; Katznelson, 1999) and higher achievement in reading (Becker and Epstein, 1982; Epstein, 1982, 1986, 1991; Tizard et al, 1982; Epstein and Dauber, 1991). Children with the greatest learning difficulties also showed significant improvement following parental involvement (Barth, 1979).

Benefits to the parents

Parental involvement has a positive personal effect on parents (Weil, 1985) offering them self-fulfilment through the acquisition of status, power, leadership qualities, and involvement in political activities (Pennock, 1979; Noy, 1986; Marianne, 1991). Building up social contacts by participation in cultural activities stimulates the parents’ own development, which they perceive as engendered by a sense of their capacity to influence events, and the feeling of overcoming their estrangement from the school (Goldring et al 1995; Goldring, 1997). The more involved the parents are with the school programmes, the more they understand both the teachers and the school (Henderson, 1987; Epstein, 1992; Lointos, 1992; Sussell et al, 1996; Karther and Lowden, 1997), and the more they feel satisfied with the school (Karther and Lowden, 1997).

Parental involvement also helped to increase parents’ confidence (Karther and Lowden, 1997), improve their parenting skills and parenting role and help them achieve greater
self-fulfilment (Davies, 1988). It also sometimes encouraged them to catch up on their education and improve their employment standing. When parents and staff worked cooperatively on an ongoing basis, the school could offer parents ideas which guided them in helping their child, receiving information regarding educational programmes and the school’s work and becoming more supportive of their children (Henderson, 1987; Epstein, 1992; Liontos, 1992).

Gaining a better understanding of the schools and education was a result of a three-year study commissioned by the Department of Education and Science (DES) in the UK. The study ranked benefits and obstacles to parental involvement and examined measures to promote parental involvement in schools. In the first phase of the study, questionnaires were sent to all LEAs throughout England and Wales; the second phase consisted of case studies in both pre-school and primary years, and the secondary stage of education. The percentage of most important choices ranked by respondents in the pre-school and primary questionnaire (n=144) was as follows:

31 percent - improved parents’ understanding of schools and education,
19 percent - improved pupils’ achievements,
20 percent - enabled parents to share the knowledge of their own children with teaching staff,
16 percent - allowed parents to learn from the staff how to help their children,
8 percent - developed “open” schools that are resources in the community,
4 percent - made schools more sensitive to local needs and opinions,
1 percent - provided support and a respite for parents.

In the secondary questionnaire (n=139) the percentage of most important choices ranked by respondents was as follows:

27 percent - improved parents’ understanding of schools and education,
21 percent - developed “open” schools that are resources in the community,
18 percent - enabled parents to share the knowledge of their own children with teaching staff,
11 percent - allowed parents to learn from the staff how to help their children,
11 percent - made schools more sensitive to local needs and opinions,
9 percent - improved pupils’ achievement,
3 percent - provided practical help for hard-pressed teaching staff,
0 percent - provided support and a respite for parents.

In both questionnaires the study showed that the most important benefit of parental involvement was that it improved parents’ understanding of schools and education (Jowett and Baginsky, 1988).

Other writers have identified various benefits in parental involvement including: parents are more informed regarding their child’s progress, gained a better understanding of the school and its goals, the role of the teacher and the services offered (Wolfendale, 1983), parents gained more power and this enabled them to become partners, play a part in various organisations and thereby have an impact on education policy (Davies, 1988). Even parents with less than good memories of their own school days, or who were antagonistic toward schools, felt more positive if they became involved:

“...those parents who are alienated from mainstream culture or have had negative school experiences could come to perceive the school as a bastion of hope for their children and for themselves.”

(Haynes and Ben-Avie, 1996, p.45)

When partnership existed between the two systems, parents grew in understanding and awareness of their child’s world gaining:

“A legitimate glimpse of the school world and the environment in which the child functions, as active partners, not critical outsiders.... helps to develop parents’ personalities as well as satisfy their needs ... It enables them to realize skills, aptitude and aspirations that have no other means of expression.”

(Noy, 1990, p. 25)

**Benefits to the staff**

Teachers benefit when parents offer them emotional support, support for school goals and activities, recognition and appreciation for the teachers’ work and acknowledgement for the complexities and problems involved in teaching (Wolfendale, 1983; Noy, 1990; Shahar, 1992).
“Understanding the complexity involved in teaching and the routine difficulties teachers face produces solidarity and empathy on the part of the parents. Parents offer teachers vital emotional support and a sense that their accomplishments are valued and the challenges they face are understood.”

(Shahar, 1992, p.13)

Involvement of parents brings a greater appreciation of teachers from the parents, appreciation of parents’ help from the teachers, and improves student performance and teacher morale (Shahar, 1992; Sussell et al, 1996), raises teachers’ self- and professional-image, increases motivation to invest effort (Noy, 1986, 1990), and enhances the feeling of professional satisfaction following improvements in the children’s performance (Comer, 1984, 1986; Davies, 1988; Epstein, 1992; Liontos, 1992).

Various writers claimed that, when teachers got to know the parents, they had more insight into the child’s cultural background and the family’s needs. This enabled them to offer a better quality of teaching (Comer, 1984; Friedman, 1990; Comer and Haynes, 1991; Goldberger, 1991; Haynes and Ben-Avie, 1996).

“This knowledge base is likely to lead to an increased sense of efficacy among teachers and more effective and improved classroom climate and thus the sense of efficacy among teachers and more effective classroom management strategies and pedagogy.” (Haynes and Ben-Avie, 1996, p.45)

Teachers benefited when they got to know about other institutions and made contacts with other people to help enrich their students’ world, when parents helped by preparing study units, worked in the classroom, helped individual children, fundraised, obtained extra equipment needed by the school, undertook repairs and renewal on the school building, and organised school trips (Noy, 1990).

Teachers’ expectations of parents and teacher-parent relations were the subjects of a study conducted in Northern California during the 1984-1985 school year. The study was based on interviews with teachers in 20 schools and the sample consisted of 34 teachers from elementary schools, 16 teachers from lower secondary schools and 35
teachers from upper secondary schools. The study investigated teachers’ expectations of parents and teacher-parent relations and found that parental involvement had a positive effect on children and stressed that its effect on teachers was extremely important (Lareau, 1989). The emotional support that teachers received from parents when collaborative relations existed between them was the highest benefit (Noy, 1986, 1990; Lareau, 1989).

“Experience shows that when parents become partners in the school’s educational activities, they change their attitudes toward teachers and teaching ... and learn to appreciate the complexity of the profession, and the pressures and stresses that teachers are under, to become the teachers’ ardent supporters.”

(Noy, 1990, p.26)

Parental involvement made an important contribution to improving school climate (Cattermole and Robinson, 1985; Comer, 1986; Comer and Haynes, 1991; Sussel et al, 1996), reduced disciplinary problems, alleviated conflict, combated apathy and alienation (Sa’ar, 1995), improved home-school relations, developed parents’ desire to enlist community support on behalf of the school, and engendered more positive attitudes toward the school and its staff (Bermudez and Padron, 1987; Noy, 1990). The author would add that, although the benefits are clearly divided between the parents, the child and the staff, they are not ‘pure’ to the stakeholders and any benefit influences the parents, the child and the staff. For instance, “reduced disciplinary problems” was a direct benefit to the child, since it improved his behaviour but, in addition, it was an indirect benefit to the parents and to the staff as well.

**Harms in involvement**

In contrast to those who observed a direct link between parental involvement and benefits are those who questioned the uncertainty of this link and doubted the ability to correlate different aspects of parental involvement with different benefits. Some, such as Lareau and Shumer (1996) and Cooper and Mosley (1999), even argued that parental involvement was detrimental. The question of the correlation between parental involvement and children’s school performance was raised, together with the issue of negative sides to parental involvement that teachers sometimes ignored. They felt that the premise that any kind of parental involvement resulted in positive support for the
child was a leap of faith and that parental involvement can produce negative results or even harm children. Under certain conditions, relations between the parents and the school might be problematic: conditions such as divorce, child abuse or neglect, domineering parents, a child suffering from emotional problems such as depression or anxiety, and where there were difficulties with studies, hostile behaviour or defiance.

Cooper and Mosley (1999) wrote that teachers should take these conditions into account before inviting parents to become involved and the benefits of parental involvement should be presented in a balanced way. Friedman and Fisher (2003) warned that parental involvement might harm the staff as well. Some teachers reported that involvement is more harmful than beneficial, since the parents permanently criticised them in their professional work.

Summary
Involvement of the families in education appeared to be beneficial to the parents, to the child and to the staff. Moreover, a direct benefit for one stakeholder led to indirect benefits for others, although it could be harmful under certain circumstances. Teachers have to be aware and take into account both the nature of parental involvement and the families’ characteristics. Inspired by the majority of the researchers, who believe that parental involvement is positive and advantageous, different programmes have been developed aimed at encouraging greater parental involvement in schools and strengthening the relationships between home and school, in order to overcome the various barriers to involvement put up by the parents, the children and the staff. The next section focuses on the barriers to involvement raised by the parents and the staff.

Barriers to Involvement
Introduction
The literature discussed the various barriers to involvement put up by the parents, the children and the staff. There is a general consensus regarding the reasons for these barriers which included a lack of understanding of what ‘parental involvement’ meant, a lack of direct contact between the parents and the school, tension between home system and school system, negative attitudes on both sides, changes in family circumstances, personal and financial problems, and school policy toward parental involvement. This
section presents the various barriers, raised by the stakeholders, emphasising the barriers put up by parents and staff since this study focused on their point of view in this issue.

**Attitudes and beliefs against involvement**

The grounds for non-cooperation between parents and schools fell into two categories - rational and irrational. The rational grounds for non-cooperation were objective; based on conscious decisions backed by solid opinions and governed by logic. They were open to persuasion and could be changed. Educators and parents believed that each system should fulfil its role, undisturbed by interference from the outside. The irrational grounds for non-parental involvement related to the subjective reasons that cannot be controlled and included feelings of hope, anger and disappointment. These reasons were present in those involved with the educational system and could spoil the relationship between the two systems (Noy, 1990), it could also spoil both the professional consideration of the staff and the parents (Dayan, 1999).

In many OECD countries, the majority of schools did not allow parents into classrooms while lessons were in session in case they disturbed the children or distracted or bothered the teacher. Despite the fact that parents who helped in the classroom saved the education system money, teachers feared that parents might “spy” on them and reported that this help was ineffective or less positive (CERI, 1997). Moore (1991) emphasised the physical barrier separating the parents and the school in the guise of school fences and gates. In addition, inadequate signposting could make parents feel like intruders. Once parents were inside the school, there was often nowhere convenient for them to sit and talk to staff members.

Smilanski *et al* (1981) argued against parental involvement in the school system, supported the notion of separation between the two systems, and emphasised the importance of the child’s adjustment to each distinct system as integral to childhood development and preparation for adult life. A too close tie with the family might lead to the child being treated on a personal level, causing the school to deviate from its original role to a role more akin to home.

Because of the considerable problems they faced in trying to satisfy the ambitions, demands, and hopes of all their children’s parents, schools produced the opposite results
from those they intended. Thus, instead of achieving a climate of closeness and cooperation, they pushed parents away and caused dissatisfaction as a result of misinterpretation by parents. For instance, parents felt disappointed when they compared their children to other children in the class (Noy, 1990; Morris and Taylor, 1998), their expectations could remain unfulfilled, and their consequent frustration and dissatisfaction might make them critical of their child’s schooling (Smilanski et al, 1981; Comer, 1986; CERI, 1997). Parents often nurtured an exaggerated sense of identification with their children, perceiving their child’s failures as reflecting their own inadequacies. They regarded society’s attitude toward the child’s achievement as linked inseparably to themselves as parents, and their children’s success or failure as their own success or failure (Smilanski et al, 1981).

**Staff barriers**

Noy (1990) identified four groups that represented the teachers attitude/behaviour towards the parents: teachers who kept parents away from the school, teachers who avoided all contact with parents, teachers who did not initiate contact, while welcoming parents’ own initiatives, and teachers who worked cooperatively with parents. The barriers put up by teachers and principals to prevent parents from playing a role in their child’s schooling, and from feeling comfortable or welcome by the school, stemmed from beliefs, behaviour patterns, and conflicting educational concepts concerning parental involvement, a lack of commitment to parental involvement, territory and turf, confusion regarding the teacher’s role, poor expectations on the part of certain teachers regarding high-risk children at the school, and teachers’ uncertainties concerning their ability to work with high-risk parents (Noy, 1990; Moore, 1991; Liontos, 1992; Raviv, 1996).

Teachers regarded their relationship with the children as paramount, and believed that time spent with parents could squander time and energy better spent on the children (Noy, 1986, 1990; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Bastiani, 1993). The principals claimed that discussions with parents wasted precious time needed to address vital pedagogic matters (Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Lindle, 1989; Shahar, 1992; Sa’ar, 1995). Furthermore, the findings of a study which examined the barriers to parental involvement from the principals’, teachers’ and parents’ points of view, revealed that 50 percent of the teachers blamed the parents themselves for the barriers to parental involvement. The
study included teachers, principals and 60 parents from two junior high schools in Columbia, US. Most teachers reported that parents had unreasonable expectations of the school, that school matters were not important enough for them to take time off work to address, and that parents were incapable of helping. The study also found that teachers were apathetic due to the parents’ consistent lack of response, that there were not enough activities designed to involve parents, and that teachers were resentful and suspicious of parents who did get involved (Leitch and Tangri, 1988).

Teachers resisted parental involvement and prevented parents’ presence in the classroom due to a concern that parents might invade their domain, pass criticism and undermine their professional standing (Coleman et al., 1966; Lightfoot, 1978; Cullingford, 1985; Comer, 1986; Leitch and Tangri, 1988; Marrsfield, 1994; Goldberger, 1996). Principals resisted parental involvement due to a concern that parents were not expert and they lacked time, they did not wish to involve parents in decision-making, especially in low SES schools (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986). Teachers tended to exclude families from school life; they believed that this isolation would avoid the parents ‘intruding’ on the one hand and, on the other hand, they would be “free from the potential bias of stereotyping children into fixed social categories” (Lightfoot, 1978, p. 9).

Working with difficult parents led many principals to control and try to limit the involvement of these parents (Dodd, 1995). Furthermore, parents of children with special needs were seen by some professionals as less able and vulnerable parents who needed treatment themselves because they had developed personal problems; some saw this as being the cause of their children’s problems as a result of discipline and love deprivation for the child and poor parenting. When parents disagreed with results or disapproved of a diagnosis and when they refused to accept programmes they might have be seen as “aggressive” parents as well. Thus, many teachers preferred to keep a ‘professional distance’ (Hornby, 1995) from the parents. Instead of working in partnership with the parents, parents were seen as problems: “where the home situation is seen as the single most important factor responsible for the child’s behaviour difficulties” (Armstrong, 1995, p.53).

Although principals and teachers were interested in greater involvement of parents in their child’s education (Epstein, 1991) they reported a lack of knowledge in this area;
training and skills were needed to work with parents (Epstein and Dauber, 1991; Williams, 1992; de Acosta, 1996). Teachers reported not having programmes to extend involvement in the school and their anxiety about this experience (Vandegrift and Greene 1992) and work pressure, including criticism from the school principal (Comer, 1986; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Moore, 1991; Shahar, 1992; Raviv, 1996; CERI, 1997; Morris and Taylor, 1998.). These barriers were caused by inadequate preparation regarding parental involvement during teacher training (Williams and Chavkin, 1984; Turnbull and Turnbull, 1986; Epstein and Dauber, 1991; Moles, 1993; de Acosta, 1996), because they were ill-equipped to deal with parental involvement, teachers tended to fall back on their own experience, which failed to furnish them with the requisite skills (Marrsfield, 1994).

Moreover, they did not receive any outside encouragement for their efforts to involve parents (Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Shahar, 1992). The staff seemed to reject parental involvement for subjective reasons; teachers considered themselves as experts in their field and were wary of criticism from outsiders (Cullingford, 1985). They referred to parents as unskilled when it came to education and felt that parent’s input was subjective and professionally unsubstantiated (Edelstein, 1989; Noy, 1990, 1992; Raziel, 1994), while some teachers regarded parents as a threat and they became defensive when parents asked probing questions. A teacher’s confidence can suffer if educated parents challenge their professional competence (Friedman and Bendas-Jakob, 1990; Marrsfield, 1994), or they might fear parents’ blaming them for problems their child experiences (Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Shahar, 1992).

Because of the negatively perceived status of the teaching profession, teachers kept parents at arms length from the sources of information at the professionals’ disposal. Fear of parental criticism and assessment of their professional performance led to reservations in the teachers, in regard to their relationship with parents (Lightfoot, 1978), and teachers who lacked self-confidence tended to exaggerate their professional ability and intimidate parents (Shahar, 1992; Morris and Taylor, 1998) to the extent that parents avoided the school (Comer, 1986; Edelstein, 1989; Friedman, 1990; Raziel, 1994).
Parents’ barriers

Although parents have in common the fact that they have children, they are not alike, they are individuals (Blamires et al, 1977) and they are different in their involvement as well as in their barriers to involvement. Parents referred to school as a professional authority in which they did not wish to interfere because of its professional status (Tizard et al, 1981; Noy, 1986), they perceived teachers as professionals who knew their work and understood what was best for their children (Cullingford, 1985; Noy, 1990). The parents consider the teachers’ professionalism not only in terms of expertise, but also in terms of their capability to handle a large numbers of children in their classes (Cullingford, 1985). Social barriers were due to differences in race, income, education (Smilanski et al, 1981; Crozier, 1999), culture, values and life style between the parents and the school staff (Comer, 1986; Turnbull and Turnbull, 1986; Moles, 1993). There were also difficulties with language and communication (Turnbull and Turnbull, 1986; Smith, 1991; Lontos, 1992; Brink and Chandler, 1993), embarrassment due to ignorance, a lack of understanding of the system (Smith, 1991; Brink and Chandler, 1993, Crozier, 1999), they were not up-to-date or did not know what questions to ask (Vandegrift and Greene, 1992), they felt that involvement would seem inappropriate and had low self esteem (Friedman and Bendas-Jakob, 1990; Noy, 1990; Vandegrift and Greene, 1992; CERI, 1997).

Failures experienced by parents in childhood, together with negative memories of school, obstructed parental involvement in schools as well (Lightfoot, 1978; Smilanski et al, 1981; Cullingford, 1985; Boger et al, 1986; Comer, 1986; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Leitch and Tangri, 1988; Noy, 1990; Smith, 1991; Brink and Chandler, 1993; Moles, 1993; Eccles and Harold, 1996; CERI, 1997), particularly in the case of populations at risk (Vandegrift and Greene, 1982; Noy, 1990) and due to personal problems and lack of time (Lightfoot, 1978; Smilanski et al, 1981; Boger et al, 1986; Comer, 1986; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Leitch and Tangri, 1988; Moore, 1991; Noy 1990; Smith, 1991; Wanat, 1992; Brink and Chandler, 1993; Moles, 1993; Eccles and Harold, 1996; CERI, 1997). Parents of children with special needs could feel isolation, anger and sadness, tired of explaining and talking about the difficulties, losing their faith in a better future and in despair (Blamires et al, 1977). Some parents regarded school as representing the establishment, and projected their negative feelings towards the establishment onto the
school. Raviv (1996) used the term "displacement" from psychology, whereby parents perceived teachers or the school through their own experiences.

Parents would not wish to be involved if they sensed that staff were patronising or condescending (Hoover-Dempsey *et al.*, 1987; Lindle, 1989), or if they felt that the staff were indifferent or antagonistic toward them or not equal to them (Moore, 1991). Parents felt anger if the school failed to inform them of clashes between their child and teachers (Lindle, 1989), or if they discovered the existence of problems when it was too late to remedy them (Coulombe, 1995). Parents were concerned about asking questions that might get teachers into trouble, fearing that the teacher might take it out on the child. Parents also felt that their involvement might burden the school (Noy, 1986; Friedman, 1989) and might create work for teachers (Shahar, 1992).

Three studies were undertaken to explore the barriers to involvement in order to overcome the barriers and build closer relationships with the parents. The findings showed that lack of time was one of the barriers. In the first study it was the main barrier to involvement: the lack of time referred to concerned the parents in two studies and the staff in the third. The first study was conducted by the National PTA in the US who administered questionnaires to 27,000 presidents of local units and 3,000 council leaders. It examined the barriers to parents’ evenings that were faced by parents. Although the barriers were lack of language, lack of time, lack of skills, poverty and problems relating to single-parent families, the findings demonstrated that the main reason was lack of time; 89 percent of the parents felt they had no time, 32 percent believed they had nothing to contribute, did not understand, or were unfamiliar with the system, 32 percent did not know how to be involved, 28 percent claimed lack of child care, 25 percent blamed shyness or unavailability during the day, 15 percent blamed language and cultural differences, 11 percent cited lack of transport, nine percent felt unwelcome at the school. Other barriers were reported by 21 percent (National PTA, 1992).

The second study, conducted by the LEAs in England and Wales and funded by the Department of Education and Science (DES), examined the barriers to parental involvement. The main goal of the study, which commenced in April 1986 and took three years, was to improve the relationship between the child’s home and the school through various programmes. The study found that 25 percent of teachers had concerns
over working with parents, 20 percent felt that, for the staff, this was not a top work priority, 18 percent reported that schools lacked the time to develop this part of school work, 11 percent indicated that parents were concerned about the school, seven percent stated that parents had no time to be involved, seven percent said that parents did not wish to be involved, seven percent blamed a lack of space in the school and five percent blamed the lack of school resources (Jowett and Baginsky, 1988).

The American Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) performed the third study in this issue. It investigated two schools, given the aliases of Park High School and Northshore High School, to explore, *inter alia*, the question of barriers to parental involvement. The ultimate aim of the study was to overcome these barriers in order to reach a state of partnership with the parents. Teachers, principals, parents and students were involved in the study. The findings indicated that the main barriers concerned lack of time and misguided attitudes. A large percentage of families had no time to be involved in the various school activities. In addition, respondents agreed that some teachers felt it unnecessary for families to be involved at senior high school level (Epstein, 1990). The author would add that, although there are various barriers identified in these studies, the common conclusion is the existence of barriers to involvement on the part of both staff and parents.

Over recent years, schools have become regional and larger, employing large numbers of teachers from a wide geographical spread. Many of the teachers are different from the families in terms of race and ethnic background. Cultural differences, and differences in attitude toward education, could cause antagonism in teachers towards their students’ families (Moore, 1991). This, in turn, reinforces their belief that parents must be distanced from their child’s education (Comer and Haynes, 1991; Moore, 1991), particularly in cases where parents are alcoholics or drug addicts, live in refuges, or where the child’s family structure has altered, or where the child’s background is socio-economically disadvantaged (Hoover-Dempsey *et al*., 1987; Shahar, 1992). Family structure and other problems produce unwillingness in children, and sometimes frustration, disappointment, apathy, anger and withdrawal, which reinforces a clear connection between low socio-economic status and poor achievement at school (Comer, 1986; CERI, 1997).
Macbeth and Ravn (1994) claimed that family background was influenced by factors:

“... including the size of the family, the wealth or poverty of the family, harmony or tension, love or lack of it, physical circumstances, the community in which the home is situated as well as directly educational influences such as books in the house, encouragement to learn from parents, examples of brothers and sisters, access to the television, moral and religious values and social attitude.”

(3)

Whilst Epstein (1995(a)) wrote that schools that catered for disadvantaged communities had a greater tendency to contact families regarding children’s problems and difficulties, unless they were working on developing a partnership programme requiring information and reporting on positive situations.

Although numerous barriers to involvement were mentioned, the various studies reported have addressed the direct correlation between parents’ socio-economic status, parents’ education and parental involvement (Feitelson, 1979; Comer, 1986; Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Lareau, 1987; McLaughlin and Shield, 1987; Davies, 1988; Delgado-Gaitan, 1988; Vandegrift and Greene, 1992; MacBeth and Ravn, 1994; Goldring et al, 1995, Goldring, 1997; Glover et al, 1998; Cooper and Mosley, 1999). Parents with a low level of education and single parents were less involved in volunteer work and in their child’s education (Lichter, 1996). The less educated parents were, the less they were inclined or able to be involved in their child’s education (Alkin, 1992; Dauber and Epstein, 1993; CERI, 1997): “...less educated or poor parents cannot or do not want to become involved in their children’s education....” (Alkin, 1992, p.1141).

Compared to disadvantaged families, families with higher socio-economic status and a better standard of education were more involved in the education of their children, who, in turn, did better at school (Coleman, 1987; Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1990; Epstein, 1995(b)). Socio-economic status and parents’ education was a double-edged sword: the disadvantaged populations’ problem regarding involvement in their children’s education, and the difficulties and lack of trust experienced by school heads and teachers regarding such families’ ability to be involved in and contribute toward their children’s education (Hewison, 1985; Macbeth and Ravn 1994). While many studies found socio-economic
status a critical factor in parents’ lack of involvement in their child’s education, others laid the blame at the feet of the schools. Schools treated such families in a way that did not encourage involvement and cooperation. In some cases, the only means available to the system was punishment, which gave rise to student violence, vandalism, and other undesirable behaviour in school. In a minority of cases, matters were even worse; because of such treatment, parents conveyed a double message, especially when problems arose, they related to the school as a source of hope on the one hand while, on the other hand, they treated school as an enemy (Lareau, 1987). A better relationship between the two systems was important for all children and for those highly at risk in particular (Davies, 1988):

“Making better connections among the key parts of the system is important for all children, but for the children who are at risk of academic and social failure it is essential. Most of these marginal children are from low income and low social status families, have high rates of social and academic difficulty, low achievement, and early school leaving.” (p.12)

One of many studies into this issue was conducted by the Institute for Responsive Education (IRE); 350 teachers and parents from Boston, Liverpool and several localities in Portugal were interviewed. These places were chosen for the high percentage of children with poor achievements and the high rates of poverty. The study explored the relationship between public schools and parents with poor socio-economic backgrounds. The findings showed that these parents had no, or hardly any, relationship with the school. Communication with parents was negative since it was focused on the children’s behavioural and learning problems. Many of the teachers had preconceived ideas regarding children from such backgrounds and anticipated disciplinary problems and poor school performance. Principals and teachers tended to regard families with low socio-economic status as impaired families. They thought that these families were seriously distressed, with problems of alcoholism and prostitution, they believed that parents who were poor or living on the social margins, were hard to reach due to their lack of time, interest and concern regarding education, or that they were incapable of taking any interest. Only a small number of the teachers believed that school policy or teacher attitudes could be part of the problem. Often parents from disadvantaged backgrounds had low expectations of their child’s capabilities and a low estimation of
their own ability to be involved. They dwelled on their own past failure. Most of the parents wanted to be more involved and exhibited interest in their children’s education and most of the parents were reachable (Davies, 1988).

An additional study explored the issue of barriers to involvement and confirmed other studies; it examined seven factors, including cooperation and support between home and school, among elementary schools in California in communities with varying socio-economic status. Socio-economic status was defined on the basis of parents’ occupation and the percentage of the pupils on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The study consisted of a questionnaire, interviews, observation and document analysis. According to the findings parents with high socio-economic status were involved in the curriculum and supported the school in different ways. These parents donated money to encourage school programmes and helped in the classrooms. Such schools were an important and integral part of the community (Hallinger and Murphy 1986).

A comparative study of primary and lower secondary schools in Baltimore was conducted by Dauber and Epstein (1993) and found that better educated parents were more involved at home and at school than less well educated parents. Parents with fewer children were more involved in their children’s education at home, although family size was not found significant in explaining parental involvement at school. Working parents cooperated significantly less at the school building, although work outside the home was not found a significant predictor of parental involvement. Marital status did not significantly affect the degree of parental involvement either at home or school.

The goal of Wanat’s (1994) study was to describe the special needs of schools attended by children from contemporary family structures and determine how well schools met these needs. This study involved parents and principals from 12 Mid-western schools in the US, high schools, lower secondary schools and primary schools. Families were selected where the father was in employment and the mother was a homemaker. The findings showed that the “problem” families’ involvement depended more on measures adopted by the schools for this purpose. Variances in parental involvement were not due to family structure, but to school practices.
Although the present study is a pioneer by focusing on parental involvement in the Miftanim, Cohen and Givon (1999) conducted a study in six Miftanim. The purpose of the study was to explore the characteristics of the trainees and it has a slight relevance to parental involvement as the findings showed involvement from the point of view of the parents and the staff. They showed that, although the staff wished to compensate the child for the parents’ deficiency, the professional tendency nowadays emphasised the importance of parental involvement in the child’s education. Therefore, 91 percent of the Miftanim carried out parent-teacher meetings, 85 percent carried out private talks when giving and receiving information, 85 percent made home visits, 53 percent carried out private talks as a result of special events or in a crisis and 16 percent gave direct care to the parents.

The stakeholders who maintained the relationship with the parents were the therapeutic staff, the social worker and the educational counsellor (100%), the principals (97%), the vocational instructors (94%), homeroom teachers (91%) and the National Service volunteers (18%). The findings from the families showed that 63 percent of the families participated in parent-teacher meetings, 66 percent participated in personal talks, 56 percent of the parents received home visits, 24 percent participated in personal talks as a result of special events or in a crisis, four percent of the families were in direct care and there was no relationship in six percent of the families. The main conclusion was that the relationship with the parents was aimed mainly at giving information and up-dating the parents about the trainee’s situation, no relationship in the family-care issue existed.

**Changing the present**

The debate on the issue of parental involvement led most of the scholars to encourage and increase the involvement of families, especially where children needed additional attention and special care. Davies (1991) stated that involvement must not be exclusive to the kind of parents who responded to initiatives, but also to parents who are defined by the school as “hard to pin down” and schools have to aspire to a type of parental involvement whose aims are to improve results, especially academic achievement, and for the child to flourish socially. Topping (1992) stated that schools have to foster a closer communication with the parents and use additional parent-teacher meetings, additional communication, by phone and by letter, to spend more time with the parents, rather than use the usual way of giving information, such as written reports and brief
chats, this is not sufficient for children with special needs, who have behavioural problems. They should also refer to the parents as part of the solution, rather than part of the problem, since “problematic pupils do not automatically have problematic parents” (Topping, 1992, p.7).

Schools have to implement programmes for at-risk families in order to reach the basic principle that the family and the school are mutually dependent and are responsible for the child’s education, and value the parents through their strengths. Furthermore, schools have to reach at-risk families since parental involvement is beneficial to all at-risk youth. They gain the most benefit from their parents’ involvement (Liontos, 1991), especially as there is a gap between the home-world and values and the school-world and values. The school culture is unfamiliar to at-risk children while home culture is familiar; this gap can lead at-risk children to reject the school culture, which includes school goals and studies (Hamilton-Lee, 1988).

In order to overcome the barriers and build a productive partnership, teachers have to develop communication with the parents based on respect, empathy and genuineness, as suggested by Carl Rogers. They also have to be realistic, objective and optimistic about the child’s progress and be open, honest and sensitive as well (Hornby, 1995):

“Teachers need to communicate the attitude that nothing is hopeless and that every situation can be improved, even if perhaps not all of the problems experienced by parents can be completely solved.”  

(p. 7)

Teachers need good interpersonal skills, to include listening and counselling, communication skills such as maintaining contact and involving the parents in their child’s education (Hornby, 1995). Programmes for low SES families aimed to overcome the barriers by guiding the parents to understand the goals and the school’s expectations by a two-way communication, based on respect and the feeling that the parents are welcome (Lareau, 1987).
Summary

The literature on the issue of parental involvement reflected the importance of the relationships between home and school, and the fact that all parents want the best for their child; this is not new. This led to increased involvement of the parents, since it is a basic element needed in the child's performance in various domains. Although parental involvement has various definitions which relate to time, population, policy, location and attitudes towards this issue, they are all based on relationships expressed by various contacts and activities of the parents and the staff in order to improve the child in social, mental and academic areas and reduce the gap between home and school.

Although both the parents and the staff motivate involvement, according to their faith, attitudes, barriers and their credo, the schools are more powerful in this issue; they are the key to the gate to involvement. Programmes for teachers to acquire the special skills to work with the families are needed in order to overcome the barriers, to welcome and to work with parents. Although parental involvement is beneficial to the different stakeholders, schools have to ask questions as follows: ‘What are the purposes, the effects and the results of such involvement?’ and ‘What are the most appropriate ways to apply this involvement?’ Schools have to involve parents differently, according to the individual needs of the children, the individual needs and capabilities of the families, and with regard to the families’ characteristics and the involvement must be based on respect, honesty and sensitivity.

The next chapter presents the methodologies and the methods used in this study in order to explore the issue of parental involvement in the Miftanim from the point of view of the parents and the staff.
CHAPTER THREE – METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between the parents and the Miftanim’s staff, namely the principals, social workers/educational counsellors, vocational instructors and homeroom teachers. This chapter presents the methodologies, both quantitative and qualitative, and the methods used in this study. The methods were a survey, which encompassed 17 Miftanim, and two case studies chosen from the Miftanim surveyed. Five different questionnaires and two different interviews were put to the different stakeholders and documents were read. The research was based on recommendations found in the literature with regard to the ethical issues.

The Research Questions

1. What are the areas and levels in which parents are involved with the Miftan and with whom?

2. Why is there involvement?
   What are the parents’ reasons to be involved?
   What are the staff’s reasons to involve the parents?

3. Who initiates the contacts?
   Who are the initiators? The parents and/or the staff?
   In what areas and levels are the contacts initiated?

4. Why is there no involvement?
   What are the parents’ barriers to involvement?
   What are the staff’s barriers to parental involvement?

5. What is the attitude of staff towards parental involvement?
   Do the staff encourage/discourage parental involvement?
   How is this attitude applied?
6. What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the parents, the staff and the children?
   Is this beneficial/harmful?

7. What is the most appropriate parental involvement form compatible with the needs of the Miftanim (the child, the parents and the staff)?

The Nature of the Research

The aim of this research is to explore the issue of parental involvement in the Miftanim in order to gather information and to acquire knowledge in this issue:

“Research is best conceived as the process of arriving at dependable solutions to problems through the planned and systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. It is the most important tool for advancing knowledge, for promoting progress, and for enabling man to relate more effectively to his environment to accomplish his purposes, and to resolve his conflicts.”

(Mouly, 1978, quoted in Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.40)

and:

“ a focused and systematic enquiry that goes beyond generally available knowledge to acquire specialised and detailed information, providing a basis for analysis and elucidatory comment on the topic of enquiry.”

(Johnson, 1994, p. 3)

Research Paradigms

The quantitative (positivist) research approach and the qualitative (relativist) research approach are used in this study. The first phase of the research is based on the
quantitative (positivist) research approach, which is based on the use of a scientific method that can be quantified through objective methods which focus on facts and look for causality. The researcher is independent and the sample is large. The intention of this research is to uncover the rules explaining the nature of the reality the researcher is seeking (Easterby-Smith et al, 1994), which is the nature of the reality of the relationships between the parents and the Miftanim. The scale in this research is medium; 21 Miftanim. Objectivity is assured since the author conducted the survey as an outsider, the questionnaires are structured, the scope of the findings is nomothetic and the findings are shown by percentage, mean, median and standard deviation (SD).

“Quantitative research is a genre which uses a special language which appears to exhibit some similarity to the ways in which scientists talk about how they investigate natural order - variables, control, measurement, experiment.”

(Bryman, 1988, p.12)

The second phase of the research is based on the qualitative (relativist) approach, which allows the author close and personal involvement with the participants in order to gain an understanding from the present situation, (Cohen and Manion, 1994), to obtain richer and in depth data (Bryman, 1988), to interpret and understand their social life, and to discover people’s meanings (Sarantakos1998).

The quantitative and qualitative approaches are different methodologies, which lead the author to gather data in several ways. Each data set represents different aspects and combining these two in the same study enables the author to analyse the data differently in order to overcome deficiencies (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996). Each theory has rules and seeks further truth in different ways; one can enhance the other.

The following comparative tables (3.1 and 3.2) show the main criteria in these two approaches/paradigms:
Table 3.1: Comparative criteria (A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative (Positivist)</th>
<th>Interpretative (Relativist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium/large –scale research</td>
<td>Small-scale research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Objectivity’</td>
<td>‘Subjectivity’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research conducted ‘from the outside’</td>
<td>Personal involvement of the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizing from the specific</td>
<td>Interpreting the specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(after Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.39)

Bryman (1988) uses eight criteria to compare the quantitative and qualitative methodologies:

Table 3.2: Comparative criteria (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of qualitative research</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>Means to exploration of actors’ interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between researcher and subject</td>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher’s stance in relation to subject</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between theory/concepts and research</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategy</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of findings</td>
<td>Nomothetic</td>
<td>Ideographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of social reality</td>
<td>Static and external to actor</td>
<td>Processual and socially constructed by actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of data</td>
<td>Hard, reliable</td>
<td>Rich, deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(after Bryman, 1988, p.94)
These differences reinforce the author’s decision to collect data from both quantitative and qualitative methodologies; relying on several data sources offers a wider picture. An additional reason is the fact that the research questions are different and require different methodologies to be answered:

“This leads to the point that different questions required different methods to answer them. Some questions can only be answered using quantitative methods, and some can only be answered using qualitative methods.”

(Punch, 1998, p.244)

The use of triangulation aims to research evidence from several different points of view (Johnson, 1994).

“Triangulation is the most frequently used term which has been identified by Norman Denzin to highlight the use of different methods, investigators, data and theories within a study.”

(Burgess, 1993, p. 104)

The different approaches have different ways of examining the same research issue; they contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon or issue from different aspects (Bryman, 1988). The fact must be faced that words and figures are needed to understand the world and qualitative data can be used to reinterpret, to explain, to add and to illuminate the quantitative data (Miles and Huberman, 1994). It can involve methods, data, theories, and investigators as well (Burgess, 1993). Robson (1993) claims that no rule exists that supports any single method. Moreover, there are advantages to using a large number of methods when researching, despite the extra time required. Robson (1993) supports Bryman (1988) and mentions the chief and most marked advantage of using multiple methods:

“One important benefit of multiple methods is in the reduction of inappropriate certainty. Using a single method and finding a pretty clear-cut result may delude investigators into believing that they have found the ‘right’
answer. Using other, additional, methods may point to differing answers which remove specious certainty.” (Robson, 1993, p.290)

As Cohen and Manion (1994) wrote:

“... triangulation is a technique of physical measurement .... Triangular techniques in the social sciences attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one standpoint and, in so doing... by making use of both.”

(p. 233)

The combination of these two approaches enables the author to gather data based on triangulation, by making use of both quantitative and qualitative data, which seek convergence of results. It is a complementary tool which aims to get different angles of a phenomenon (Greene et al, 1989) in order to study the issue from more than one standpoint; it aims to explain and to map out the complexity and the richness of human behaviour (Cohen and Manion, 1994), such as the issue of parental involvement, the facts, the point of view of the parents and the staff and the reasons for the present situation in the Miftanim.

The Methodologies

Introduction

Various questions arose at this stage. It had to be decided which methodologies to choose in order to obtain the most appropriate data; the type of survey that would give the best results; the extent of the survey; the reason for the choice of a case study; what would best contribute to the research; whether to choose one or more case studies; which Miftanim to choose and the criteria for this choice; whether analysis of documents would contribute to the acquired knowledge and, if so, which documents.

The methodologies chosen in the present study were the survey and two case studies: the survey was the first phase of the research and the case studies were the second phase.
The survey findings promoted and assisted the author in her choice of the two case studies.

**The survey**

Survey can be defined as “an investigation of the behaviour, opinions, etc of a group of people” (Crowther, 1995, p.1204) and:

“...*surveys are methods of data collection in which information is gathered through oral or written questioning. Oral questioning is known as interviewing, written questioning is accomplish through questionnaires.*”

(Sarantakos, 1998, p. 223)

and:

“*Surveys are well suited to descriptive studies where the interest is, say, in how many people in a given population possess a particular attribute, opinion or whatever...*”

(Robson, 1993, p.49)

Hutton (1990) defined a survey as:

“...*the method of collecting information by asking a set of pre-formulated questions in a predetermined sequence in a structured questionnaire to a sample of individuals drawn so as to be representative of a defined population.*”

(p. 8)

In the first phase of the research, a cross-sectional survey was carried out, this is a survey conducted at a particular moment of a predefined population (Frankel and Wallen, 1993; Robson, 1993; Cohen *et al*, 2000). Its aim is to understand nature, relationships, opinions, a particular attribute and events in the life of people (Robson, 1993; Cohen and Manion, 1994; Johnson, 1994; Babbie, 1995; Thomas, 1996; Denscombe, 1998; Sarantakos, 1998). It is intended “to construct a data set from which estimates can be made and conclusions reached about this population” (Thomas, 1996, p.115).
The survey collected data from a predefined population, the staff and the parents, at a specific time, the end of the scholastic year, in order to describe the spheres of parental involvement in the Miftanim in 2002, the demographic characteristics of the parents and the staff in the Miftanim and the different behaviour, attitudes and/or feelings of those participants towards parental involvement. In this survey, structured questionnaires were sent by mail to collect information by a set of pre-formulated questions, based on the research questions. The sample consisted of 17 Miftanim out of 21 Miftanim in Israel in the Jewish sector. The 17 agreed to participate in the survey as a result of the author making personal contact by phone with the principal and/or the secretary from each Miftan. The defined population is representative since it includes each role of the Miftan staff: principals, social workers/educational counsellors, vocational instructors and homeroom teachers.

The case study

Case study can be defined as:

“...a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence.”

(Robson, 1993, p.52)

and:

...a case study is an umbrella term for a family of research methods having in common the decision to focus an enquiry round of instance.”

(Adelman et al, 1977, quoted in Nisbett, 1984, p. 5)

The case in this study is a Miftan; a case study speaks for itself and is reliable. Special features can be discerned which provide the key to understanding situations. They illuminate and support other case studies. A single researcher can conduct a case study and additional people are not required (Nisbet and Watt, 1984). The data is not presented in professional language, allowing it to be understood by different populations, and also
by people who are not researchers (Nisbet and Watt, 1984; Johnson, 1994); it may be a classroom, a child, or any other case to concentrate on (Verma and Mallick, 1999; Stake, 2000), “it might be just an element of such an organization: a class, a work team…” (Blaxter et al, 2001, p.71). The case study aims to “gain in-depth understanding replete with meaning for the subject, focusing on process rather than outcome, on discovery rather than confirmation” (Burns, 2000, p. 460), and to understand the different ways of thinking and the interdependent functions of the people who have different roles but work together in the same place (Drever, 1995). Thus, in the Miftan, the different roles are the parents, the principal, the social worker/educational counsellor, the vocational instructor and the homeroom teacher.

The data for a case study is gathered using various techniques, including observation, interviews and reading documents (Yin, 1994; Bassey, 1999; Verma and Mallick, 1999; Burns, 2000), records or pupils’ work (Verma and Mallick, 1999), physical artefacts, and archival records (Yin, 1994; Burns, 2000). The recommendation of Yin (1994) is that no single source is better than any other and “…the various sources are highly complementary, and a good case study will therefore want to use as many sources as possible” (p.80), the tools used in the case studies are interviews and analysis of documents, the latter “…can be used as supplemental information as part of a case study whose main data source is participant observation or interviewing” (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p.57).

The topic of this thesis is to explore relationships between the parents and the Miftan’s staff in the present year of the research. It was relevant to use the interview and reading documents methods since other methods, such as physical artefacts, archival records and records or pupils’ work, were not relevant. Observation was not appropriate as the study focused on relationships, which are expressed by many visual and non-visual activities, spread at different locations and at different times.

The second phase of this research was to choose two subjects for case study (multi case studies) from the Miftanim that had participated in the first phase of the research. Focusing on one case study can lead to esoteric interest, a case study should therefore be
enlarged to encompass different types of the object of investigation, and the choice of two case studies enables comparison (Johnson, 1994). It also enlarges and encompasses the data that refers to the research questions at different types and angles of the parental involvement issue. These two Miftanim were selected on the basis of the high rate of response in the survey. This indicated the will of the participants to cooperate, especially the parents. The author telephoned to ask for the principals’ agreement to participate, in the first place, and then each member of staff and the parents were contacted in the second place.

A question that arises in the context of the case study is whether it is possible to generalise, (external validity), since one cannot make deductions on the basis of one case (Burns, 2000). It does not represent a world in the widest term, but aims to illuminate the case itself, and what can be learned from a case study is unique to the present case (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Yossifon, 2001). The two case studies in the present work do not presume to arrive at a generalisation regarding the Miftanim in Israel. The findings that emerged, and the conclusions drawn, relate to these two Miftanim only.

**The Research Tools**

**Introduction**

The methods used in this research are the questionnaire, the interview and documents. Various questions arose at this stage about the questionnaire, the interview and documents. The following questions arose with regard to the questionnaire:

- What type of questionnaire to design?
- Will it be a questionnaire used in other researches or will it be a new one? What will be the content of the questions?
- Will the questions contain all the research questions or will the questions focus on some of them?
- Which research questions?
Other questions arose in the second phase of the research with regard to the interview and the documents:

- What type of interview?
- Will it be a structured, semi-structured or unstructured interview?
- What type of documents should be read?

Although there are a variety of questionnaires in the literature on the parental involvement issue, none of them were designed for the Miftanim’s population. Many questions were irrelevant to this research and building a new questionnaire was chosen for this research. The questions were bound to the specific population and to the unique research questions in this study. The questionnaires and the interview were based and constructed according the various advices found in the methodology literature.

The questionnaire

The questionnaires in this study aimed to collect data from five different groups in the Miftanim connected to the parental involvement issue. Four groups out of five represent the staff and the fifth group represents the parents in the Miftanim. The questionnaires for the staff included the principals, the social workers/educational counsellors, the vocational instructors, and the homeroom teachers.

Although the literature offers various questionnaires relating to this issue, the author preferred to create a new questionnaire which related to the Miftanim life, to get as close as possible to the reality of parental involvement in the Miftanim. The questions comprised statements which referred to the subject and that were vital to the study, and incorporated recommendations and suggestions found in the methodological literature. These referred to the actual questions, the type of questions, their length and content, and required work. The questions should be clear, easy to read, attractive to the respondent and, most important, achieve what they set out to do (Bayt-Marom et al, 1986; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Sarantakos, 1998). Sudman and Bradburn (1982), Bell (1993) and Cohen et al, (2000) added the importance of the order of the questions and suggested keeping sensitive questions to the end of the questionnaire.
The author ensured that words and terms meant the same thing to the respondents as to her, and used unambiguous terms wherever possible. She avoided questions that might prevent the subject from answering or which might have interfered with the subject’s answer, such as questions requiring the respondent to look up a source which might make them skip the question, questions that could only be recalled with effort, hypothetical questions that generated worthless answers (Bayt-Marom et al, 1986; Bell, 1993; Babbie, 1995), questions that were formulated in the negative, and complicated questions (Best, 1977; Kane, 1985; Bayt-Marom et al, 1986; Munn and Drever, 1990; Barnes, 1993; Cohen and Manion 1994; Babbie, 1995; Blaxter et al, 2001).

This tool offers advantages and disadvantages as well.

Advantages
A questionnaire survey is not time consuming, does not require large numbers of people and can reach a very sizeable population. The respondents’ answers are not influenced by the presence of the researcher or by any interaction between the respondent and the researcher. The respondents may answer the questions more freely, especially on sensitive issues, owing to the anonymity of the questionnaire (Munn and Drever, 1990; Cohen and Manion, 1994; Johnson, 1994; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996). Respondents are under no time pressure; they may seek advice or other sources before answering (Cohen and Manion, 1994; Johnson, 1994; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996).

The author would add, however, that despite the fact that the first advantage is relative it was not in actuality considering the fact that the creation of the questionnaires and the need to pilot them took a lot of time. In addition, for the most part there was a real need to send follow-up questionnaires, this again required more time to photocopy questionnaires, to send them out and more waiting time for their return. The last advantage may also be a disadvantage since seeking other sources can lead to formality instead of spontaneity.
Disadvantages
Mail survey is very expensive, questionnaires require instructions, questions must be simple, the researcher cannot supervise the respondents and has no way of knowing who completed the questionnaires. There is a low response rate, the researcher cannot ask for explanations or additional information (Cohen and Manion, 1994; Johnson, 1994; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996). The subject is not studied in depth and occasionally participants require the presence and encouragement of the researcher (Johnson, 1994). In addition to these disadvantages, Robson (1993) adds the element of the survey participants who influence the data through memory, personality, motivation and a situation of social volition might be created. To circumvent some of these disadvantages, the author introduced herself to each Miftan secretary or principal by phone. This provided an opportunity to underline the importance of the study, to explain the performance of the survey, and to ask for the number of the questionnaires to be sent.

The questionnaire design
The questionnaires are unique and are relevant to the different groups and roles of the participants. The questionnaires for the principals (see appendix 1) and the social workers/educational counsellors (see appendix 2) included 52 closed questions and three open questions; the questionnaires for the vocational instructors (see appendix 4) and the homeroom teachers (see appendix 3) included 43 closed questions and three open questions; the questionnaires for the parents (see appendix 5) included 42 closed questions and three open questions.

Each questionnaire contained four sections:

a) Cover letter - explanation and purpose of the questionnaire
b) Demographic details
c) Instructions
d) Questions

The questionnaire ended with a sentence of appreciation for their participation in the survey, and a request to post the questionnaire in the accompanying stamped-addressed envelope.
a) The cover letter delineated the study goal: ‘The parents and the Miftan staff’s attitude toward the Miftan’; the author’s status and obligation: ‘One of the requirements of my doctoral studies is the submission of a questionnaire’; a request for cooperation: ‘I would be very grateful if you would fill in the questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope’; and a statement of confidentiality written in larger letters: ‘THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED ONLY FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES’. A sentence of appreciation for their collaboration also appeared at the end of this section. The cover letter is the element that affects the rate of response to the questionnaire and its main purpose is to present the subject to the respondents, to neutralize and remove any doubt or lack of trust that they might have toward the study, to promise confidentiality, encourage their motivation to take part in the study and to answer the questions (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Sarantakos, 1998).

b) The participants were asked for demographic details which included category responses; “yes” or “no”; open questions and scale question with different degrees (Robson, 1993; Blaxter et al, 1996). The staff’s demographic details included the following: name (not necessary); gender; age; education; period in this profession; and period of service in the Miftan. The parents’ demographic details included the following: name (not necessary); gender; family status; number of children at home; job; profession owner; income; education; activity in PA.

c) This section contained short and clear instructions for completing the questionnaire, these aimed to ensure that the participant could easily understand what was required by using clear and simple language (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Sarantakos, 1998). To the bottom of this part was added the sentence: ‘There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome’. This sentence aimed to reduce stress, to get authentic answers and to avoid social volition (Robson, 1993).

d) The fourth section was a matrix of questions, “a method of organizing a large set of rating questions that have the same response category” (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996, p.248) and included the questions followed by statements. The
statements and the answers were written as a table for the sake of convenience and in order to prevent confusion and ensure correspondence between the statements and the answers. The answers were in the form of a Likert scale, or summated rating, which was chosen because it is relatively easy to construct, it looks interesting and, in most cases, participants enjoy answering it (Robson, 1993). It consisted of statements along a continuum ranging from “Agree” to “Disagree” or from “To a very great extent” to “Not at all” (Best, 1977; Sarantakos, 1998).

This questionnaire offered four categories of answers and the scores were:
(1) “To a very great extent”
(2) “To a great extent”
(3) ”Slightly”
(4) “Not at all”.

Four categories of answers were chosen instead of five categories, in order to avoid the situation in which people would prefer not to make a clear decision and would tend to “escape” to the medium answer (Bayt-Marom et al, 1986). At the end of each section, a space was left for an open question; the purpose of this was to address points that might have been overlooked.

The questions in the questionnaires

The staff’s questionnaire dealt with the following issues:

a) The areas and levels of parental involvement.
b) The staff’s attitudes towards involvement.
c) The initiation of the involvement.
d) The impact of the involvement on the different stakeholders.
e) The staff’s barriers to parental involvement.

The parents’ questionnaire dealt with the following issues:

a) The areas and levels of parental involvement.
b) The initiation of the involvement.
c) The reasons for involvement.
d) The impact of the involvement on the different stakeholders.
e) The parents’ barriers to involvement.

The interview

The interview is an important source of data in a case study (Yin, 1994). It is used to identify relationships, test hypotheses and may be used along with other methods in the study (Moser and Kalton, 1971). It is a type of conversation with a goal (Robson, 1993) and Cannell and Kahn (1968) write that this type of conversation should be:

“... a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information, and focused by him on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction, or explanation.”

(Cannell and Kahn, 1968, quoted in Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.271)

The interview is the art of asking questions of others and listening to their answers, it is a conversation and a tool that is not neutral since it is based on reality created by people. The personal characteristics of the interviewer involved influence this tool (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). The author would add that this method is influenced by the personal characteristics of the interviewee as well. Cohen and Manion (1994) describe three purposes of the interview:

“... it may be used as the principal means of gathering information... to test hypotheses or to suggest new ones; or as an explanatory device to help identify variables and relationships. It may be used in conjunction with other methods in a research undertaking.” (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.272/273)

and:

“By providing access to what is ‘inside a person’s head, it makes it possible to measure what a person knows (knowledge or information), what a person
likes or dislikes (values and preferences), and what a person thinks (attitudes and beliefs).” (Tuckman, 1972, quoted in Cohen and Manion. 1994, p. 272)

and:

“…an interest in understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience.” (Seidman, 1998, p.3)

This tool also has advantages and disadvantages.

**Advantages**

The researcher has flexibility and control when asking questions. This is reflected in her ability to explain questions, ask for clarification or put questions in the order he/she chooses, and the high rate of answers (Dane, 1990; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Nahmias and Nahmias, 1998; Sarantakos, 1998). In addition, body language can be read, the interviewees are not required to read or interpret complicated documents (Sarantakos, 1998), data can be collected from the background and from spontaneous responses, spontaneous answers can be recorded, unlike with questionnaires where there is more time to think about the answers. There is also control over issues regarding the time, the place of the interview and the identification of the interviewee. Participating in the interview demands less patience and motivation than completing the questionnaire, since the interviewee is not needed just for the answers but for participation. The researcher can explain and also clarify misunderstandings (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Nahmias and Nahmias, 1998; Sarantakos, 1998).

**Disadvantages**

The disadvantages of this method include the high cost. It is time consuming, (Robson, 1993; Cohen and Manion, 1994; Johnson, 1994; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias 1996; Sarantakos, 1998; Burns, 2000). The lack of anonymity may cause interviewees to feel shy or threatened, there is also the possible bias of the interviewer (Robson, 1993; Cohen and Manion, 1994; Johnson, 1994; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias 1996; Sarantakos, 1998). This way is also less effective when sensitive issues are involved and people
prefer to write rather than talk about them (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Sarantakos, 1998).

In order to create an interview based on the literature recommendations and to circumvent some of the disadvantages, the author includes the main questions, and then prompts and probes (explores) in a logical sequence, to give the interviewee the sense of “flow” naturally (Drever, 1995).

“The purpose of the questions is to help people say what they want to say. Prompts are directed towards what they know but have not yet mentioned... encourage ... to talk and jog their memory, but they must not put words into people’s mouths...Probes are directed at what people have already said, asking ... to clarify and explain, but not as a rule to justify or defend their position.”

(Drever, 1995, pp.23/24)

The author used the word ‘explore’ instead of the word ‘probe’ as Seidman (1998) did. Contrary to some researchers, Seidman (1998) is uncomfortable with this term which has “a sense of the powerful interviewer treating the participant as an object” (p.68) and suggests using the word ‘explore’: “I am more comfortable with the notion of exploring with the participant than with probing into what the participant says” (p.68).

A semi-structured interview was chosen for this phase. This is a combination of the structured interview, in which the interviewer reads the questions and records them, without having the option of making alterations, additions or clarification, and the unstructured interview, in which the interviewer has flexibility both in the type and order of the questions and terminology, allowing him to conduct the interview without restrictions (Burgess, 1984; Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Denscombe, 1998).

The questions in the interviews
The interview for the staff (see appendix 6) and the interview for the parents (see appendix 7) contained nine questions which included the main questions. Prompt and exploratory questions were added, according to the need for flexibility and the
participants’ patience. It opened with an introduction, which explained and reminded the participants of its content and goals (Drever, 1995): ‘This interview is a part of a larger research. Its aim is to collect data on your relationships with the Miftan. It focuses on the parental involvement issue’.

The first question concerned what parental involvement is, in order to have the same concept of the theme: ‘What parental involvement is, from your point of view?’. According to Drever, 1995: “The first question is very important… should allow them to talk at some length... not be threatening…” (p.26). In order to create a climate of openness, and to ensure that the participants trusted the author and believed that the data would not be used against them (Jones, 1985), the author began the interview with the following preamble: that the interviewee agrees to participate on a voluntary basis, he/she is free to refuse to answer any question, free to stop the interview and withdraw at any time, the interview is confidential (Robson, 1993; Burns, 2000), no names or places will be mentioned (Verma and Mallick, 1999), there is no right or wrong answer, any answer will be welcome. Furthermore, it was stated in the course of the interview that, if there were any regrets about things that they said, it would be off the record. The author asked the interviewees for permission to record the interviews.

The author avoided asking short and direct questions; there was a need to explain and to introduce each question, to use clear language appropriate to the population, to avoid ambiguous and unclear concepts, questions with double negatives and leading questions (Cohen and Manion, 1994; Drever, 1995; Sarantakos, 1998; Seidman, 1998). The question before the last question aimed to look forward with hope and optimism to the future and to suggest ways of involvement: ‘which involvement would you like to have in the Miftan?’ The last question aimed to close the interview, to conclude the subject and to ask for further information (Hughes, 1996): ‘Have you anything further to add/to ask about the subject? Is there something we have not addressed regarding the subject?’.

At the end of each interview, the author asked the participants if they wished to hear the interview so that they could be sure that only the things they said were written/recorded. None of the participants wanted to hear the interview again, saying they had full trust in
the author. Later, each interviewee received the written interview by post, they were requested to read it again, to comment/agree/disagree/add to the content, and to send it back to the author in the accompanying stamped, addressed envelope. None of them sent the interview back to the author.

Analysis of documents
Analysis of documents is different from the other research tools. It is final and exists, in contrast to questionnaires and interviews (Johnson, 1994). It is a ‘mute’ evidence, separated from its author across time and space (Hodder, 1994), which provides interesting details about dates and events, or description of how people think about their world (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998), it aims to increase evidence from other sources of data and to corroborate them (Yin, 1994).

The documents assist with the correct spelling of names, or names of organizations, referred to in the interviews. They can provide other details that corroborate what was said in the interviews. The documents comprise letters, journals, announcements, invitations, progress reports, documentation of processes and events, suggestions, administrative documents, newspaper clippings or relevant articles, miscellaneous correspondence (Yin, 1994), policy documents, proposals and memos (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). Before documents are used, questions are asked, for example, what relevant documents are there? Where are they located and how can they be obtained? What was the original purpose of the document? (Johnson, 1994).

In order to best answer these questions, it was necessary to carry out preparatory work involving the secretary, social worker/educational counsellor and Miftan principal. This involved asking questions and seeking the assistance of these people. The documents chosen for reading and analysis in the two Miftanim were any documents that referred to contact between the Miftanim and the parents, for example, invitations to parents’ days/school events, circulars, contracts, letters from staff to parents, and vice versa.
Piloting the Tools
Some questions arose at the pilot stage as follows:

- Is the pilot vital and necessary?
- In which Miftan should the pilot be run?
- Who will be the participants?
- How many participants will take part in the pilot?

The pilot is a kind of polishing and sharpening of the research instrument which aims to discover problems, ambiguities, weaknesses and inadequacies, to estimate the cost and time, to evaluate the suitability of the research instruments, and to enable the researcher to become familiar with the process and the environment in which the study will be conducted (Sarantakos, 1998) in a similar population, with the same conditions, (Munn and Drever, 1990), in order to improve the tools for the research population (Johnson, 1994).

It also:

“...helps investigators to refine their data collection plan with respect to both the content of the data and the procedures to be followed. ...The pilot site could then assume the role of a 'laboratory' for the investigators, allowing them to observe different phenomena from many different angles ... .”

(Yin, 1994, p.74/75)

The author’s own Miftan was selected for the pilot study for the following reasons: firstly, one of the conditions for Ministry of Education approval was a strict prohibition on conducting the research in the author’s institution. Even had it been permissible, the author would not have used her own Miftan for the actual study out of concern for social volition among the staff, and the fear of subjectivity toward the data. However, the Miftan was ideal for a pilot study as good personal relationships and close acquaintance with the staff would provide an in-depth pilot research with constructive and frank feedback.
Piloting the questionnaire

The members of staff involved in the pilot were the Miftan principal, a social worker, a vocational instructor, a homeroom teacher, and a parent from the author’s class since the Miftan has no PA. Each participant received the questionnaire. They were asked to complete it and to add their comments. Returning the questionnaire to the author provided the opportunity to chat about the comments in order to improve it. The author went to the parent’s home to give the questionnaire and stayed until it was completed. The following changes were introduced into the questionnaire following the pilot: to add in to each question the word ‘Miftan’; to omit from the staff questionnaire the statement, ‘the parents are problematic’ in the barriers section (this statement is not ethical and offends the parents). The parents’ questionnaire was not changed, as there were no comments on it.

Piloting the interview

An interview pilot was carried out at the same Miftan. The main reason for this was convenience and accessibility, it also allowed continuing relationships to be developed between the interviewees and the author. She interviewed the people who participated in the pilot questionnaire: the Miftan principal, a social worker, a vocational instructor, a homeroom teacher, and a parent.

The homeroom teacher, the vocational instructor and the social worker agreed to be recorded. At the end of each interview, the author asked the following questions: ‘Did you understand the questions I have been asking you?’ and ‘Could you add any further questions regarding this issue that I didn’t ask?’ After the pilot interview, the question ‘Did you understand the questions I have been asking you?’ was changed to ‘Were the questions clear enough?’, no one added further questions or comments to the questions which were asked.

Reliability and Validity

What would be the best way to conduct this research to ensure its reliability and validity? The author tried to conduct this research according to the following suggestions.
Reliability
Reliability is concerned with the consistency of a measure (Bryman, 1988), which aims to reach the same results, under the same conditions by the test or the technique functions (Herbert, 1990; Sarantakos, 1998; Verma and Mallick, 1999; Burns, 2000).

“... a method is reliable if it produces the same results whenever it is repeated, even by other researchers. Reliability is also characterised by precision and objectivity.... Social scientists are interested in achieving ‘internal reliability’ and ‘external reliability’. Internal reliability means consistency of results within the site... External validity refers to consistency and replicability of data across the sites.” (Sarantakos, 1998, p.83)

To ensure complete reliability in this study, the author composed the questions to the different participants with similar content. The questionnaires covered five different groups; the findings are compared within the groups and to the pilot findings.

Validity
A research tool is valid when it measures what it aims to measure (Hornik, 1988; Herbert, 1990; Sarantakos, 1998; Morrison, 1999), reflects the concept it aims to refer to (Bryman, 1988), and produces accurate results (Sarantakos,1998). Many researchers often replace the term ‘validity’ with terms like credibility, trustworthiness and authenticity (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Two other types of validity exist: internal validity and external validity (generalisation). Internal validity examines the question of whether the findings indeed reflect the reality. It may be tested using strategies such as repeat testing, with the participants’ help, and triangulation. External validity seeks the way to generalise from the sample to the population, “A measure is supposed to have content validity if it covers all possible aspects of the research topic” (Sarantakos, 1998, p. 79). Thus the questionnaires encompassed the question of parental involvement and the factors related to it, for example, areas and levels of involvement, barriers to parental involvement, reasons for involvement, initiation of involvement and the effect(s) of the involvement on the different stakeholders; parents, the children and staff.
The questionnaires examine parental involvement in relation to the various groups: the Miftan principal, social worker/educational counsellor, the vocational instructor, the homeroom teacher and the parent, in order to obtain answers for each type of group since construct validity refers to the results of the different groups. As Sarantakos (1998) states: “The results of each group are checked with regard to whether they differ from each other” (p.79). In qualitative research validity is not required, since there is no need to predict peoples’ behaviour but to understand and to interpret it (Yossifun, 2001).

The Population

Population is defined as: “... a collective term used to describe the total quantity of cases of the type which are the subject of our study” (Walliman, 2001, p.232).

Various questions arose at this stage:

- Which Miftanim will participate in this study?
- Who will be the population?
- How many participants from each group?
- How many parents?
- How to choose the parents?
- How to contact the parents?

Selecting the population for the survey

The population in this research is the staff and the parents in the Miftanim. The survey encompasses 21 Miftanim in the first place(out of 24) in the Jewish sector in Israel. This study focused on the Jewish sector and excluded the Arab sector in order that it could deal with the same culture (a broader comment on this issue is to be found on page 296 in the recommendations). The population chosen for this study included the different groups in the Miftanim: the principals, social workers/educational counsellors, vocational instructors, homeroom teachers and parents, since population may be defined as the people who participate in it and supply the information the researcher seeks (Johnson, 1994), and each group has similar characteristics (Cohen et al, 2000).
Selecting the case studies

Which Miftanim to choose for the case studies and how many, were the two main questions at this stage. Initially the author thought to choose case studies from the 21 Miftanim that had participated in the survey and wished to cooperate with the author in this research. The answer to the second question was to choose two Miftanim in order to compare them. The idea was to choose extreme Miftanim, one with the highest percentage of parental involvement and the second with the lowest percentage of parental involvement. Robson (1993) defines it thus:

“Extreme case samples, concentration on extreme values when sampling, perhaps where it is considered that they will throw a particularly strong light on the phenomenon of interest.”

(Robson, 1993, p.142)

Since the percentage of responses to the parental questionnaire was low, it was not possible to choose the Miftanim according to these criteria. It was necessary to relate to Miftanim from which parents had cooperated in the survey, and to be informed by the social worker or the secretary of those Miftanim if there were parents who would agree to be interviewed. The two Miftanim were chosen on the basis of the higher agreement criteria of the participants in the research and their cooperation with the author. The locations of these two Miftanim were not the nearest to that of the author.

The participants in the second phase were the principal, social worker, educational counsellor, two vocational instructors, two homeroom teachers and four parents in the first Miftan. Participants in the second Miftan were the principal, social worker, two vocational instructors, two homeroom teachers, and four parents (there was no educational counsellor in the second Miftan).

Access

The Miftanim are owned by the Welfare Ministry and are supervised by them and by the Ministry of Education. In order to conduct the research, the survey and to get access to the case studies, it was necessary to obtain permission and access: “… access to the institution or organization where the research is to be conducted, and acceptance by
those whose permission one needs before embarking on the task” (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 354). Two separate authorizations were needed from each of these bodies.

The author requested a meeting with the Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager, representing the Ministry of Labour and Welfare in Jerusalem, in order to explain the goals of the research, to get information about the Miftanim, for example, research, studies, policy, articles and the Miftanim list which includes the number of the Miftanim, locations, principals and secretaries name and phone numbers. The Manager asked relevant questions about the research and gave a list of documents to be sent (see appendix 8). These documents included the full research proposal, the research design, the questionnaires, the interviews, an approval of the research by the University, a letter from the University stating the name of the academic supervisor for the study, a letter attesting to confidentiality, an undertaking to send a copy of the thesis to the Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager and approval from the Ministry of Education. A letter additional to the above documents was sent (see appendix 8.1) and after a delay of two months due to a national strike by the Ministry of Labour and Welfare, and after numerous contacts and personal requests, verbal approval was obtained from the Manager and her deputy.

The Ministry of Education required the following documents: the full research proposal and research design, the names and location of the Miftanim participating in the study, the applicant’s CV, an approval of the research by the University, a letter from the University stating the name of the academic supervisor for the study, and the final version of the questionnaires and interviews (see appendix 9). A written approval was sent, valid for one year (see appendix 10).

In order to get data from the entire year, the author chose to start the research close to the end of the year. Since there was a long delay in gathering the questionnaires, the interviews started very close to and during the holiday. Since the interviews carried over into the new school year it was necessary to request a new approval from the Ministry of Education. This was received almost immediately (see appendix 11). Local approval to conduct the survey was given by the principal or secretary in the Miftanim. Approval to
conduct the interviews and to read documents was given by the principals in the first instance, and by each participant in the two Miftanim in the second instance.

**Gathering Data**

What would be the best contact with the participants to enable the author to obtain maximum data and at the same time to keep confidentiality, to be honest and not to push or press the participants? What would be the method to use in order to have control over the amount of questionnaires received? Should the questionnaires be numbered? Would the numbered questionnaires increase the confidentiality problem and reduce the percentage of responses to the questionnaires? These questions arose during the research process which started in October 2001 and ended in September 2002 (see appendix 12).

**The first phase – the survey**

Each Miftan received a package that included the questionnaires for the different participants: principal, educational-counsellor/social worker, vocational instructor, homeroom teacher and parent. The questionnaires were accompanied by stamped-addressed envelopes with the author’s name in order to minimise nuisance and unnecessary expense for participants and to try to ensure a higher response rate (Cohen and Manion, 1994).

In addition to the above, three personal letters were sent: one letter was addressed to the principal (see appendix 13), this requested cooperation. At the bottom of the letter was a note stating that a photocopy of the letter had been sent to the Youth Rehabilitation Manager, thus indicating that there had been verbal approval from the Youth Rehabilitation Manager (see appendix 14). A second letter, (see appendix 15) was addressed to the Miftan secretary, explained the survey’s performance to the participants. There was a request to distribute the questionnaires to the different participants and to ensure that the questionnaires were sent back to the author. A third letter (see appendix 16) was sent to each social worker requesting that he/she find parents who would agree to participate in the survey if there was no PA in the Miftan. The Ministry of Education’s approval was attached to each package. The packages were sent by registered mail and included 206 questionnaires in total.
Sending the packages with the questionnaires and the different documents to the Miftanim left a waiting time for the author before continuing to the next step. A very low percentage of responses was received. Each questionnaire that was received was marked in a follow-up table. Each Miftan was identified by a number (from 1 to 21), these numbers were allocated arbitrarily. After two weeks, the author reminded the non-respondents to take part in the research by phone contact and by fax (see appendix 17) with the Miftan secretary and some of the principals. This contact uncovered two different problems: one was refusal to participate because of the lack of written approval from the Youth Rehabilitation Services, the second problem was the fact that the Ministry of Education’s approval was designed for the secular sector only. The author had to request (see appendix 18) and obtain further approval (see appendix 19) to include the religious sector. This took another month. The second problem was resolved, but not the first one.

In addition to the problems mentioned above, some of the principals required written approval from their district inspector. These inspectors required a written approval from the Youth Rehabilitation Manager and vice versa. The author had to make phone calls to the Youth Rehabilitation Manager to try to get written approval, however, the situation did not change. The author had to explain to the inspectors and the principals by phone and by fax (see appendices 20, 21, 22, 23) that only oral approval had been given. As a result of these activities, some Miftanim completed the questionnaires while others did not. One Miftan sent the package back, a principal of another Miftan said that the staff was ‘fed-up’ filling in questionnaires, and would therefore not participate. A staff member of another Miftan said that the fact that the questionnaires were numbered gave them the feeling that they were being tagged and that they would not participate.

For the second time, the author sent faxes (see appendix 24) to remind the Miftanim staff to participate and to thank the ones who did. It was necessary to send new packages and to request cooperation again and again. The author was given a further opportunity to ask Miftan staff to complete the questionnaires at a meeting at an in-service course which included staff of four Miftanim. This enabled the participants to complete questionnaires
with the district Supervisor’s encouragement. Two-hundred and six questionnaires were sent and 147 questionnaires were returned: 12 principals, 40 vocational instructors, 53 homeroom teachers, 22 social workers/educational counsellors and 20 parents. The author sent a thank letter (see appendix 25) to the 17 Miftanim that had participated in the first phase.

The second phase - the case studies
In the two case studies it was necessary to ask for the cooperation of each member of staff and the parents. The interviewees in each case study were selected on the basis of the agreement of all members to cooperate. The principal, the social worker, the educational counsellor, two vocational instructors, two homeroom teachers, and four parents took part in the first case study. The principal, the social worker, two vocational instructors, two homeroom teachers and four parents took part in the second case study. The author personally asked for agreement from staff and the staff in each Miftan chose the parents. In the first case study, the vocational instructor chose three parents, and the educational counsellor chose one parent. They contacted the parents and gave the parents’ phone number to the author. In the second case study, the social worker chose four parents. She gained the parents’ approval by phone in the author’s presence and they agreed to give their phone number to the author. The author phoned each parent and fixed a convenient time for an interview.

The interviews with the Miftan staff in the case studies were held at the Miftanim, with the exception of the interview with the educational counsellor, which was held in a coffee bar in a Mall. The interviews with the parents were held in their homes. All the participants agreed to the transcription of their interviews. Out of 21 interviewees, eight agreed to be recorded. After the interview process, the author sent a personal letter (see appendix 26) to each interviewee, thanking them for their participation, enclosing their written interview, and asking them to read it, to agree/disagree and/or to write/add comments. Documents were gathered from the secretaries of the Miflanim only.
Analysis of Data

Introduction
What were the suitable ways/tools to analyse the different data, in order to get the best out of it? Should a computer program be used to analyse it? Should the different data be analysed in different ways? The quantitative data were analysed statistically and are presented in tables, by percentage, mean, median and SD, in schemes and in charts. The qualitative data were analysed by, and are presented by, schemes and tables based on criteria and categories. The findings of each phase and the combination of the quantitative and qualitative data are presented in Chapter Four.

Analysis of quantitative data
In order to bring out relevant and meaningful information from the questionnaires, statistical measurement was necessary. Data analysis was performed using a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) programme, a computer program for statistical analysis that analyses quantitative data. This programme was chosen since:

“... its immense power and relative ease (and speed) of use. While there are other packages around which will do similar jobs, SPSS is specifically designed for Social Scientist and is one of the most commonly used.”

(Comber, 2000, p.2)

The findings present each question separately in order to get a focused picture at the specific question, according to each different group, (principals, social workers/educational counsellors, vocational instructors, homeroom teachers and parents). Then, the questions were clustered according the research questions. The clusters were based on the questions which relate to the same category i.e. questions which deal with barriers to involvement were divided by two criteria; personal/professional barriers and demographic barriers, and were grouped in two clusters.
Analysis of qualitative data
The first step of the analysis was to transcribe the 21 recorded and written interviews into the computer and to translate them into English. The second step was to select the answers relevant to the research questions in tables, in order to refer to the important and focused data. Presenting the selected data in tables by creating categories was the next step. The categories and the criteria are based on the research questions; for example, one research question was ‘What are the staff’s barriers to parental involvement?’ The criteria was the barriers and the category were professional/personal and parents’ demographic barriers in the staff’s findings. The data were compared to the different groups and to the two case studies in order to get closer to the reality and to get a better understanding for the discussion and the conclusion.

Two types of documents pertaining to the Miftanim were given to the author by the secretaries. One type was informative and requested approval for activities, for example, a trip or evening meeting. The second type, which was confidential and dealt with various care processes of the children such as a psychiatric process, was accordingly anonymous since it was personal and secret. Both sets of documents were translated into English. As the latter documents were blank it was only possible to analyse them objectively; for example, a document giving parental approval for a child to take a psychiatric medicine or a contract between the child and parents, and the staff.

Ethical issues in research
What would be the best way to conduct this research in order to obtain relevant data, which would contribute to this issue in the research world, and behave in accordance with the code of ethics? What to tell about the research? What would be the best way to convince the population to participate on the basis of goodwill on the one hand, while not pressing or bothering them on the other hand? How to write critically about other researches on the one hand and to appreciate and to write with respect to the researchers on the other? Does the author have total freedom to conduct his research? These are the questions that accompanied the author during her research.
In the field of social research, researchers benefit from a freedom of action in their research process, “this freedom of action has always been thought to offer the best opportunities for answering the research question or solving the problem” (Sarantakos, 1998, p.21). Most countries have a ‘Code of Ethics’ to control researchers by standards and rules and to prevent problems arising from the research process (Sarantakos, 1998). The centre of research ethics is the conflict between the yearning for knowledge on one hand, and the will to treat people honestly and fairly on the other.

To resolve this conflict there is a need to acquire an ethical balance and the author based her work on the different recommendations found in the literature:

“...researchers must balance their obligations to promote intellectual freedom and contribute to knowledge with fair treatment of the very people to whom these obligations are owed and to whom the knowledge is to be distributed.” (Erickson, 1967, quoted in Dane, 1990, p.38)

Thus the author was well aware of the codes of ethics whilst enjoying ‘this freedom’.

Each stage of the research can be a source of ethical problems:

“The nature of the research project... the context for the research... methods of data collection... the nature of the participants... the type of data collected... what is to be done with the data.” (Cohen et al, 2000, p.49)

To overcome the ethical problems, there was a need to apply the guidelines in this research.

The first step of the research was to gain access and documents were sent to whomever it concerned in order to gain approval. The author started the research only after receiving approval (after two months). The author was as accurate as possible in data gathering and data processing, she chose relevant research methodology, she interpreted and reported the data appropriately and was very aware that fabrication and falsification of data is
misconduct (Dane, 1990; Sarantakos, 1998). The author identified herself correctly (Dane, 1990; Sarantakos, 1998), she was informed and consented to the type and the degree of question sensitivity (Dane, 1990; Sarantakos, 1998; Cohen et al, 2000), she was well aware of the welfare of the participants (Dane, 1990; Sarantakos, 1998). The author welcomed the word ‘participant’ which was the most appropriate word to define the people who participated in this research; people cannot be called ‘subjects’ or ‘objects’, they are partners in the process of the research (British Psychological Society, 1993).

The first part of the questionnaires in the study was intended to inform the participants about the purpose of the study, ‘one of the requirements of my doctoral studies in education consist of submitting a questionnaire’. The subject was introduced, ‘the parents and the Miftan staff’s attitude toward the Miftan’. There was a direct and polite request to complete it, ‘I would be very grateful if you would complete the questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope’. To respect and to honour the privacy of the participants the questionnaires stated, ‘The questionnaire is confidential and will be used only for research purposes’, in order to give them the possibility on the one hand to answer freely and with openness, and not to feel under any pressure or threat on the other hand. In the personal details section, the participants could choose whether or not to name themselves, ‘Name (not necessary) for the purpose of follow-up only’. The final sentence before the questions was, ‘There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome’. This sentence was aimed at respecting everyone’s opinion, giving the participants freedom to choose, even if the answer was unusual. To show appreciation to them, the questionnaire ended with the following sentence, ‘Thanks again for your collaboration’.

The second phase of the research was to interview the staff and the parents in two Miftanim. It was necessary to receive the approval of all the interviewees, and, first of all of the Miftan principal who had to agree and to permit the author to come into the Miftan in order to interview the staff. After approval from the participants was received, the author phoned each participant to introduce herself, she gave her name, her profession and the place in which she worked and explained the purpose of the interview. The
participants chose the time and the place to be interviewed. The author informed the participants of the nature of the study in order to give them the opportunity to be free in their decision to participate or not, to honour their right to privacy, and the right to refuse to answer questions (Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Sarantakos, 1998) and the retraction of consent which allowed the participant to quit the research at any time he wished (Dane, 1990).

The data was confidential, without names and signs that might have led to recognition of the participants (Dane, 1990; Sarantakos, 1998), it would be used only for the purpose of the study; The author said the following sentences: ‘you agree to participate on a voluntarily basis, you are free to refuse to answer any question and free to stop the interview and to withdraw at any time, there is no right or wrong answer, any answer will be accepted’. During an interview, an interviewee asked for help to express herself, the author told her that she had all the time she needed, and that she would not ‘put words into her mouth’. In some of the interviews, confidential things were said and it was agreed that they would be ‘off record’; this data wasn’t written down and wasn’t used in any part of the research.

An additional angle to the ethical issue in research is in regard to the researcher-researcher relationship. The author based herself on the following rules: she should abstain from plagiarism, not misuse her authority (Sarantakos, 1998), treat other researchers ethically (Dane, 1990) and, when criticising studies of colleagues, it should be done with “honesty, sincerity, justice, and responsibility rather than by polemic, personal bias or collective interests” (Sarantakos, 1998, p.24).

**Summary**

This study aimed to explore the issue of parental involvement in the Miftanim in order to share the findings, the conclusions and the recommendations with others. The purposes of sharing this study are to raise and emphasise this issue with those it concerns; to suggest ways of dealing with this issue in order to improve/change the present situation, to encourage other researchers to follow-up this research and to rely on this study. Each stage of this study and the processes of planning, gathering, analysing and writing were
performed as accurately as possible, in the light of the ethical issues stated above, with respect to the rules and the regulations of the family of scholars. The following flow chart presents the research process (Figure 3.1).

**Figure 3.1: The research process**
The following chapter presents the findings and the analysis of the data. It is divided into three parts: analysis of quantitative data, analysis of qualitative data and the combination of these two.
CHAPTER FOUR - FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH

Preface
This chapter presents the data of the research and is divided into three sections: the first section presents the findings and the analysis of the survey; the second section presents the findings and the analysis of the case studies, and the third section combines them both.

These sections aim to cast light on the issue of parental involvement in the Miftanim from various angles in order to arrive at the most accurate conclusions at the heart of this research, the purpose of which is to get as close as possible to reality, to gain insight and to suggest ways to achieve the best performance in the parental involvement issue.

The first section, ‘Findings and Analysis of the Survey’, presents the findings and the analysis of the questionnaires completed by the staff and the parents in 17 Miftanim. A total of 127 staff questionnaires and 20 parents’ questionnaires were returned. The second section, ‘Findings and Analysis of the Case Studies’, presents the findings and the analysis of the 21 interviews in two Miftanim; eight of these were with parents and 13 with staff members. Confirmative and confidential documents were also analysed. The third section, ‘Combining the Data’, presents the combination of the survey and case studies data, and the conclusions that stem from these data.

Section One - Findings and Analysis of the Survey

Introduction
This section presents the research questions, the questionnaires, the research process, the findings and the analysis of the survey, and the conclusions which stem from these data. The purpose is to examine the parental involvement issue in the Miftanim in Israel from data gathered via postal questionnaires. The findings of the survey are presented according to the various groups of participants: 12 principals, 22 social workers/educational counsellors, 40 vocational instructors, 53 homeroom teachers and 20 parents.
This study aimed to explore the relationships between the parents and the Miftanim. In order to do so it was essential to break down the study title into detailed questions and focus, in turn, on the questions that cover a specific part of the involvement issue in schools.

The study examines the following research questions:

1. What are the areas and levels in which parents are involved with the Miftan and with whom?

The areas and the levels of the involvement are based on the Hornby (2000) model of parental involvement, which is divided into two categories: parental contributions and parental needs. The parental contributions category includes policy, resource, collaboration and information and the parental needs category includes communication, liaison, education and support.

2. Why is there involvement?

What are the parents’ reasons to be involved?
What are the staff’s reasons to involve the parents?

3. Who initiates the contacts?

Who are the initiators? The parents and/or the staff?
In what areas and levels are the contacts initiated?

4. Why is there no involvement?

What are the parents’ barriers to involvement?
What are the staff’s barriers to parental involvement?

5. What is the attitude of staff towards parental involvement?

Do the staff encourage/discourage parental involvement?
How is this attitude applied?

6. What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the parents, the staff and the children?
Is this beneficial/harmful?
7. What is the most appropriate parental involvement form compatible with the needs of the Miftanim (the child, the parents and the staff)?

**The questionnaires**

The questionnaires are designed for the staff group and the PA and parents who do not participate in the PA. The principals’ questionnaire includes 53 closed questions and three open questions (see appendix 1). The social workers/educational counsellors’ questionnaire includes 53 closed questions and three open questions (see appendix 2). The vocational instructors’ and the homeroom teachers’ questionnaires include 43 closed questions and three open questions (see appendices 3 and 4). The parents’ questionnaire includes 42 closed questions and three open questions (see appendix 5).

The questions in the questionnaires deal with some of the research questions and are based on different recommendations that emphasise the importance of the length and the issue of sensitive questions (Bell, 1993). The purpose of the questionnaire is to cover that section of the research which aimed to be friendly to the participants, without threatening questions, in order to attain a high percentage of respondents (Munn and Drever, 1990; Barnes, 1993; Cohen and Manion, 1994; Babbie, 1995; Bayt-Marom et al, 1986). The questions are based on the following research questions and are applied to both staff and parents:

- The areas and levels in which parents are involved with the Miftan, (research question 1);
- The initiation of the involvement, (research question 3);
- The barriers to involvement, (research question 4);
- The effect(s) of the involvement on the parent, child and staff. (research question 6).

The latter focused on the positive effects/impacts only (Munn and Drever, 1990; Barnes, 1993; Cohen and Manion, 1994; Babbie, 1995; Bayt-Marom et al, 1986). Statements relating to the staff’s attitude towards parental involvement (research question 5) are added to the staff questionnaire, and statements relating to the parents’ reasons for involvement (research question 2) are added to the parents’ questionnaire.
The survey process
The author received oral approval from the Youth Rehabilitation Manager and written approval from the Ministry of Education for the research. She contacted the Miftanim in order to obtain their agreement to participate in the survey. The author contacted 24 Miftanim in order to introduce the survey and to obtain the principal’s agreement to participate. Three Miftanim out of the 21 refused to participate in the survey for the following reasons: two were due to be closed the following year and the principal from the third Miftan said that they were “too busy to be bothered with a survey”.

Based on this information, 21 packages were sent to the Miftanim. Each package included questionnaires to the staff and to the parents. The staff questionnaires were sent to the Miftan secretary and the parents’ questionnaires were sent to the social worker/educational counsellor to be given to the parents. The number of questionnaires to be sent was advised by phone by the secretaries of the Miftanim. Three out of 21 principals claimed that they would like to participate but said they needed written approval from the Youth Rehabilitation Manager, another Miftan principal claimed that his staff were “tired” of questionnaires, thus the survey finally encompassed 17 Miftanim.

In the first instance 206 questionnaires were sent out. Additional questionnaires were sent according to follow-up needs and in attempts to obtain answers from different Miftanim. One hundred and forty-seven questionnaires were returned, 71 percent on average. Table 4.1 shows the percentage of respondents in 17 Miftanim according to the different groups.

Table 4.1: The percentage of questionnaires returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Questionnaires sent</th>
<th>Questionnaires returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational instructors</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers/educational counsellors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only parents not in the PA completed the parents’ questionnaires as the PAs in these Miftanim are registered but inactive. This was explained to the author by the secretaries and the principals during frequent and regular contacts with them. The percentage of the parents’ questionnaires is as expected since it is similar to the research findings in the literature, especially in at-risk families (Rademacker and Evans, 1995; Cooper, 2001). The percentage of the principals who responded is due to the fact that some did not agree to participate because they did not receive written approval from the Youth Rehabilitation Manager and/or the Miftan inspectors. Other participants did not agree because the questionnaires were numbered, although the author explained the reason and the purpose of the numbers. The survey percentage is achieved after taking additional steps such as talking personally to the principals, the secretaries and the social workers, sending faxes and asking for greater collaboration (see appendix 12).

The questionnaires are divided into five groups according to the different participants and are analysed by a computer program for statistical analysis, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and by Excel.

**Analysis process**

The questionnaires were analysed by SPSS and by Excel. Tables and graphs present the findings by percentage, by mean, median and standard deviation, according to the four scaled responses and scores as follows: ‘To a very great extent’ (1), ‘To a great extent’ (2), ‘Slightly’ (3) and ‘Not at all’ (4). The clusters are presented by weighting mean. The total of the percentage is 100 except when there was a need to round off the numbers. The number of the participants (N) in the findings is changed according to the number of participants and missing answers are not included (Robson, 1993; Bayt-Marom et al, 1986).

The details represent some of the variables found in the literature which influence parental involvement. The parents’ demographic details are ‘gender’, ‘family status’, ‘number of children living at home’, ‘having a profession’, ‘job’, ‘income’, ‘education’, and ‘PA activities’. The staff’s details are ‘gender’, ‘education’, ‘period in this profession’, and ‘period of service in the Miftanim’. The purpose is to find links between those variables and their influence on the parental involvement issue.
The findings are grouped into clusters; each cluster includes the findings of the question and the statements which have the same criteria and are based on the research questions. The first cluster presents the findings of the question: ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’ referring to the research question dealing with the areas and the levels of parental involvement in the Miftan. The statements refer to the Hornby (2000) model and include eight parameters: policy, resource, collaboration, information, communication, liaison, education and support. The purpose of those parameters is to examine the involvement as a whole group.

Subsequently, this cluster is divided into two additional clusters based on the parental needs and parental contribution categories with the intention of seeking out the differences between them. The parental contributions cluster includes four parameters: policy, resource, collaboration, information while the parental needs cluster includes four parameters: communication, liaison, education, and support. Each parameter is then presented with the intention of seeking out the differences between them. An additional cluster dealing with the reasons for involvement is added to the parents’ findings. The findings of the open question are presented at the end of this section.

The second cluster presents the findings of the question which deals with the benefits of involvement. This cluster is then divided into additional clusters based on the benefit categories. The staff’s cluster is divided into three categories: the benefits to the child, to the parents and to the staff member, according to each role. The parents’ cluster is divided into three categories: the benefits to the child, to the parents and to the staff. The findings of the open question are presented at the end of this section.

The third cluster presents the findings of the question which deals with the barriers to involvement. The staff’s cluster is then divided into additional clusters based on two categories: personal/professional barriers to parental involvement and barriers which stem from parents’ demographic details. The findings of the open question are presented at the end of this section.
The findings of the statements that are not clustered deal with the criteria of attitudes and the initiation to involvement of the staff, the parents’ findings deal with the initiation to involvement.

The findings are presented in two main sections, the staff’s section and the parents’ section. The staff’s section includes the findings of the principals, the social workers/educational counsellors, vocational instructors and homeroom teachers. The findings from each group are presented by personal details, the various clusters, the questions that are not clustered and, finally, the conclusions drawn from this analysis.

**Principals’ Findings**

**Table 4.2: Personal details - principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal details</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59 +</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period in this profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 +</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of service in this Miftan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 +</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Areas and levels of involvement**

The cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements that relate to the Areas and levels of involvement, based on the Hornby (2000) model. Category, parameter, mean of each statement, highest and lowest involvement are shown in brackets.
The question was: ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’

The statements were:
1. Parents help with organizing different events (bazaars, celebrations, sports days). (Contributions) (Resource) (mean 3.42)
2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Needs) (Support) (mean 2.67)
3. Parents participate in drawing up/choosing their child’s curriculum. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (3.75)
4. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (2.42)
6. You have talks with parents about different matters which arise between the staff and the child. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (1.42)
8. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (1.83)
9. Parents help solve these problems. (Contributions) (Resource) (2.67)
10. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Contributions) (Information) (2.25)
12. You brief the parents on Miftan matters. (Contributions) (Policy) (1.75)
13. You visit parents at home. (Needs) (Liaison) (2.50)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Needs) (Communication) (1.33) (Highest)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Needs) (Communication) (2.50)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail (Needs) (Communication) (3.92) (Lowest)
19. The PA is active in the Miftan. (Contributions) (Policy)(3.17)
20. The parents participate in different events (exhibitions, performances, bazaars, trips). (Needs) (Education) (2.83)
21. Parents attend general parents-staff meetings. (Needs) (Liaison) (2.33)
22. Parents attend “open days” in the Miftan. (Needs) (Liaison) (2.83)
23. You have general talks with parents about different issues which relate to the Miftan. (Contributions) (Policy) (2.33)
24. Parents participate in making decisions. (Contributions) (Policy) (3.33)
25. Parents fundraise for the Miftan. (Contributions) (Resource) (3.75)

Table 4.3: Areas and levels of involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Areas and Levels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six principals claim that there is parental involvement ‘To a great extent’ and six claim that there is a slight involvement in the Miftan. There is involvement in the Miftanim (mean, 2.44) since the findings ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘Not at all’ are zero percent. The highest involvement, according to the principals, is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by phone’ (mean, 1.33) and the lowest involvement is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail’ (mean, 3.92).

Needs and contributions

The cluster of areas and levels is divided into two clusters and presents two categories; parental needs and parental contributions.

The parental needs’ category includes the following statements:
2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Support)
13. You visit parents at home. (Liaison)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Communication)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Communication)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail. (Communication)
20. The parents participate in different events (exhibitions, performances, bazaars, trips). (Education)
21. Parents attend general parents-staff meetings. (Liaison)
22. Parents attend “open days” in the Miftan. (Liaison)
The parental contributions’ category includes the following statements:
1. Parents help with organizing different events (bazaars, celebrations, sports days). (Resource)
2. Parents participate in drawing up/choosing their child’s curriculum. (Collaboration)
3. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme. (Collaboration)
4. You have talks with parents about different matters which arise between the staff and the child. (Collaboration)
5. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Collaboration)
6. Parents help solve these problems. (Resource)
7. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Information)
8. You brief the parents on Miftan matters. (Policy)
9. The PA is active in the Miftan. (Policy)
10. You have general talks with parents about different issues which relate to the Miftan. (Policy)
11. Parents participate in making decisions. (Policy)
12. Parents fundraise for the Miftan. (Resource)

Table 4.4: Parental needs and parental contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Category</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parental Needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parental Contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the fact that involvement in parental contributions is a little higher than parental needs, there is no great difference between the two: parental needs (mean, 2.30) and parental contributions (mean, 2.15). Most of the principals, 75 percent, claim involvement in parental needs ‘To a great extent’, while it is higher in parental contributions at 83 percent. In both categories the findings ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘Not at all’ are zero percent. Most of the principals believe ‘To a great extent’ that there is involvement in the Miftan.

In the parental needs cluster the highest involvement is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by phone’ (mean, 1.33) with 75 percent responding ‘To a very great extent’ and 17 percent ‘To a great extent’ (mean, 1.33; S.D .65). The lowest involvement is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail’ (mean, 3.92). Zero percent responded ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘To a great extent’ and 92 percent responded ‘Not at all’. In the parental contributions cluster, the highest involvement is ‘You have talks with parents about different matters which arise between the staff and the child’ (mean, 1.42). The lowest involvement is ‘Parents fundraise for the Miftan’ (mean, 3.75) with 75 percent responding ‘Not at all’ and 25 percent ‘Slightly’.

**Parameters**

These clusters are divided into eight parameters: policy, resource, collaboration, information, communication, liaison, education and support.
Table 4.5: Parameters in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.2: Parameters in involvement
The following parameters are presented by mean in ascendant order: information (2.25), liaison (2.56), communication (2.58), policy (2.65; median, 3; SD.63), collaboration (2.65; median, 3; SD.31), support (2.67), education (2.83) and resource (3.58). The highest involvement is in the information parameter (2.25) and the lowest involvement is in the resource parameter (3.58) which shows almost no involvement.

An open question was asked at the end of this section; question 26: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ None of the principals answered this question.

**Benefits**

This cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements which relate to the benefits in involvement. Mean, highest and lowest benefits are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan effect each of the following sentences?’

The statements were:

28. Improves the child’s self-image. (1.67) *(Highest)*
29. Improves parent’s self-image. (2.00)
30. Improves the child’s behaviour. (2.00)
31. Improves the child’s achievements. (2.25)
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan. (1.67) *(Highest)*
33. Improves the child’s social relationships. (2.25)
34. Improves the child’s attitude toward the principal. (1.83)
35. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff. (1.75)
36. Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work. (1.67)
37. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child. (1.83)
38. Involved parents serve as a pressure group on the authorities (Ministry of Education, Local Authorities) in order to gain assistance for my work. (2.83) *(Lowest)*
Table 4.6: Benefits in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety–one percent of the principals answered that parental involvement is beneficial (mean, 1.98); eight percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 83 percent ‘To a great extent’. The highest benefits were ‘Improves the child’s self-image’ and ‘Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan’ (mean, 1.67, median, 2, SD .49) and the lowest benefit was ‘Involved parents serve as a pressure group on the authorities (Ministry of Education, Local Authorities) in order to gain assistance for my work’ (mean, 2.83)

Benefits to the different stakeholders

This cluster is divided into three categories: benefits to the child, to the parents and to the principal.

The benefits statements for the child were:
28. Improves the child’s self-image.
30. Improves the child's behaviour.
31. Improves the child's achievements.
32. Improves the child's attitude toward the Miftan.
33. Improves the child's social relationships.

For the parents they were:
29. Improves parent’s self-image.
35. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff.
36. Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work.

And for the principals they were:
34. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Principal.
37. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child.
38. Involved parents serve as a pressure group on the authorities (Ministry of Education, Local Authorities) in order to gain assistance for my work.

**Table 4.7: Benefits to the stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Category</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>To the children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>To the parents</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>To the principals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principals answered that parental involvement is beneficial to the parents in the first place (mean, 1.81), ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘To a great extent’ (92%), then to the children (mean, 1.94) ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘To a great extent’ (83%), and then to the principals (mean, 2.33) ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘To a great extent’ (33%). However, 67 percent claimed that there is only a ‘slight’ benefit to them.

The highest benefit to the parents is ‘Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work’, (mean, 1.67), and the lowest benefit to parents is ‘Improves parents’ self-image’ (mean, 2.00).
The highest benefits to the child are ‘Improves the child’s self-image’, and ‘Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan’ (mean, 1.67; median, 2; SD .49). The lowest benefits to the child are ‘Improves the child’s achievements’ and ‘Improves the child’s social relationships’ (mean, 2.25; median 2; SD .62).

The highest benefit to the principal is ‘Improves the child’s attitude toward the Principal’ (mean, 1.83, median, 2; SD .39) and the lowest benefit is ‘Involved parents serve as a pressure group on the authorities (Ministry of Education, Local Authorities) in order to gain assistance to my work’ (mean, 2.83).

An open question was asked at the end of this section; question 39: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ None of the principals answered this question.

**Barriers**

This cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements which deal with the barriers principals might have to involving the parents. Mean, highest and lowest barriers are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?’

The statements were:

40. Parents are uneducated. (2.67)
41. Parents might be detrimental to my professional status. (3.83)
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have. (2.83)
43. Parents might be violent toward the child. (2.33) (**Highest**)
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically. (2.75)
45. Single parents. (3.00)
46. Parents are unemployed. (2.92)
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence. (3.92) (**Lowest**)
48. Parents might criticize (offend) the child. (2.67)
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems. (2.42)
50. Parents just get in the way of the professional ‘s work. (3.33)
51. Parents are more educated than I am. (3.92) (**Lowest**)
52. Parents might criticize my work. (3.73)
53. Parents might put pressure on me when making decisions. (3.67)
54. Parents might put pressure on the different authorities in order to put pressure on me. (3.83)

**Table 4.8: Barriers to involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-seven percent of the principals answered ‘Slightly’ and 33 percent answered ‘Not at all’. There are slight barriers to involvement. The highest barrier to involvement is ‘Parents might be violent toward the child’ (mean, 2.33) and the lowest barriers to involvement are ‘Parents might lower my self-confidence’ and ‘Parents are more educated than I am’ (mean, 3.92, median, 4; SD .29).

*Personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers*

This cluster is divided into two categories: personal/professional and parents’ demographic details barriers.

The personal/professional category includes the following statements:

41. Parents might be detrimental to my professional status.
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have.
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence.
48. Parents might criticize (offend) the child.
50. Parents just get in the way of the professional ‘s work.
51. Parents are more educated than I am.
52. Parents might criticize my work.
53. Parents might put pressure on me when making decisions.
54. Parents might put pressure on the different authorities in order to put pressure on me.
The parents’ demographic details category includes the following statements:
40. Parents are uneducated.
43. Parents might be violent toward the child.
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically.
45. Single parents.
46. Parents are unemployed.
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems.

Table 4.9: Personal/professional and parents demographic barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parents’ Demographic details</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.4: Barriers to involvement

Barriers

![Graph showing the distribution of barriers between personal/professional and parental demographics](image-url)
In barriers to involvement there are almost no personal/professional barriers to parental involvement (mean, 3.53). Seventy-five percent of principals answered ‘Not at all’ and 25 percent answered ‘Slightly’. This contrasts with parental demographics (mean, 2.68) where 41 percent gave positive answers; eight percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 33 percent ‘To a great extent’, while 25 percent indicated ‘Slightly’ and 33 percent ‘Not at all’.

The highest barrier to involvement in the personal/professional category is ‘Parents might criticize the child’ (mean, 2.67). The lowest barriers to parental involvement are ‘Parents might lower my self-confidence’ and ‘Parents are more educated than I am’ (mean, 3.92; median, 4; SD.29). In the parents’ demographic category, the highest barrier to parental involvement is ‘The parents might be violent toward the child’ (mean, 2.33), 67 percent responded ‘To a great extent’, and the lowest barrier to parental involvement is ‘Single parent’ (Mean,3.00).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 55: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’. None of the principals answered this question.

**Attitude and initiation**

Table 4.10 presents the findings of the statements that are not clustered: questions 5, 7 and 11 deal with the principal’s attitude and policy towards parental involvement and questions 14 and 15 deal with initiation into parental involvement. These statements refer to the question ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents can have talks with you only by appointment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents can have talks with you any time</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You encourage parental involvement in the Miftan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents are the ones who initiate the involvement with you</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a consensus regarding the fact that most of the principals meet parents only after an appointment has been made (mean, 1.50), 58 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 33 percent ‘To a great extent’. There is a higher consensus in question 7 regarding principals who receive parents at any time (mean, 1.25), 75 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 25 percent ‘To a great extent’. Question 11 shows that principals do encourage parental involvement, 50 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 50 percent ‘To a great extent’ (mean, 1.50). The principals’ initiation to involve parents (mean, 1.42) is higher than the parents’ initiation to involvement (mean, 2.42).
Summary
According to the findings from the principals’ questionnaire, 75 percent of the principals are male; 50 percent are between 23 and 39, and 50 percent between 40 and 59 years old; 83 percent have a University degree; 58 percent have been principals for between one and fourteen years; and 67 percent have worked in their current Miftan for between one and four years.

There is involvement in the Miftan. This involvement is higher in contributions than in needs; the highest involvement is information and the lowest is resource. Parental involvement is beneficial to the different stakeholders; to the parents in the first place, to the child and to the principals. Demographic details are higher barriers to involvement than personal/professional barriers, although there are slight (almost no) barriers to involving parents. Meeting the parents ‘any time’ is higher than meeting them ‘only by appointment’. The principals encourage parental involvement and the principals’ initiation to involvement is higher than the parents’ initiation to involvement.

Social Workers/Educational Counsellors’ Findings
Table 4.11: Personal details – social workers/educational counsellors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal details</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period in this profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of service in this Miftan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas and levels of involvement

This cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements that relate to the areas and the levels in involvement, based on the model. Category, parameter, mean of each statement, highest and lowest involvement are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’

The statements were:

1. You hold meetings with parents to offer guidance and help regarding the different authorities (Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, clinic, National Insurance Institute, etc.). (Needs) (Education) (2.14)
2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Needs) (Support) (2.45)
3. You up-date the parents about their child in the social, personal and study areas. (Needs) (Liaison) (1.45)
4. Parents participate in the child’s therapeutic/rehabilitation programme. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (2.27)
6. You have talks with parents about different matters which arise between the staff and the child. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (1.95)
8. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (1.68)
9. Parents help solve these problems. (Contributions) (Resource) (2.64)
10. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Contributions) (Information) (2.14)
12. The involvement with the parents is made by the record/contact book. (Needs) (Communication) (3.50)
13. You visit parents at home. (Needs) (Liaison) (2.32)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Needs) (Communication) (1.32) (Highest)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Needs) Communication) (2.86)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail. (Needs) (Communication) (3.95) (Lowest)
19. The PA is active with you. (Contributions) (Policy) (3.90)

Table 4.12: Areas and levels of involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Areas and Levels</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-two percent of the social workers/educational counsellors answered that there is involvement in the Miftan (mean, 2.25) ‘To a great extent’ and 18 percent ‘Slightly’, while zero percent answered ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘Not at all’. The highest involvement is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by phone’ (mean, 1.32) and the lowest is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail’ (mean, 3.95).

Needs and contributions

This cluster is divided into two categories: parental needs and parental contributions.

The parental needs’ category includes the following statements:
1. You hold meetings with parents to offer guidance and help regarding the different authorities (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, National Insurance Institute, etc.). (Education)
2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Support)
3. You give current information to the parents about their child (social area, personal area and study area). (Liaison)
12. The involvement with the parents is made by the record/contact book. (Communication)
13. You visit parents at home. (Liaison)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Communication)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Communication)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail. (Communication)
The parental contributions’ category includes the following statements:

4. Parents participate in the child’s therapeutic/rehabilitation programme. (Collaboration)
6. You have talks with parents about different matters which arise between the staff and the child. (Collaboration)
8. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Collaboration)
9. Parents help solve these problems. (Resource)
10. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Information)
19. The PA is active with you. (Policy)

Table 4.13: Parental needs and parental contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Category</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parental Needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parental Contributions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 4.5: Needs and contributions in involvement

The involvement in parental contributions (mean, 2.40) is higher than in parents needs (mean, 2.56). The highest involvement in parental needs is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by phone’ (mean, 1.32) and the lowest is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail’ (mean, 3.95). The highest involvement in parental contributions is ‘You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child’ (mean, 1.68) and the lowest is ‘The PA is active with you’ (mean, 3.90).

Parameters
These clusters are divided into eight parameters as shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: Parameters in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The parameters are presented here in ascendant order: collaboration (mean, 1.98), education (mean, 2.14), information (mean, 2.14), liaison (mean, 2.14), support (mean,
2.45), resource (mean, 2.64), communication (mean, 2.79) and policy (mean, 3.90). The highest involvement is collaboration (mean, 1.98) and the lowest is policy (mean, 3.90).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 19: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ None of them answered this question.

**Benefits**

This cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements that relate to the benefits in involvement. Mean, highest and lowest benefits are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?’

The statements were:

28. Improves the child’s self-image. (1.77)
29. Improves parent’s self-image. (1.73)
30. Improves the child’s behaviour. (1.77)
31. Improves the child’s achievements. (2.00)
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan. (1.86)
33. Improves the child’s social relationships. (2.50) (**Lowest**)
34. Improves the parents’ attitude toward the social worker/educational counsellor. (1.68)
35. Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work. (1.36) (**Highest**)
36. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child. (1.91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-one percent of the social workers/educational counsellors believe that parental involvement is beneficial ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘To a great extent’ (mean, 1.84).
The highest benefit is ‘Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work’ (mean, 1.36) and the lowest is it ‘Improves the child’s social relationships (mean, 2.50).

Benefits to the stakeholders
This cluster is divided into three categories; the benefits to the child, to the parents and to the social workers/educational counsellors.

The benefits statements relating to the child were:
28. Improves the child’s self-image.
30. Improves the child’s behaviour.
31. Improves the child’s achievements.
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miifan.
33. Improves the child’s social relationships.

For the parents they were:
29. Improves parent’s self-image.
35. Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work.

And for the social workers/educational counsellors they were:
34. Improves the parents’ attitude toward the social workers/educational counsellors.
36. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child.

Table 4.16: Benefits to the stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>To the child</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>To the parents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>To the social workers/educational counsellors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.7: Benefits to the stakeholders
There is a consensus about the benefits of involvement: there are benefits to the different stakeholders. The involvement is beneficial to the parents (mean, 1.59), to the social workers/educational counsellors (mean, 1.79) and to the child (mean, 1.98).

The highest benefit to the parents is ‘Parents gain better insight into the work of the staff’ (mean, 1.36). The lowest benefit to the parents is ‘Improves parents’ self-image’ (mean 1.73). The highest benefits to the social workers/educational counsellors are ‘Improves the parents’ attitude toward the social worker/educational counsellor (mean, 1.68) and then ‘Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child (mean, 1.91).

The highest benefits to the child are ‘Improves the child’s self-image and ‘Improves the child’s behaviour’ (mean, 1.77), the lowest benefit is ‘Improves the child’s social relationships’ (mean, 2.50).
An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 37: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ None of the social workers/educational counsellors answered this question.

**Barriers**

This cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements that deal with the barriers that social workers/educational counsellors might have to involving the parents. Mean, highest and lowest barriers are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?’

The statements were:

40. Parents are uneducated. (3.36)
41. Parents might be detrimental to my professional status. (3.86)
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have. (3.50)
43. Parents might be violent toward the child. (2.14) (**Highest**)
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically. (3.50)
45. Single parents. (3.50)
46. Parents are unemployed. (3.55)
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence. (3.86)
48. Parents might criticize (offend) the child. (2.52)
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems. (2.62)
50. Parents just get in the way of the professional’s work. (3.10)
51. Parents are more educated than I am. (3.95) (**Lowest**)
52. Parents might criticize my work. (3.86)

**Table 4.17: Barriers to involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are almost no barriers to involving parents (mean, 3.32), 45 percent of the social workers/educational counsellors answered that there are no barriers at all and 55 percent claimed ‘Slightly’. The highest barrier to involvement is ‘Parents might be violent toward the child’ (mean, 2.14) and the lowest barrier is ‘Parents are more educated than I am’ (mean, 3.95).

**Person/professional and parents’ demographic barriers**

This cluster is divided into two categories; personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers.

The personal/professional category includes the following statements:

41. Parents might be detrimental to my professional status.
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have.
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence.
48. Parents could criticise (offend) the child.
50. Parents just get in the way of the professional’s work.
51. Parents are more educated than I am.
52. Parents might criticise my work.

The parents’ demographic details category includes the following statements:

40. Parents are uneducated.
43. Parents might be violent toward the child.
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically.
45. Single parents.
46. Parents are unemployed.
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems.

**Table 4.18: Personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score Category</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Parents’ Demographic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the personal/professional category there are almost no barriers to involving parents (mean, 3.54), zero percent answered ‘To a very great extent’ and ‘To a great extent’. The highest barrier to parental involvement is ‘Parents might criticize the child’ (mean, 2.52) and the lowest is ‘Parents are more educated than I am’ (mean, 3.95). However, the social workers/educational counsellors believe that there are barriers in the parents’ demographic category (mean, 3.11), 14 percent ‘To a great extent’. The highest barrier is ‘Parents might be violent toward the child’ (mean, 2.14) and the lowest is ‘Parents are unemployed’ (mean, 3.55).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 55: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ None of the social workers/educational counsellors answered this question.

Table 4.19 presents the findings of the statements that are not clustered: questions 5, 7 and 11 deal with the social workers/educational counsellors’ attitude and policy towards
parental involvement and questions 14 and 15 deal with initiation into parental involvement. These statements refer to the question ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’

### Table 4.19: Attitude to and initiation in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parents can have talks with you only by appointment</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parents can have talks with you any time</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>You encourage parental involvement in the Miftan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The parents are the ones who initiate the involvement with you</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ‘Parents can have talks with you only by appointment’ (mean, 1.73), 55 percent answered ‘To a very great extent’ and 27 percent ‘To a great extent’. Eighty-two percent claimed that parents can contact them ‘any time’; 23 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 59 percent ‘To a great extent’. Seventy-seven percent indicated that they encourage parental involvement (mean, 1.91); 32 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 45 percent ‘To a great extent’. 
The findings relating to the statement ‘Do the parents initiate the involvement with you’ (mean, 2.55), are 55 percent ‘Slightly’, and five percent ‘Not at all’. Contrary to these findings, there is a strong tendency for members of staff to initiate involvement with the parents (mean, 1.73); 36 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 55 percent ‘To a great extent’.

**Summary**

According to the social workers/educational counsellors’ findings, 95 percent of them are female; 73 percent are between 23 and 39 years old; 95 percent have a University degree; 77 percent have been in the profession for between one and fourteen years and 96 percent have worked in their current Miftan for between one and fourteen years.

There is involvement in the Miftan; the involvement is higher in contributions than in needs; the highest involvement is collaboration and the lowest involvement is in communication. Parental involvement is beneficial to the different stakeholders; to the parents in the first place, to the child and to the social workers/educational counsellors. Demographic details are higher barriers to involvement than personal/professional issues, although there are almost no barriers to involving parents. Meeting the parents ‘only by appointment’ is higher than meeting them ‘any time’. They encourage parental involvement and their initiation to involvement is higher than the parents’ initiation to involvement.
Vocational Instructors’ Findings

Table 4.20: Personal details – vocational instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal details</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59 +</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section of High School/Vocational School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Vocational Instructor</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period in this profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 +</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of service in this Miftan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 +</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas and levels of involvement

This cluster includes the question and the statements that relate to the areas and the levels in involvement, based on the model. Category, parameter, mean, highest and lowest involvement are shown in brackets.

The question was:
‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’

The statements were:
1. Parents help in the workshop. (Contributions) (Resource) (3.50)
2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Needs) (Support) (2.90)
3. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s work plan. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (3.60)
4. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (3.43)
5. Parents help with organizing workshop activities (field trips, exhibitions, trips to enterprises, etc.). (Contributions) (Resource) (3.73)
6. Parents participate in workshop activities (field trips, exhibitions, trips to enterprises, etc.). (Needs) (Education) (3.65)
7. Parents help to prepare material for workshop work. (Contributions) (Resource) (3.88)
8. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (1.98)
9. Parents help solve these problems. (Contributions) (Resource) (2.75)
10. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Contributions) (Information) (2.38)
12. The involvement with the parents is made by the record/contact book. (Needs) (Communication) (3.08)
13. You visit parents at home. (Needs) (Liaison) (1.83)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Needs) (Communication) (1.40) (Highest)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Needs) (Communication) (3.30)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail. (Needs) (Communication) (3.98) (Lowest)
19. The PA is active in the workshop. (Contributions) (Policy) (3.79)

Table 4.21: Areas and levels of involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Areas and Levels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ninety-five percent of the vocational instructors answered that there is slight involvement in the Miftan (mean, 2.95). The highest involvement is ‘The involvement is made by phone’ (mean, 1.40) and the lowest is ‘The involvement is made by e-mail’ (mean, 3.98).

Needs and contributions
The cluster is divided into two categories; parental needs and parental contributions.

The parental needs’ category includes the following statements:
2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Support)
6. Parents participate in different activities (circles, field trips, exhibitions, trips to enterprises, etc.). (Education)
12. The involvement with the parents is made by the record/contact book. (Communication)
13. You visit parents at home. (Liaison)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Communication)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Communication)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail. (Communication)

The parental contributions’ category includes the following statements:
1. Parents help in the workshop. (Resource)
3. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s work plan. (Collaboration)
4. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme. (Collaboration)
5. Parents help with organizing workshop activities (field trips, exhibitions, trips to enterprises, etc.). (Resource)
7. Parents help to prepare material for workshop work. (Resource)
8. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Collaboration)
9. Parents help solve these problems. (Resource)
10. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Information)
19. The PA is active in the workshop. (Policy)
Table 4.22: Parental needs and parental contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Parental Needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Parental Contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.9: Needs and contributions in involvement

There is a higher involvement in the parental needs’ category (mean, 2.84) than in the parental contributions’ category (mean, 3.22). The highest involvement in parental needs is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by phone’ (mean, 1.40) and the lowest is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail’ (mean, 3.98). The
highest involvement in parental contributions is ‘You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child’ (Mean, 1.98) and the lowest is ‘Parents help to prepare material for workshop work’ (mean, 3.88).

Parameters

These clusters are divided into eight parameters as shown in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23: Parameters in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>,Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parameters are presented in ascendant order as follows: liaison (mean, 1.83), information (mean, 2.38), communication (mean, 2.87), support (mean, 2.90), collaboration (mean, 2.94), education (mean, 3.65), resource (mean, 3.70) and policy (mean, 3.79). The highest involvement is in liaison and the lowest in policy.

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 20: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ One vocational instructor wrote: “Relationships with the parents are very important to me, they participate for better or for worse, together we can find a better solution for the student.” Another answered that: “Parental involvement is minimal”.

**Benefits**

This cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements that relate to the benefits of involvement. Mean, highest and lowest are shown in brackets.
The question was: ‘To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?’

The statements were:
28. Improves the child’s self-image. (2.05)
29. Improves parent’s self-image. (2.42)
30. Improves the child’s behaviour. (2.05)
31. Improves the child’s workshop achievements. (2.31)
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan. (2.31)
33. Improves the child’s social relationships. (2.45) (Lowest)
34. Improves the child’s attitude toward the vocational instructor. (2.08)
35. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the vocational instructor. (2.08)
36. Parents gain better insight into the vocational instructor’s work. (1.89) (Highest)
37. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child. (2.00)
38. Parental involvement improves the vocational instructor’s morale. (1.89) (Highest)

Table 4.24: Benefits in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the vocational instructors there is a slight benefit in parental involvement (mean, 2.91). The highest benefits are ‘Parents gain better insight into the vocational instructor’s work’ and ‘Parental involvement improves the vocational instructor’s morale’ (mean, 1.89), the lowest benefit is ‘Improves the child’s social relationships (mean, 2.45).

Benefits to the different stakeholders
This cluster is divided into three categories; the benefits to the child, to the parents and to the vocational instructors.
The benefits statements relating to the child were:
28. Improves the child’s self-image.
30. Improves the child’s behaviour.
31. Improves the child’s workshop achievements.
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan.
33. Improves the child’s social relationships.

Relating to the parents they were:
29. Improves parent’s self-image.
36. Parents gain better insight into the vocational instructor’s work.

And relating to the vocational instructors they were:
34. Improves the child’s attitude toward the vocational instructor.
35. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the vocational instructor.
37. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child.
38. Parental involvement improves the vocational instructor’s morale.

Table 4.25: Benefits to the stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>To the child</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>To the parents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>To the vocational instructors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The vocational instructors claim that parental involvement is beneficial to them in the first place (mean, 1.95), to the parents (mean, 2.15) and lastly to the child (mean, 2.23). The highest benefit to the vocational instructors is ‘Improves the vocational instructor’s morale’ (mean, 1.89). The lowest benefits are ‘Improves the child’s attitude toward the vocational instructor’ and ‘Improves the parent’s attitude toward the vocational instructor’ (mean, 2.08).

The highest benefit to the parents is ‘Parents gain better insight into the vocational instructor’s work’ (mean, 1.89), followed by ‘Improves parents’ self-image’ (mean, 2.42). The highest benefit to the child is ‘Improves the child’s behaviour’ (mean, 2.05) and the lowest benefit to the child is ‘Improves the child’s social relationships’ (mean, 2.45).
An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 39: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ One vocational instructor answered that: “There is usually no contribution”.

**Barriers**

This cluster presents the findings of the question and the statements that deal with the barriers that vocational instructors might have to involving the parents. Mean, highest and lowest barriers are presented in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?’

The statements were:

40. Parents are uneducated. (2.54)
41. Parents might be detrimental to my status as a vocational instructor. (3.62)
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have. (2.85)
43. Parents might be violent toward the child. (2.64)
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically. (2.51)
45. Single parents. (2.69)
46. Parents are unemployed. (2.51)
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence. (3.59)
48. Parents might criticize (offend) the child. (2.85)
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems. (2.00) (Highest)
50. Parents just get in the way of my professional work. (3.74) (Lowest)
51. Parents are more educated than I am. (3.59)
52. Parents might criticize my work. (3.61)

**Table 4.26: Barriers to involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the vocational instructors there are slight barriers to involvement, 79 percent answered ‘Slightly’ and zero percent answered ‘To a very great extent’. The highest barrier to involving parents is ‘Parents are caught up in their own personal problems’ (mean, 2.00) and the lowest barrier is ‘Parents just get in the way of my professional work’ (mean, 3.74).

Personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers

This cluster is divided in two categories; personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers.

The personal/professional category includes the following statements:

41. Parents might be detrimental to my status as a vocational instructor.
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have.
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence.
48. Parents might criticize (offend) the child.
50. Parents just get in the way of my professional work.
51. Parents are more educated than I am.
52. Parents might criticize my work.

The parents demographic details’ category includes the following statements:

40. Parents are uneducated.
43. Parents might be violent toward the child.
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically.
45. Single parents.
46. Parents are unemployed.
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems.

<p>| Table 4.27: Personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Category</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Parents’ Demographic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The barriers to involving parents are stronger in the parents’ demographics category (mean, 2.48) than in the personal/professional category (mean, 3.41). More than half of the vocational instructors (54%) believe ‘To a great extent’ that parents’ demographic factors are barriers to involving parents. In the personal/professional category, the highest barrier to involving parents is ‘Parents don’t have the professional knowledge I have’ (mean, 2.85) and the lowest barrier is ‘Parents just get in the way of my professional work’ (mean, 3.74). In the parents’ demographic category, the highest barrier is ‘Parents are caught up in their own personal problems’ (mean, 2.00) and the lowest is, ‘Single parent’ (mean, 2.69).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 55: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’. One vocational instructor answered: “Sometimes the parents cause harm which is very difficult to fix. In most cases, parents are helpless and almost don’t have any influence over their children”.
Attitude to and initiation in involvement

Table 4.28 presents the findings of the statements that are not clustered: question 11 deals with the attitude towards parental involvement, questions 14 and 15 deal with the initiation to parental involvement. These statements refer to the question ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’

Table 4.28: Attitude to and initiation in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>You encourage parental involvement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The parents are the ones who initiate the involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vocational instructors encourage parental involvement (mean, 1.85), 35 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 48 percent ‘To a great extent’. The vocational instructors’ initiation to involve parents is higher (mean, 1.55) than the parents’ initiation (mean, 3.08).

Summary

According to the findings from the vocational instructors’ questionnaires, 58 percent are male; 73 percent are from 40 to 59 years old; 55 percent have a College degree; 61 percent have been in the profession for between 15 and 29 years and 68 percent have worked in their current Miftan for between one and fourteen years.

There is involvement in the Miftan and this involvement is higher in needs than in contributions; the highest involvement is liaison and the lowest is policy. Parental involvement is beneficial to the different stakeholders: to the vocational instructors in the
first place, to the parents and to the child. Demographic details are higher barriers than personal/professional barriers, although there are barriers to involving the parents. The vocational instructors encourage parental involvement and their initiation to involvement is higher than the parents’ initiation to involvement.

The findings of the open questions emphasize the importance of the relationships and the collaboration with the parents. On the one hand, this aims to find better solutions for the child even though the involvement of the parents is minimal and they are helpless and do not contribute on the hand they might harm the child.

Homeroom Teachers’ Findings

Table 4.29: Personal details – homeroom teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal details</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59 +</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section of High School/Professional School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher College degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period in this profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 +</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of service in the Miftan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29 +</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas and levels of involvement

The first cluster includes the question and the statements that relate to the areas and the levels in involvement. Category, parameter, mean, highest and lowest involvement are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’

The statements were:
1. Parents help in classroom work. (Contributions) (Resource) (3.91)
2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Needs) (Support) (2.60)
3. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s curriculum. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (3.75)
4. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (2.77)
5. Parents help with organizing class activities (field trips, trips to exhibitions, etc.). (Contributions) (Resource) (3.87)
6. Parents participate in class activities (field trips, trips to exhibitions, etc.). (Needs) (Education) (3.57)
7. Parents help with preparing material for classroom work. (Contributions) (Resource) (3.98) (Lowest)
8. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (2.13)
9. Parents help solve these problems. (Contributions) (Resource) (2.89)
10. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Contributions) (Information) (2.45)
12. The involvement with the parents is made by the record book. (Needs) (Communication) (3.09)
13. You visit parents at home. (Needs) (Liaison) (1.98)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Needs) (Communication) (1.45) (Highest)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Needs) (Communication) (2.58)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail. (Needs) (Communication) (3.94)

19. The PA is active in the classroom. (Contributions) (Policy) (3.96)

Table 4.30: Areas and levels of involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Areas and Levels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-four percent of the homeroom teachers answered that there is a slight involvement (mean, 2.95). The highest involvement is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by phone’ (mean, 1.45) and the lowest is ‘Parents help with preparing material for classroom work’ (mean, 3.98).

Needs and contributions

The cluster is divided into two categories; parental needs and parental contributions.

The parental needs’ category includes the following statements:

2. You have talks with the parents about their personal matters. (Support)
6. Parents participate in activities (workshops, field trips, trips to exhibitions, etc.). (Education)
12. The involvement with the parents is made by the record book. (Needs) (Communication)
13. You visit parents at home. (Liaison)
16. The involvement with the parents is made by phone. (Communication)
17. The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars. (Communication)
18. The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail. (Communication)

The parental contributions’ category includes the following statements:

1. Parents help in classroom work. (Resource)
3. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s curriculum. (Collaboration)
4. Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme. (Collaboration)

5. Parents help with organizing class activities (field trips, trips to exhibitions, etc.). (Resource)

7. Parents help with preparing material for classroom work. (Resource)

8. You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child. (Collaboration)

9. Parents help solve these problems. (Resource)

10. Parents attend private talks concerning their child. (Information)

19. The PA is active in the classroom. (Policy)

Table 4.31: Parental needs and parental contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Category</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Parental needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Parental contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.13: Needs and contributions in involvement
According to the homeroom teachers there is a higher involvement in the parental needs’ category (mean, 2.75) than in the parental contributions’ category (mean, 3.31). In parental needs, the highest involvement is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by phone’ (mean, 1.45) and the lowest is ‘The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail’ (mean, 3.94).

In parental contributions, the highest involvement is ‘You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child’ (mean, 2.13) and the lowest is ‘Parents help with preparing material for classroom work’ (mean, 3.98).

Parameters
This cluster is divided into eight parameters as shown in Table 4.32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.32: Parameters in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of the parameters are presented in ascendant order as follows: liaison (mean, 1.98), information (mean, 2.45), support (mean, 2.60), communication (mean, 2.77), collaboration (mean, 2.89), education (mean, 3.57), resource (mean, 3.92) and policy (mean, 3.96). The highest involvement is in liaison and the lowest is in policy.

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 20: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ One out of 53 homeroom teachers answered the open question, and stated: “Generally, there is no parental involvement, there is a very scanty section of parents who respond, but there isn’t any initiation from them”.

**Benefits**

This cluster presents the question and the statements relating to the benefits of parental involvement. Mean, highest and lowest benefits are shown in brackets.
The question was: 'To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan effect each of the following sentences?'

The statements were:
28. Improves the child’s self-image. (Mean, 2.08)
29. Improves parent’s self-image. (Mean, 2.43)
30. Improves the child’s behaviour. (Mean, 2.10)
31. Improves the child’s classroom studies and achievements. (Mean, 2.31)
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan. (Mean, 2.19)
33. Improves the child’s social relationships. (Mean, 2.83) (Lowest)
34. Improves the child’s attitude toward the teacher. (Mean, 2.21)
35. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the teacher. (Mean, 2.02)
36. Parents gain better insight into the teacher’s work. (Mean, 1.94) (Highest)
37. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child. (Mean, 2.06)
38. Parental involvement improves the teacher’s morale. (Mean, 2.31)

**Table 4.33: Benefits in involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The homeroom teachers answered that parental involvement is beneficial (mean, 2.25). The highest benefit in involvement is ‘Parents gain better insight into the teacher’s work (mean,1.94) and the lowest is ‘Improves the child’s social relationships (mean,2.83).

**Benefits to the different takeholders**
The cluster is divided into three categories; the benefits to the child, to the parents and to the homeroom teachers.

The benefits statements relating to the child were:
28. Improves the child’s self-image.
30. Improves the child’s behaviour.
31. Improves the child’s classroom studies and achievements.
32. Improves the child's attitude toward the Miftan.
33. Improves the child's social relationships.

For the parents they were:
29. Improves parent’s self-image.
36. Parents gain better insight into the teacher’s work.

And for the homeroom teachers they were:
34. Improves the child’s attitude toward the teacher.
35. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the teacher.
37. Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child.
38. Parental involvement improves the teacher’s morale.

Table 4.34: Benefits to the stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>To the child</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>To the parents</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>To the homeroom teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The homeroom teachers believe that involvement of parents is beneficial to the different stakeholders. It is beneficial to the homeroom teachers in the first place (mean, 2.1), to the parents (mean, 2.18) and lastly to the child (mean, 2.31). The highest benefit to the homeroom teachers is ‘Improves the parent’s attitude toward the teacher’ (mean, 2.02) and the lowest is ‘Parental involvement improves the teacher’s morale (mean, 2.31). The highest benefit to parents is ‘Parents gain better insight into the teacher’s work’ (mean, 1.94) followed by ‘Improves parents’ self-image’ (mean, 2.43). The highest benefit to the child is ‘Improves the child’s self-image’ (mean, 2.08) and the lowest benefit is ‘Improves the child’s social relationships’ (mean, 2.83).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 39: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ One of the homeroom teachers answered: “In the very isolated cases of parental involvement, it is beneficial to both the child and the teachers, and the conclusion drawn from this minimal involvement is that it is ‘idealistic’”.
Barriers
This cluster includes the question and the statements that deal with the barriers homeroom teachers might have to involving the parents. Mean, highest and lowest barriers are written in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?’

The statements were:
40. Parents are uneducated. (2.89)
41. Parents might be detrimental to my status as a homeroom teacher. (3.70)
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have. (3.30)
43. Parents might be violent toward the child. (2.42)
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically. (3.09)
45. Single parents. (3.21)
46. Parents are unemployed. (3.17)
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence. (3.91)
48. Parents might criticize (offend) the child. (2.75)
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems. (2.19) (Highest)
50. Parents just get in the way of my professional work. (3.81)
51. Parents are more educated than I am. (3.96) (Lowest)
52. Parents might criticize my work. (3.89)

Table 4.35: Barriers to involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are very low barriers to involvement (mean, 3.25), the highest barrier is ‘Parents are caught up in their own personal problems’ (mean, 2.19) and the lowest is ‘Parents are more educated than I am’ (mean, 3.96).
**Personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers**

The cluster is divided into two categories: personal/professional barriers and parents’ demographic barriers:

The personal/professional category includes the following statements:

41. Parents might be detrimental to my status as a homeroom teacher.
42. Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have.
47. Parents might lower my self-confidence.
48. Parents might criticize (offend) the child.
50. Parents just get in the way of my professional work.
51. Parents are more educated than I am.
52. Parents might criticize my work.

The parents demographic details’ category includes the following statements:

40. Parents are uneducated.
43. Parents might be violent toward the child.
44. Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically.
45. Single parents.
46. Parents are unemployed.
49. Parents are caught up in their own personal problems.

<p>| Table 4.36: Personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers |
|-------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal/professional</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ demographic</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parents’ demographics category (mean, 2.83) is higher than the personal/professional category (mean, 3.62). The highest barrier in the personal/professional category is ‘Parents might criticize the child’ (mean, 2.75) and the lowest barrier is ‘The parents are more educated than I am’ (mean, 3.96). The highest barrier in the parents’ demographic category is ‘Parents are caught up in their own personal problems’ (mean, 2.19) and the lowest barrier is ‘Single parent’ (mean, 3.21).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 20: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ None of the homeroom teachers answered this question.

**Attitude to and initiation in involvement**

Table 4.37 presents the findings of the statements that are not clustered: question 11 deals with the attitude towards parental involvement, questions 14 and 15 deal with the
initiation to parental involvement. These statements refer to the question ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’

Table 4.37: Attitude to and initiation in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>You encourage parental involvement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>The parents are the ones who initiate the involvement with you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homeroom teachers encourage parental involvement (mean, 2.40). There is a great difference between the parents’ initiation and the homeroom teachers’ initiation to relationships. The homeroom teachers’ initiation is higher (mean, 1.55) than the parents’ initiation (mean, 3.17), in fact, there is almost no initiation from the parents while there is high initiation from the homeroom teachers.

Summary

According to the findings from the homeroom teachers’ questionnaires, 72 percent are female; 60 percent are from 40 to 59 years old; 79 percent have a University degree; 48 percent have been in the profession for between 15 and 29 years and 70 percent have worked in their current Miftan for between one and fourteen years.

There is involvement in the Miftan and this involvement is higher in needs than in contributions; the highest involvement is liaison and the lowest is policy. Parental involvement is beneficial to the different stakeholders; to the homeroom teachers in the first place, to the parents and to the child. Demographic details are higher barriers than
personal/professional barriers. They encourage parental involvement and their initiation to involvement is higher than the parents’ initiation.

The findings of the open questions emphasized the fact that there is no involvement, only a very scanty section of parents respond and they don’t initiate it. This minimal involvement is ‘idealistic ’; it is beneficial for these children.

**Parents’ Findings**

**Table 4.38: Personal details – parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal details</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children at Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Three</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Six</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section of Secondary School/Professional School.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity in PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas and levels of involvement

The first cluster includes the question and statements that relate to the areas and the levels in involvement. Category, parameter, mean, highest and lowest involvement are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?.

The statements were:
1. You help with classroom work (individual help for child). (Contributions) (Resource) (Mean, 3.25)
2. You help with preparing classroom work (placards, work sheets, work cards). (Contributions) (Resource) (Mean, 3.65)
3. You help with preparing material for the workshop (carpentry, locksmith’s work, hairdressing). (Contributions) (Resource) (Mean, 3.75)
4. You help with organizing workshop activities (bazaars, visits to enterprises, trips, exhibitions, etc.). (Contributions) (Resource) (Mean, 3.60)
5. You attend private talks concerning your child. (Contributions) (Information) (Mean, 3.10)
6. You participate in parents’ workshops in the Miftan. (Needs) (Education) (Mean, 3.65)
7. You participate in preparing the child’s personal/special curriculum. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (Mean, 3.45)
8. You attend private talks concerning your personal matters. (Needs) (Support) (Mean, 3.43)
9. You attend parents-staff meetings. (Needs) (Liaison) (Mean, 1.90)
10. You fundraise for the Miftan. (Contributions) (Resource) (Mean, 3.70)
11. You donate to the Miftan. (Contributions) (Resource) (Mean, 3.55)
12. You help your child with homework. (Contributions) (Collaboration) (Mean, 3.50)
13. The involvement with the Miftan is made by phone. (Needs) (Communication) (Mean, 1.30) (Highest)
14. The involvement with the Miftan is made by letters/circulars, record/contact book. (Needs) (Communication) (Mean, 3.75)
19. The involvement with the Miftan is made by e-mail (Electronic mail). (Needs) (Communication) (Mean, 3.95) (Lowest)

23. You participate in making decisions in the Miftan. (Contributions) (Policy) (Mean, 2.40)

**Table 4.39: Areas and levels of involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Areas and Levels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is involvement in the Miftanim (mean, 2.77), most of the parents answered that they are involved in the Miftan ‘Slightly’ (80 percent). The highest involvement is ‘The involvement with the Miftan is made by phone’ (mean, 1.30) and the lowest is ‘The involvement with the Miftan is made by e-mail (Electronic mail)’ (mean, 3.95).

**Needs and contributions**

This cluster is divided into two categories; parental needs and parental contributions.

The parental needs’ category includes the following statements:

6. You **participate** in parents’ workshops in the Miftan. (Education)
8. You attend private talks concerning your personal matters. (Support)
9. You **attend** parents-staff meetings. (Liaison)
17. The involvement with the Miftan is made by phone. (Communication)
18. The involvement with the Miftan is made by letters/circulars, record/contact book. (Communication)
19. The involvement with the Miftan is made by e-mail (Electronic mail). (Communication)

The parental contributions category includes the following statements:

1. You help with **classroom work** (individual help for child). (Resource)
2. You help with **preparing** classroom work (placards, work sheets, work cards). (Resource)
3. You help with preparing material for the workshop (carpentry, locksmith’s work, hairdressing). (Resource)

4. You help with organizing workshop activities (bazaars, visits to enterprises, trips, exhibitions, etc.). (Resource)

5. You attend private talks concerning your child. (Information)

7. You participate in preparing the child’s personal/special curriculum. (Collaboration)

10. You fundraise for the Miftan. (Resource)

11. You donate to the Miftan. (Resource)

12. You help your child with homework. (Collaboration)

23. You participate in making decisions in the Miftan. (Policy)

Table 4.40: Parental needs and parental contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parental needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parental contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.17: Needs and contributions in involvement
According to the parents there is a higher involvement in parental needs (mean, 2.94) than in parental contributions (mean, 3.29). The highest involvement in parental needs is ‘The involvement in the Miftan is made by phone’ (mean, 1.30) and the lowest is ‘The involvement with the Miftan is made by e-mail (Electronic mail)’ (mean, 3.95).

The highest involvement in parental contributions is ‘You attend private talks concerning your child’ (mean, 1.90), and the lowest is ‘You help with preparing material for the workshops (carpentry, locksmith’s work, hair-dressing)’ (mean, 3.95).

**Parameters**
These clusters are divided into eight parameters as shown in Table 4.41.

**Table 4.41: Parameters in involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of the parameters are presented in ascendant order as follows: liaison and information (mean, 1.90; Median, 2; SD .1.02), policy (mean, 2.40), communication (mean, 3.00), education (mean, 3.10), collaboration (mean, 3.4), resource (mean, 3.58) and support (mean, 3.65). The highest involvement is in both liaison and information (Mean, 1.90; Median, 2; SD .1.02) and the lowest involvement is in support (mean, 3.65).

Reasons for involvement

This cluster deals with the parents’ reasons for being involved in the Miftan. These statements belong to the question: ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?’ Mean is shown in brackets.

The statements were:

20. Parents get to know their children better therefore their involvement will be helpful. (Mean, 1.60)
21. Parents are involved because they have good influence on their child. (Mean, 1.50)
22. Parents are involved because it is important for them that their child succeeds. (Mean, 1.10)

Table 4.42: Reasons for involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parents agreed with the reasons for involvement (mean, 1.40), 60 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 35 percent ‘To a great extent’. There is a consensus about the reasons for involvement (SD .49).

The findings are presented in ascendant order: ‘Parents are involved because it is important for them that their child succeeds’ (mean, 1.10); ‘Parents are involved because they have good influence on their child’ (mean, 1.50); ‘Parents get to know their child better therefore their involvement is helpful’ (mean, 1.60).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 24: ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ One parent answered: “I collaborate with the staff in finding solutions for my son in order to progress and to succeed”.

Benefits
This cluster presents the question and the statements regarding the benefits of parental involvement. Mean, highest and lowest benefits are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?’

The statements were:
26. Improves the child’s self-image. (Mean, 1.45) (Highest)
27. Improves parents’ self-image. (Mean, 1.90)
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28. Improves the child’s social relationships. (Mean, 2.05) (Lowest)
29. Improves the child’s behaviour. (Mean, 1.80)
30. Improves the child’s performance. (Mean, 1.95)
31. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan. (Mean, 1.90)
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff. (Mean, 2.00)
33. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff. (Mean, 1.60)
34. Parents gain better insight into the work of the Miftan’s staff. (Mean, 1.60)

Table 4.43: Benefits in involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents answered that parental involvement is very beneficial (mean, 1.81). The highest benefit is ‘Improves the child’s self-image’ (mean, 1.45) and the lowest benefit is ‘Improves the child’s social relationships’ (mean, 2.05).

Benefits to the different stakeholders
The benefits are divided into three categories; the benefits to the child, to the parents and to the staff.

The benefits statements for the child were:
26. Improves the child’s self-image.
28. Improves the child’s social relationships.
29. Improves the child’s behaviour.
30. Improves the child’s performance.
31. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan.
32. Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff.

For the parents they were:
27. Improves parents’ self-image.
34. Parents gain better insight into the work of the Miftan’s staff.

And for the staff:
33. Improves the parent’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff.

**Table 4.44: Benefits to the stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>To the child</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>To the parents</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>To the staff</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4.19: Benefits to the stakeholders**

**Benefits**

- To a very great extent
- To a great extent
- Slightly
- Not at all
Parents answered that parental involvement benefits the staff in the first place (mean, 1.60), 55 percent ‘To a very great extent’ and 30 percent ‘To a great extent’. Benefits to the parents are second (mean, 1.75) followed by benefit to the child (mean, 2.75).

The highest benefits to the parents are ‘Parents gain better insight into the work of the Miftan’s staff’ (mean, 1.60) and ‘Improve parents’ self-image’ (mean, 1.90). The highest benefit to the child is ‘Improves the child’s self-image’ (mean, 1.45) and the lowest is ‘Improves the child’s social relationships’ (mean, 2.05).

An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 35; ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ Two parents responded as follows:

“Being an involved parent raises the kid’s morale, his adaptation is better, he is more positive towards himself, towards his family and towards his environment”.

“The kid’s attitude changes when he knows that there is a relationship between the staff and the parents and there is follow-up.”

**Barriers**

This cluster includes the question and the statements that deal with barriers parents might have to being involved. Mean, highest and lowest barriers are shown in brackets.

The question was: ‘To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to be involved in the Miftan?’

The statements were:

36. The Miftan’s staff do not treat the parents well. (Mean, 3.30)
37. Parents lack time to be involved with the Miftan. (Mean, 2.50) (**Highest**)
38. Parents are not professional as the Miftan’s staff are. (Mean, 2.63)
39. The children are already grown-up and they are more responsible. (Mean, 2.58)
40. The children object to parental involvement. (Mean, 2.79)
41. Parents are busy with work. (Mean, 2.68)
42. Parents have negative recollections of their own school days. (Mean, 3.37)
43. Parents do not understand/hardly understand Hebrew. (Mean, 3.47) (**Lowest**)
44. Parents are not pleased that their child attends the Miftan. (Mean, 3.37)

Table 4.45: Barriers to involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.20: Barriers to involvement

There are barriers to involvement (mean, 2.75). Although zero percent answered ‘To a very great extent’, 37 percent answered ‘To a great extent’ and 32 percent ‘Slightly’, while 32 percent indicated ‘Not at all’.

The highest barrier to involvement is ‘Parents lack time to be involved with the Miftan’ (mean, 2.50) and the lowest barrier is ‘Parents do not understand/hardly understand Hebrew’ (mean, 3.47).
An open question was asked at the end of this section, question 45; ‘Do you have anything else to add to this issue?’ Six out of 20 parents answered as follows:

“The kid has to cooperate, otherwise the cooperation of the parents and the staff will go down the drain”; 

“We are not pleased that the kid is in the Miftan and we would prefer that he study in a regular school in order to graduate”; 

“I am not pleased that my kid is in the Miftan but he is there nevertheless, and I cooperate with the staff “; 

“I am very pleased with this Miftan, I take off my hat to the principal and the social worker. It is to their credit that my daughter has changed positively”; 

“We are very pleased that ‘Noname’ is in the Miftan, this institute gives him better and more suitable solutions than regular school”; 

“We are very pleased that ‘Noname’ is in the Miftan, especially with the vocational instructor, who is doing his best and I hope that he will be rewarded for his work”.

**Initiation in involvement**

Table 4.46 presents the findings of the statements that are not clustered and belong to the question ‘To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan’? The statements deal with initiation and with whom the parents are involved.

**Table 4.46: Initiation in involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>To a very great extent (1)</th>
<th>To a great extent (2)</th>
<th>Slightly (3)</th>
<th>Not at all (4)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the homeroom teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the vocational instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the social worker/educational counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings show that parents initiate involvement with the following stakeholders, in ascendant order: with the homeroom teacher (mean, 1.90); with the vocational instructors (mean, 1.95); with the principal (mean, 2.00) and with the social worker/educational counsellor (mean, 2.15).

Summary
According to the findings from the parents’ questionnaires, 75 percent are female; 70 percent are married; 60 percent have one to three children at home; 65 percent have a job; 30 percent have a profession (two secretaries, one nurse, one carpenter, one carpenter instructor and one hairdresser); 45 percent have a ‘well below average’ income; 45 percent have completed a section of secondary school/professional school and none of them are active in the Miftan PA.

Although the parents are slightly involved with the Miftan, the involvement in needs is higher than involvement in contributions; the highest involvement is liaison and the lowest involvement is policy. Parental involvement is beneficial to the different stakeholders; to the vocational instructors in the first place, to the parents and to the child. The parents have barriers to involvement. The parents initiate the involvement with the homeroom teacher in the first place, with the vocational instructor, with the principal and at last, with the social worker/educational counsellor.

The findings of the open questions are as follows: they emphasize the importance of collaboration with the staff, their purposes are to raise the child’s morale, it improves his attitude towards everyone, his adaptation is better, he will succeed and progress. Some of them cooperate, although they are sorry that their child is in the Miftan while others are very pleased with that fact and are grateful to the staff.
Section Two - Findings and Analysis of the Case Studies

Introduction
This section presents the findings of two case studies and is divided into three sub-sections: the interview process, the findings from the interviews and the analysis of documents. The interview process includes the interviews, the questions used in the interviews, gaining access for the interviews, the process of the interviews and the analysis process. The findings section presents the findings from the interviews with staff and parents in Miftan A and Miftan B. Finally, the two different types of documents are presented.

The interview process

The interviews
The purpose of the interviews was to collect qualitative data from the interviewees in order to obtain a wide picture and in-depth understanding of the research issue (Drever, 1995), to supplement the survey findings, and to combine the different data (Bryman, 1988; Greene et al., 1989; Robson, 1993; Cohen and Manion, 1994; Miles and Huberman, 1994). Two different interviews were designed for the different stakeholders, one for the parents and one for the staff. The participants in Miftan A were the principal, social worker, educational counsellor, two vocational instructors, two homeroom teachers and four parents. The participants in Miftan B were the principal, social worker, two vocational instructors, two homeroom teachers and four parents. The author interviewed 21 interviewees in total.

The questions used in the interviews
The interviews consisted of nine main questions, based on the research questions. In addition, numerous prompt and explore questions were asked, according to the need for flexibility and to the participants’ patience. The questions were graded according to sensitivity. The first question was a neutral and warming question (Bell, 1993) which was put to both the parents and the staff: ‘How would you define parental involvement?’.

The purpose of this question was to introduce the issue of the research and to obtain a basic understanding of this term.
The second question to the staff was: ‘What are the areas and the issues that you are involved in with parents?’ and a similar question: ‘What are the areas and the issues that you are involved in with the Miftan?’ was put to the parents.

The third question was put to both the parents and the staff: ‘Who initiates the involvement and in what issue(s)?’. The findings from this question are presented in schematic form in order to give a visual picture of the direction taken by the initiator.

The fourth question was also put to both the parents and the staff: ‘What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the child, parents and staff?’. This question is neutral, since the influence can be both beneficial and harmful. A supplementary question was asked: ‘Is any harm caused by involvement?’ if the answer focused on the beneficial effect only. If the answer focused on the harmful effect only then the question asked was: ‘Is there any benefit in involvement?’.

The fifth question for the parents was: ‘What are the reasons that you are involved with the Miftan?’ and for the staff it was: ‘What are your reasons for involving the parents’.

The sixth question put to the parents was: ‘What is the staff’s attitude toward your involvement?’. For the staff the sixth question was: ‘Considering the families’ profile in the Miftan, what is your attitude to parental involvement?’. Supplementary questions for the staff were: ‘Do you prefer to involve some families over others?’ ‘Which families and why?’ ‘What are you doing to reinforce your attitude?’.

The seventh question put to both the parents and the staff was: ‘Do you think that there are barriers to involvement?’ with an additional question: ‘What are the barriers to parental involvement?’.

The eighth question: ‘What kind of involvement do you wish to have in the Miftan?’ and the ninth question: ‘Do you have any questions or anything else to add on this issue?’ were put to both the parents and the staff. These last two questions were asked in order to close the interview with a view to the future.
Gaining access
The interviews took place after the author received approval and a convenient time and place were agreed upon.

Miftan A
In accordance with the author’s personal request, and with the agreement of the principal and the staff in Miftan A, the interviews were held during a training course which took place in this Miftan. The educational counsellor was the only exception and the interview with her took place in a café in a shopping centre. The author contacted the parents personally by phone to obtain their agreement to be interviewed and to arrange a convenient location and time. The parents’ interviews took place in their homes in the Miftan town, since most of the children are from this town.

Miftan B
The request to Miftan B was made by phone. The principal agreed to participate and he requested his staff to totally cooperate with the author and to give her any help she required. The interviews with the staff were held in the Miftan during the summer holiday while different preparations and renovations for the next year were taking place. The author contacted the parents personally by phone to gain their agreement to be interviewed and to arrange a convenient location and time. The parents’ interviews took place in their homes; none of these parents lived in the Miftan’s town, therefore each interview was held in a different town since the majority of the children in this Miftan are from the periphery.

During the interview
The interview began with “small talk”: the author introduced herself, she emphasised the fact that she had been a homeroom teacher in a Miftan for 22 years and conversation flowed in this direction. The author opened the interview by confirming that the interviewee had agreed to participate voluntarily, that he/she was free to refuse to answer any question, and to stop the interview and to withdraw at any time (Robson, 1993). Also that the interview was confidential, names and places would be pseudonyms, there was no right or wrong answer, any answer would be welcome (Dane, 1990; Frankfort-Nahmias and Nahmias, 1996; Sarantakos, 1998).
The first interview was held on 25/6/2002 and the last one on 25/9/2002. (Date, location, time, type of data gathered are given in appendix 33.) In order to hold to the principle of confidentiality and to avoid any identification (Sarantakos, 1998; Dane, 1990) the Miftanim, the participants and the children in this research are referred by pseudonyms and letters.

**The analysis process**

The first step in dealing with the data was to transcribe the interviews from the written reports and from the tape recordings onto the computer and to translate them into English. No data was selected at this stage in order not to “lead to premature judgments about what is important and what is not” (Seidman, 1998, p.96). The transcribing process showed a great difference between the recorded interviews and those that were not recorded. The recorded interviews are richer, deeper and provide the accurate participants’ words better than the written interviews (Seidman, 1998). The next stage was to transform the raw data into data that made sense; to select the answers according to the research questions, using tables to present the data clearly and to facilitate the comparison between the Miftanim. The data is presented in matrices containing summarised text, verbal information and quotes (Miles and Huberman, 1994) which aim to “explain aspects of research” (Sarantakos, 1998, p. 359).

These data are presented in two sections: the staff section and the parents section, as the interviews are different and the findings present the issue of parental involvement from both the parents’ and the staff’s point of view. The data were selected according to the research questions and based on criteria, parameters and categories (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The criteria were; areas and levels of involvement, initiation to involvement, involvement effect(s), reasons for involvement, and attitude to and behaviour in involvement. The parameters were; policy, resource, collaboration, information, communication, liaison, education and support. The categories were; the effect(s) on the child, the parents and the staff, benefits and harms in involvement, personal/professional and parents' demographic barriers to involvement.

An additional form of analysis was to emphasise personal and unique data given by the interviewees, such as the unusual/extraordinary, contradictory, conditional, negative and reflective (Robson, 1993; Miles and Huberman, 1994). The backgrounds to
extraordinary interviews are presented in order to give a sense of the process of the interview, to illuminate and to help to understand the given data. The data presents this issue from the professional and personal angles of the interviewees, and includes thoughts, ideas, anger, remorse, wonder and hope. The author did not change the interviewees’ words in order to transfer thoughts, opinions, points of view, atmosphere and feelings as close to reality as possible.

Interview Findings

Miftanim profiles

Table 4.47: Miftan A and Miftan B profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Miftan A</th>
<th>Miftan B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>In the heart and within the town. Regional.</td>
<td>Distant and at the edge of the town. Regional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family profiles</td>
<td>The majority are at-risk families</td>
<td>The majority are at-risk families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trainees</td>
<td>60 (most of them are from the Miftan town)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section one - staff findings

Introduction
This section presents the findings from staff of Miftan A and Miftan B. The staff profile, the content of analysis is presented in tables and figures, by criteria, parameters and categories. Tables 4.48 and 4.49 present the staff’s profiles.
Table 4.48: Miftan A Profile (staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Period in this profession (Years)</th>
<th>Period in the Miftan (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Eight.</td>
<td>First year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational C.</td>
<td>B.A and group guide</td>
<td>Twenty-two.</td>
<td>Six.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A.</td>
<td>Certified vocational instructor and Teacher Training College</td>
<td>Thirty</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B.</td>
<td>Certified vocational instructor.</td>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>Nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. A.</td>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. B.</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.49: Miftan B Profile (staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Period in this profession (Years)</th>
<th>Period in the Miftan (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Teacher college</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I.C.</td>
<td>Teacher college</td>
<td>Seventeen</td>
<td>Ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I.D.</td>
<td>Teacher college and B.A</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. C.</td>
<td>B.A (Children with Special Needs) and M.A</td>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T.D.</td>
<td>B.A Informal/personal education</td>
<td>Twenty three</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background to interviews
These interview backgrounds present the climate in which the interviews took place. The principals’ interviews were selected since they represent the general background and the principals’ attitude towards the research, the issue and the author.

Principal A
The author had to request, more than once, a convenient time to interview the principal of Miftan A. It was agreed to hold the interview on a day when the principal had personal meetings with the staff at the end of the Miftan’s year. The principal’s schedule was very busy and the interview had to be fitted in between his other meetings. He appeared to be under pressure. The author asked the first question, the principal put his head in his hands and said “it is a ‘heavy’ subject”, and suggested postponing the interview to the following week. The author assumed that principal A wanted to be under less work pressure and more relaxed in the interview in order to give the best of himself. The second interview, however, was in a tense atmosphere and the answers were very short.

Principal B
The interview with the principal from Miftan B was quite different. The author felt very comfortable since the principal was very kind, he said that the subject was very important; he told his secretary that he was not to be disturbed and said that he was ready to cooperate. He requested his staff’s cooperation and told them to give any assistance to the author. The interview with principal B was longer and more intensive than with principal A.

Defining involvement
To the warning question: “What is parental involvement?” the staff responded as follows:
Staff included in the definition of involvement policy, resource, collaboration, information, communication, liaison and support, the latter refers to the parents’ support in the staff’s work. They emphasised that the parents have to be interested and to care about the child, (to ask questions, to be critical) to take responsibility, to be there. Miftan A
Staff included in the definition of involvement policy, resource, collaboration, information, communication, liaison, education and support. They emphasised that the parents have to be interested in their child, take responsibility and back up the staff. However, in contrast, one said that parental involvement has to be only on the surface, not deep involvement, and in two ways, information to up-date the parents, and participation in social events. **Miftan B**

### Areas and levels of involvement

In answer to the question: “What are the levels and the areas of parental involvement in the Miftan?” The principals gave a general review of the involvement in the Miftan as follows:

“We involve parents in routine on-going matters, most contacts with parents are due to children’s behavioural problems, and are made in order to ‘put out fires’. Involvement is made without fore-planning and without any purpose.” **Principal Miftan A**

“Most of the involvement in the Miftan is latent, from home; the majority of parents encourage their children to go to the Miftan, and they agree to the child’s participation in activities and trips announced via circulars.” **Principal Miftan B**

The findings relating to areas and levels of involvement are based on the Hornby (2000) model and are divided into two categories: parental needs and parental contributions. The first category is divided into four parameters: communication, liaison, education and support. The second category is also divided into four parameters: information, collaboration, resource and policy.

**Parental contributions**

Tables 4.50 and 4.51 present the parental contributions’ category, which includes policy, resource, collaboration and information parameters.
Table 4.50: Parental contributions - Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Participant</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Once a year (one family contribution) Torch race and Quiz.</td>
<td>Only after staff level collaboration had not succeeded in various issues.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural/social/study programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural/sex education/adaptation programmes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural programmes Cost accounting and production of the furniture/repairs for home.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural programme Production process in furniture/repairs for home</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural programme only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural programme only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a consensus regarding the information parameter; all the parents contribute information about their child and about themselves as required and according to different situations. There was also a consensus that the parents are not involved in policy, but are involved in information. None of the parents contribute to the Miftan, except one
graduate student’s family, once a year. There is collaboration with the different stakeholders in the Miftan, according to their role in various issues, especially with regard to the behaviour issue. Only when behavioural problems arise is there a need to involve the parents. Collaboration with the principal happens only when the parents and the staff do not succeed.

Table 4.51: Parental contributions - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural/study/psychology/social programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medical care/mental programmes; behavioural programme for the extremely difficult children only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Work/study process.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural programme and production process in furniture/repairs for home</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom.T.C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom.T.D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Behavioural programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a consensus regarding the information parameter; all the parents contribute information about their child and about themselves as required and according to different situations. There was also a consensus that the parents are not involved in policy or contribution, but are involved in information. Only one participant said that there is no collaboration with the parents at all. The collaboration with other members of staff is in various issues; four out of five participants emphasised the behavioural issue, (when problems arise). One homeroom teacher said that the collaboration with the parents is in the behavioural programme only.
**Parental needs**

Tables 4.52 and 4.53 present the parental needs’ category, which includes support, education, liaison and communication parameters.

**Table 4.52: Parental needs - Miftan A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Liaison</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Home visits and parent-social worker meetings</td>
<td>By phone and letters (few).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language/social/health/behavioural/economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and personal matters. Direct them to outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational C</td>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations and formal by holistic</td>
<td>Home visits and parental-educational counsellor meetings</td>
<td>By phone and letters (few).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To help the child accept that he is in the Miftan</td>
<td>treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I A</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations,</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Home visits. (at the request of the child.)</td>
<td>By phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I B</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations,</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Home visits and parent-instructor meetings</td>
<td>By phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T A</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Home visits (twice a year) parent-teacher meetings</td>
<td>By phone and the record/contact book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The educational counsellor and the social worker said that the parents get formal and concentrated support in different areas. The rest of the participants said that the support the parents get is informal/personal through conversations. All participants said that the involvement in education is informal, although the educational counsellor provides formal education. There is involvement in liaison with home visits and parent-staff meetings. Vocational instructor A said that the home visits are made only at the request of the child. Homeroom teacher D emphasised the fact that parents came to parent-teacher meetings only when she threatened them. Instructor B said that only a few parents came to the parent-teacher meetings. They emphasised that the highest involvement is made by phone.

Table 4.53: Parental needs - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Liaison</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Formal and informal/personal/ psychological/ financial/medical</td>
<td>Workshop: to internalize and to apply new behaviours, treatments and processes.</td>
<td>A lots of home visits and parent-principal meetings</td>
<td>By phone, circulars, and letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Formal and informal/personal Directs them to outside authorities, escorts them all along the way.</td>
<td>Workshops: to apply new attitudes and behaviour through new tools; holistic treatment for the entire family.</td>
<td>Home visits and parent-social worker meetings</td>
<td>By phone and letters (few).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I.C</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Home visits (three times a year), one parent-instructor meeting.</td>
<td>By phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. D</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations,</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Home visits (three times a year) one parent-teacher meeting</td>
<td>By phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom. T C</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Informal/personal through conversations.</td>
<td>Home visit once a year (compulsory) and one parent-teacher</td>
<td>By phone (few.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principal and the social worker gave formal support to the parents in addition to the informal/personal support. Other participants gave the parents informal/personal support through conversations. The parents get education through workshops with the principal and the social worker, while they get informal/personal education from the others. There is involvement in liaison with home visits and parent-staff meetings. However, there was only one formal parent-teacher meeting during the year, the second was cancelled due to transportation problems. Almost all parents were present at the final ceremony. There is high involvement in communication, which is made mostly by phone.

**Initiation to and issues in involvement**

The initiation to involvement and the issues are presented by figures; Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show the answers to the question: “*Who initiates the involvement and in what issue(s)?*”.

**Figure 4.1: Initiation and issues (staff)**

*Miftan A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td>Any decision/process not solved/done at the staff level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in exceptional problem</td>
<td>Parents’ rights; transfer to other class/institution; any staff new decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social w</strong></td>
<td>Parents difficulties (money); Child (army, problems, difficulties)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|---------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------|

- The principal and the social worker gave formal support to the parents in addition to the informal/personal support.
- Other participants gave the parents informal/personal support through conversations.
- The parents get education through workshops with the principal and the social worker, while they get informal/personal education from the others.
- There is involvement in liaison with home visits and parent-staff meetings. However, there was only one formal parent-teacher meeting during the year; the second was cancelled due to transportation problems.
- Almost all parents were present at the final ceremony.
- There is high involvement in communication, which is made mostly by phone.

**Initiation to and issues in involvement**

The initiation to involvement and the issues are presented by figures; Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show the answers to the question: “*Who initiates the involvement and in what issue(s)?*”.

**Figure 4.1: Initiation and issues (staff)**

*Miftan A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td>Any decision/process not solved/done at the staff level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in exceptional problem</td>
<td>Parents’ rights; transfer to other class/institution; any staff new decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social w</strong></td>
<td>Parents difficulties (money); Child (army, problems, difficulties)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|---------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------|
The staff is the main initiator in involving the parents. The homeroom teachers and the educational counsellor said that they are the ones who initiate the involvement. The staff
emphasised the behavioural issue, and the fact that the initiation is according to needs that arise from the work, which is almost to “put-out fires”, much of it is made during the study day.

The main issues that lead to the staff’s initiation are: changes in the child’s behaviour/mood, absence, regular visits to the Miftan, work and safety in the workshop and parents’ rights. The main issues that lead the very few parents to initiate involvement are furniture production, and help with money and army difficulties.

Figure 4.2: Initiation and issues (staff)

Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Donation in medical/health matters. Any hard event/decision (removal, transfer) contracts with parents, behaviour, medical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff problems, transfer, when they receive negative/other letters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social. W</td>
<td>(90%) Holistic care (behavioural, health, social, mental) When there is a need to involve other people relating to criminal cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic problem, child’s behaviour change, when an exceptional event happens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I.C</td>
<td>(95%) Behaviour, safety, motivation, child’s removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be up-date in behaviour. To up-date about the child absence. Furniture production and repair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The staff is the main initiator to involving the parents. One homeroom teacher said that he does not initiate the parent’s involvement. The main issues that lead to the staff’s initiation are: absence, safety, motivation, medical/health, removal, donation, criminal and behaviour. The latter is the most common issue; much of this initiation is made during the study day.

There is almost no parental initiation. The parents’ main issues are: security matters, updates in the behavioural area, furniture production and repair, and when they are
discontent. One homeroom teacher said that the parents initiate their involvement when they need the teacher’s help with the child at home.

**The effect(s) of parental involvement**

The following tables present the effect(s) of parental involvement, both benefits and harms. These findings answer the question: ‘What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the child, parents and staff?’.

**Benefits in involvement**

The benefits to the stakeholders are divided into three categories: benefits to the staff, benefits to the parents and benefits to the child and are presented in tables 4.54 and 4.55.

**Table 4.54: Benefits in involvement -Miftan A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>To the staff</th>
<th>To the parents</th>
<th>To the child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Motivation, persistence, self-image, behavioural/study areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker A</td>
<td>Positive feeling, when they back me up.</td>
<td>Feel support and become calmer.</td>
<td>Behavioural/emotional/social and health areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational counsellor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Positive feeling. Gain a better understanding of the processes.</td>
<td>Reduce behavioural problems. Receive a better attitude from their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td>Gives me tools to work with the child. Improves relationships with the trainee. Self-image. Self-confidence. Support. Improves the child’s attitude, collaboration, recognition and his estimation of me.</td>
<td>Good feeling Self-image</td>
<td>Self-confidence, self-image support. Improves his mood, behaviour, work, motivation. reduces behavioural and/or social problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vocational I. B  | Helps to solve problems in general, and behavioural problems in particular. Improves my self-image. | Improves their self-image. Increases pride in themselves. Makes closer relationships with their child. | Improves self-image (immediately) behaviour/study and social areas. Makes closer relationship with parents.

Homeroom T. A  | Reinforcement. Increases my self-confidence and gives me strength to work with back-up (support). | Reinforcement. Improves their positive feelings and self-confidence. | Increases the child’s regular visits. Reduces truancy. Improves the child’s functioning and behaviour, motivation, self-confidence and self-image.

Homeroom T. B  | None | None | Behaviour.

The principal, the educational counsellor and one homeroom teacher said that parental involvement is not beneficial to them. The others said that it improves the relationship between the trainee and the staff, including the attitude, estimation and recognition. It improves the positive feelings, self-image, self-confidence and the support they get. They get help and tools to work more effectively with the child.

The principal and one homeroom teacher said that there is no benefit for the parents, while the others said that the benefits to the parents are that they are getting support, they are calmer, it improves their feelings, self-image, self-confidence, pride and their relationship with their child. They gain better understanding of the processes.

There was a consensus about the benefits to the child; parental involvement improves the behavioural/social/study/work/emotional and health areas, it improves motivation, persistence, regular visits, self-confidence, self-image, support, mood and the parents’ attitude in their relationships. It reduces behavioural problems and truancy. Three out of six participants emphasised the fact that the child’s improvement in behaviour is only in the short term and that they have to contact the parents again and again on this issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>To the staff</th>
<th>To the parents</th>
<th>To the child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Support.</td>
<td>More positive, they are aware of themselves and get to know their child better. Improves their self-confidence.</td>
<td>Positive feeling. Receives a better attitude from their parents. Reduces his fears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Back up (support) and helps me in my work with the child. Makes the work flow, reduces mishaps.</td>
<td>Calmer. Reduces the stress between them. Behaves differently (better).</td>
<td>Cooperates and he is positive towards psychiatrist/other care/process. Calmer. Better functioning in the study/emotional/health/behavioural and social areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I.D</td>
<td>Helps me a lot with the child’s behavioural problems. Self-confidence and my work is more relaxed.</td>
<td>Positive feeling.</td>
<td>Improves the child’s behaviour/functioning in the workshop. Promotes the child in the workshop, in the rehabilitation process and contributes to a better feeling. Receives a better attitude from their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. C</td>
<td>Good feeling.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Increases the regular visits to the Miftan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a consensus about the benefits to the staff, they include support (2), relaxes them, easier/better flow of work (2), improves self-confidence, good feeling, (2) satisfaction, get help with the child’s behavioural problems. It reduces mishaps. One homeroom teacher said that parental involvement is not beneficial to the parents. The
others said that it improves their relationships, they get a positive feeling, self-confidence, trust, confidence towards the child, awareness of themselves, and they get to know their child and his behaviour better. One said that the positive feeling is only a result of positive information the parent receives about the child.

There was a consensus about the benefits to the child; they include improved positive feeling, self-confidence, self-image, motivation, achievements in the workshop, cooperation, behaviour and a better functioning in study and in the workshop. The child is calmer and more positive. It increased the regular visits to the Miftan and reduced his fears. He received better understanding from his parents. Two participants said that the child’s improvement in behaviour was in the short term only and the homeroom teacher said that only a few children improved their behaviour.

Harmful effects of involvement

Tables 4.56 and 4.57 present the harmful effects of parental involvement on the stakeholders. This section is again divided into three categories, harmful effects on the staff, the parents and the child.

Table 4.56: Harmful effects in involvement - Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>On the staff</th>
<th>On the parents</th>
<th>On the child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Disturbing our work.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confused. Lose trust in the staff. The child is disturbed and this leads to tension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Disturbing my work in the rehabilitation process. Feel discomfort.</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction and discontent.</td>
<td>Confused, disturbed, might go over the limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational C.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Might be harmed physically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. A</td>
<td>Might harm my authority and my self-image; reduce my value in the child eyes.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Might destroy the trust between the child and me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Might be bitten. Might become afraid of the parents. Might destroy the trust between the child and me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four out of seven participants said that the involvement of parents does not harm them. Contrary to them, the principal, the social worker and one homeroom teacher said that parental involvement is harmful: disturbing the work, creating feelings of discomfort, harming the teacher’s authority and self-image, and reducing her value in the child eyes. Only one out of the seven participants said that parental involvement harms the parents: the parents are dissatisfied and discontented when they do not agree with the staff. Two out of seven participants said that parental involvement is not harmful to the child. The others said that the child might become confused (2), disturbed, behave worse, might be harmed, lose trust in the staff and might become afraid of his parents. The child is confused due to the fact that he receives ‘double messages’.

Table 4.57: Harmful effects in involvement - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>On the staff</th>
<th>On the parents</th>
<th>On the child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>The staff work harder. Too much energy. Give a bad name to the staff and to the Miftan (when there is a disagreement).</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Might be punished, deprived of things. Undisciplined and might be dangerous. Confused. Lack of trust and distant. Feels under attack and helpless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Become annoying and negative toward me.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confused, behaviour and functioning deteriorate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I.C</td>
<td>Damage my image from the child’s point of view, and damage the child’s trust in me.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confused. Lost trust in me. Might be physically and mentally harmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I.D</td>
<td>Behaved nervously toward me.</td>
<td>Become nervous and violent to each other.</td>
<td>Might be physically harmed, even in the Miftan itself. Behaves nervously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom. T C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Might be physically and mentally harmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom. T. D</td>
<td>Destroys the trust between us.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confused.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One out of six participants said that parental involvement does not harm them. The others said that the parents behave nervously and are annoying and negative toward them, it destroys the trust between them, damages the child’s image of his teacher and damages the trust he has in his teacher. When the parents do not understand the
processes and do not agree with the staff, they become harmful. One out of six participants said that the involvement harms the parents: they become nervous and violent to each other. There was a consensus that involvement might harm the child: the child becomes nervous, undisciplined, distant, helpless, confused (4) (the child is confused by receiving ‘double messages’). There is also a loss of trust in the staff (2), deterioration in his behaviour and his functioning, and he might be harmed physically (3).

**Reasons for involving parents**

Tables 4.58 and 4.59 present the reasons for involving parents, the answers to the question: ‘What are your reasons for involving the parents?’.

**Table 4.58: Reasons for involvement - Miftan A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Children succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Children succeed. It is a circular process. The positive reports of the child will go back to the parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational.C</td>
<td>Working on parent-Miftan-children relationships will create a supportive family, the parents will be conscious of the child’s needs, with better communication, in a balanced family. The child will have self-realisation, will be a better student with a greater mental hygiene, which is the most important thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td>A higher success with the child, easier work for me and more work in furniture production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B</td>
<td>The parents will accept the fact that the child is in the Miftan. The parents and the child will have a new and positive self-image. To reduce behavioural problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom. T. A</td>
<td>The child has to know that the parents are interested and care about him. To reduce behavioural problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. B</td>
<td>To get help in the behavioural area, only useful when the parents “control” the child, when they are authoritative (most of the time they are not).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four out of seven participants said that the main reason for involving the parents is the child’s success. In addition, three participants stress the behavioural problems as their main reason for involving the parents.
Table 4.59: Reasons for involvement - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>When we pass the parents’ ‘test’, it is easier to work with the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Makes the work and the treatments easier. The agreement is a result of an understanding process which brings expected results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I C</td>
<td>Vocational I C</td>
<td>To help when there are behavioural problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I D</td>
<td>Homeroom t. C</td>
<td>It will be easier to work with the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom t. C</td>
<td>Homeroom t. C</td>
<td>When parents see the child’s products, the child is encouraged, has the feeling that they care about him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom t. D</td>
<td>Homeroom t. D</td>
<td>The child and the parents are a whole unit; I involve parents because I care for the child. They are responsible for what happens to him after Miftan hours. To help when behavioural problems arise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the main reason for involving the parents is the child’s welfare, it was said that parental involvement assisted and made the staff’s work with the child easier. Two participants said that their main reason was to get parents’ help with the child’s behavioural problems.

The influence of the families’ characteristics on the staff

The next question was: ‘Considering the families’ characteristics in the Miftan, what is your attitude to parental involvement?’ The supplementary questions were: ‘Do you prefer to involve some families over others?’ ‘Which families and why?’ ‘What are you doing to reinforce your attitude?’.

Families’ characteristics

The staff in both Miftanim agreed that most of the families are at-risk families (99%). There are difficult families, parents addicted to alcohol, drugs and gambling, parents who are physically and verbally violent, and some of the parents are in prison. In a few families there is incest, hard to reach parents, low SES, personal, family and health problems, living and adaptation difficulties. There are uneducated parents, unemployed
parents, single parents, and some of the children are orphans and are living with their siblings.

Staff’s attitude towards parental involvement

Miftan A

All members of staff in Miftan A claimed that they encourage parental involvement. To the question ‘Do you prefer to involve some families over others? ’ ‘Which families and why?’ they answered:

“I will not involve violent parents, drug addicts and delinquent families. Other families are not problematic.” Principal

“It is naturally easier to work and to share with ‘normal’ parents, and it is hard to reach most of the families, the weak and the despairing families. I will not share with parents when there is child resistance, when the issues are abortion, contraception or drugs. I will not share with parents who are opposed to the Miftan, or parents who are not willing to cooperate. Work is harder with these parents, and it is not always fruitful. There is a tendency to involve those parents who cooperate, without any connection to the families’ characteristics.” Social worker

“I know who the addicted and/or violent parents are, and I will not involve them. I will involve parents who are ‘clean’. Any at-risk family characteristic will not be a reason for me to prefer one parent over the other, unless there is a risk of harm to the child, mental and/or physical, a child might be harmed when he is exposed to violence, even if between his parents. It is difficult to work with the parents and we often meet with rejection.” Educational counsellor

“The fact is that parental involvement is an asset, and the key to the child’s success, it is worth while to acknowledge the parents and to involve them at any stage, even if they do not appear interested, and are hard to reach. It is of great importance to create links, particularly with these parents, to find a way to reach them. In all my vocational work, I have not seen parents who did not want contact, the vocational instructor has to find the way if he wants it. I will do anything with all the parents in order to get to any kind of
involvement, depending on the degree of their interest, the processes and on the created problems. Such involvement will advance the child and give him hope.” Vocational instructor A

“I will involve parents who are ready to cooperate, where there are results. I will not involve violent parents or parents who might harm the child. This situation might cause a loss of the trust in me that the child has acquired. Sometimes I give up where there is no cooperation and the response is very poor.” Vocational instructor B

“I don’t choose the parents, I accept them as they are. I know how to flow with them, according to the type of family, I will navigate in accordance and will refer to all parents equally, unless there is any danger of violence to the child.” Homeroom teacher A

“The result of parents’ negative attitude towards their child is children with very low self-image, and/or lack of self confidence. I will involve these parents in order to strengthen the bonds between them. The child is in the centre and, no matter the kind of the family, no characteristic will dictate to me who to involve. I will involve the parents according to the child’s needs, and will reach each of them.” Homeroom teacher B

Table 4.60 presents the staff’s preferences towards parental involvement in Miftan A. It is divided into two categories; parents that the staff prefer not to involve and parents that the staff prefer to involve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Will not involve</th>
<th>Will involve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A</td>
<td>Violent parents</td>
<td>All the others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drug addicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delinquent family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Child’s resistance</td>
<td>Cooperative parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-cooperative parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Counsellor</td>
<td>Addicted parents</td>
<td>“Clean” parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>All parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B</td>
<td>Non-cooperative parents</td>
<td>Cooperative parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents who might cause harm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeroom T. A</th>
<th>Dangerous or offensive parents (violent)</th>
<th>All the others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>All parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two out of seven participants said that they would involve all the parents, without any preference. The others said that they would not involve violent parents (4), delinquent families, where there is a child’s resistance to involving his parents, parents who are opposed to the Miftan (who are not happy that their child is in the Miftan), non-cooperative parents (2) and addicted parents (2). The staff said that they would involve all the others. The social worker and the vocational instructor emphasised that they will involve cooperative parents only, and the educational counsellor emphasised the importance of involving only ”clean” (not addicted) parents.

**Miftan B**
Two staff members from Miftan B, one vocational instructor (C) and one homeroom teacher (C), said that they do not in any way encourage parental involvement. They have relationships with the parents only when this is compulsory: “I do what I have to do when it is compulsory and not for the reason that there is any effect or any benefit from it”. In comparison with them, other staff members encourage parental involvement, they answered the questions as follows:

“I will involve any family, all the families are at-risk families.” **Principal**

“Despite the fact that most of the parents are problematic, it is possible to work with them at a basic level, unless they are so destructive toward the child and/or she/he has to be taken out of the family, when there is drug problem or a situation in which there is no one it is possible to talk to. I try to be in contact with all the parents, depending on the nature of the parent and the issue.” **Social worker**

“Because I work with at-risk families, I don’t involve them. I don’t believe that they can contribute to the educational process, and it is healthy and correct to make an absolute
separation between home and Miftan, since each of us has his role, and the less the parents are involved, the better it is.”  **Vocational instructor C**

“I will involve parents who I know will help or at least not harm the child’s rehabilitation process. I will not involve violent parents.” **Vocational instructor D**

“Some of the parents have potential as parents, people who failed in their children’s education, parents who are satiated with summonses, they were invited so many times before they actually arrived at the Miftan. I don’t expect the parents to be able to help and do more for the rehabilitation and success of the child. Their capability is limited, but I don’t have any preference for any parents. Even an addicted mother or an uneducated mother can be warm, loving and caring. I visit them all at home because it is an obligation, and that is it. But to involve them, I check each of them, they are not objective and, sometimes, because they lack understanding of education in general, and of study processes in particular, they might interrupt the child’s rehabilitation process, sometimes it prevents me from sharing with them the different processes the child undergoes.”  **Homeroom teacher C**

“The families’ characteristics don’t influence me, since all the parents are problematic, all the children come from at-risk families and belong to distressed families.”  **Homeroom teacher D**

Table 4.61 presents the staff’s preferences towards parental involvement in Miftan B. It is divided into two categories: parents that the staff prefer not to involve and parents that the staff prefer to involve.

**Table 4.61: Attitude towards involvement -Miftan B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Will not involve</th>
<th>Will involve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>All parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Destructive and violent families</td>
<td>According to the parents and the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drug problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. C</td>
<td>All the parents</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.62: Staff behaviour(s) – Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Behaviour(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compel the staff to make home visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Share information with them and collaborate with them in different processes in behavioural/study/social areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Share information with them, try to tell them things in a positive way, without criticism, or making them feel shame or creating a guilt situation; give them a lot of hope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Make efforts to bring them to the workshop. This is a situation that they have not felt in previous years. I make home visits 12 times a year. This strong bond serves our common interest. I create positive and mending experiences, in order to bring success and a calm and comfortable atmosphere at home. In home visits, I emphasize positive factors and present the child’s productive works. This is the way to prepare fertile ground for common and shared work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage the parents to visit and to see the child’s productive works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. A</td>
<td></td>
<td>I give parents true feelings that I have towards the child, they understand my care and they collaborate. I present the child’s works from the exhibition, for instance, roots work, sharing with them the general and the particular study process in the classroom, and I consent positively to their requests, giving homework for example.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two out of six participants said that they would involve all the parents, without any preference (the principal and one homeroom teacher). The others said that they would not involve destructive families, those who were addicts, violent (2), subjective parents and parents who might harm the rehabilitation and study process. The social worker emphasised that she will involve the parents according to the parents and the issue.

Answers to the supplementary question "What are you doing to reinforce your attitude?" are shown in tables 4.62 and 4.63.
I inform the parents about their child in positive ways, through home visits, phone calls and chats.

All participants encourage involvement of parents by using the following parameters: collaboration, information, communication, liaison and support. They emphasised their positive way of working with the parents: giving positive information, creating positive and mending experiences, consenting positively to requests and doing many home visits.

Table 4.63: Staff behaviour(s) – Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>I give the parents the feeling that they can reach me by phone/personally any time and any place. My door is open. Parental involvement is vital for the time the child is not in the Miftan. We care about the time after the Miftan when the child is exposed and spends time in the street. The parents have to be aware of this and have to provide solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>The issue of parental involvement has increased since I started to work: I guide the staff and emphasise the importance of that issue. This involvement is required since they have to collaborate and share with us care/rehabilitation programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. D</td>
<td>I make home visits, acknowledge the family and the child from other perspectives, listen to them, present the child’s productive works, tell positive things. This leads to developing a will to bond and to take a positive approach. They are not running away as they did before because of past frustrations and failures. I support and strengthen them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. D</td>
<td>Encourage the parents to keep in touch, invite them to take part in different activities in home visits. I treat the family as a whole, and do not differentiate between the family and the child. This is important because the parents are in charge after the Miftan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four out of six participants encourage parental involvement by using the following parameters: collaboration, information, communication, liaison, support. The social worker guided the staff in this issue. They raised the importance of parental involvement with regard to the time the child is not in the Miftan.

**Barriers to involvement**

Tables 4.64 and 4.65 present the answers to the questions: “*Do you think that there are barriers to involvement?*” “*What are the barriers to parental involvement?*” These barriers are divided into two categories: personal/professional and parents’ demographic barriers.
Table 4.64: Barriers to involvement-Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Personal/professional</th>
<th>Demographic details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Lack of time.</td>
<td>Hard to reach parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Lack of time.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational counsellor</td>
<td>Lack of time. (Dynamic work)</td>
<td>Violent. Alcohol /drug addicted parents They might harm the child physically/mentally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td>None. Only that I might offend them.</td>
<td>Nervous/violent parents. They might harm the child physically/mentally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Uneducated parents. Don’t accept the reality. The parents might harm and damage the child’s rehabilitation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HomeroomT. A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Uneducated parents. The parents might behave distantly, might harm the child physically/mentally or repel him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Violent/unhelpful parents. The parents might harm the child physically/mentally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four out of seven participants said that they have no personal/professional barriers to involving parents. The vocational instructor said that the only barrier to involving the parents is that he might harm them. The principal, the social worker and the educational counsellor said that the personal/professional barriers to involvement are lack of time (3), and lack of programme/plan. The social worker said that she has no demographic details’ barriers to parental involvement. The others said that the demographic details’ barriers to involving parents are: hard to reach parents; might damage their work; do not accept the reality; violent (3), nervous, addicted, uneducated (2), unhelpful parents and parents who might harm the child physically/mentally (5).
Table 4.65: Barriers to involvement -Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Personal/professional</th>
<th>Demographic details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Staff are unqualified.</td>
<td>Violent, childish, obsessive and overreacting parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Lack of time, lack of programme/plan</td>
<td>Hard to reach parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. C</td>
<td>Interfere with my work.</td>
<td>Uneducated parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Violent parents who might harm the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Violent parents who might harm and mock the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three out of six participants said that they have no personal/professional barriers to parental involvement. The principal, the social worker and the vocational instructor said that the staff are not qualified to work with parents, also that there is a lack of programme, a lack of time and it interferes with the work. One out of six participants said that she has no demographic barriers to parental involvement. The others said that the barriers are: violent (3), childish, obsessive, overreacting, hard to reach, uneducated and parents who might harm and mock the child.

**Expected involvement**

To the question "What kind of involvement do you wish to have in the Miftan?" the staff answered as follows:

**Miftan A**

"Greater readiness of the parents to volunteer for projects, to check and to be more interested in their child, on-going accompaniment in the child’s work in the different areas, to help on trips, with the theatre, and to reach a situation in which the child will teach them, for example, career education (a course the children study in the Miftan)."

**Principal**

"To participate in a higher percentage of parent meetings, events, parties, ceremonies, trips, open/special days, to contribute from their special skills/abilities.” **Social Worker**
“Active PA, parents who will contribute, tell about their accomplishments in order to make their child proud of them, help in the classroom, participate in parent-child workshops in different areas which deal with mutual expectations and adolescent characteristics in order to reach better understanding and communication. To collaborate with the parents within a structured framework. To be better parents and to improve the way they look after their child through the hope we have to give them. We have to follow up graduate children and tell the parents about the ones who succeed, let them know that we do great work with their child in the Miftan, educational and rehabilitation work.” **Educational Counsellor**

“The parents have to collaborate more in the educational and rehabilitation process of their child, even in the furniture production, as they collaborate in the cost accounting of the items. To spend time with their child in the workshop, to help other children, to participate in the school trips, to come to every parents’ meeting, to initiate and contribute in the areas in which they are strong.” **Vocational instructor A**

“Real involvement, where the parents will understand the processes and together we will achieve the appropriate collaboration which will promote the child in all areas. Changing the name of the ‘Miftan’ for instance to ‘New Technology Centre’, will increase parental involvement.” **Vocational instructor B**

“To help and to be present in the classroom, to see the way their child studies, to contact and to ask about the child, to be interested, to be ready to get help from me to resolve different problems, to collaborate in the child’s different processes, to ask relevant questions, be active, not to take everything for granted, to be critical, also towards me. I don’t feel any criticism or response to my work or to me. To improve the Miftan’s image, and to remove the Miftan stigma in order to encourage increased parental involvement, but they don’t have the capability, the will and the knowledge to ask, to know, because they depend too much on us as professionals.” **Homeroom Teacher A**

“To be in touch, to be interested in what the child is doing and learning, to be aware of the problems, to help resolve behavioural, mental, social and study problems. To help in
the classroom and to escort the child on trips, to participate in parent group support, in parents’ workshops and different activities with mediators.” **Homeroom Teacher B**

All the participants in this Miftan wished to have a higher involvement in the various parameters and emphasised the following: policy (1), resource (6), collaboration (6), information (1), communication (3), liaison (5), education (3) and support (2).

**Miftan B**

“Increased participation in activities by parents, decisions made together towards their child only, because they are not regular parents, to have a good PA with a good student board, to plan events common to all, such as going to the theatre, creating activities together, campfire picnics, trips, to contribute in any area in which they are capable.”

**Principal**

“Leadership parents, strong PA, with better family situations and with less personal and economic problems, parents who are capable of influence especially with outside institutes; to raise projects and to share with us their kids processes.” **Social Worker B**

“To involve parents in the social (trips, parties, ceremonies) and behavioural areas only, and not in decision-making, not at the personal level and for sure not at the general level. The less the parents are involved, the better it is, there is a need to acknowledge them generally.” **Vocational instructor C**

“To arrive and to stay for a while from time to time, to share the work process with the child, to be available when problems arise, to contribute from their skills, to contribute left–over materials from work or any other contribution to the workshop.” **Vocational instructor D**

“The best involvement in the Miftan is no involvement at all. I am ready to work totally without the parents, because they don’t contribute to anything and I don’t need them.” **Homeroom Teacher C**
“Parents’ visits to the Miftan, observation and assistance in the classroom, participation in group activities, such as adolescent problems, how to cope with different situations and guidance in being a parent.” Homeroom Teacher D

Homeroom teacher C, who is totally against involvement of parents, said that ‘the best involvement is no involvement at all’. Vocational instructor C emphasised that the ‘less the parents are involved, the better it is’ and also the fact that the involvement must not be in policy (decision-making), it can be in social activities with the children and in behavioural areas only. All the others wish to have parental involvement in various parameters and emphasised the following; policy (2), resource (4), collaboration (2), communication (2), liaison (3), education (1) and support (1).

Additional thoughts on the parental involvement issue

Tables 4.66 and 4.67 present the findings of the last question: “Do you have anything to add/ask on this issue?”

Table 4.66: Additional thoughts-Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Not enough has been done on this issue. I think that I have to invest in it. We need to build programmes ahead of time and not only involve parents when there are immediate needs to ‘put out fires’. We have to combine the two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational counsellor</td>
<td>The Miftan has matured and is now prepared to deal with the parent issue, there is insight, we stop, we ask and check questions. This issue has to be further improved, it is a very tough area which is very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I ask myself the question: if I think that involvement of parents is so important, why it is done so rarely? I have to continue to think about this, in order to continue with this issue. After exposure to your survey I have become, to a certain extent, more occupied with this issue. My thoughts are more organised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. A</td>
<td>It is a dream to have involvement, because most of the parents are busy with daily and many other problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I. B</td>
<td>There is almost no involvement; the parents are ashamed to send their children to the Miftan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom I. B</td>
<td>The kids are ashamed of their parents; they don’t want us to be in contact with them or to visit them. They are ashamed because of the poverty and the poorness they live in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The staff stress the fact that there is almost no involvement in the Miftan, they wish to have higher involvement of parents in the Miftan. The issue is important, questions are raised, there is a need to invest and to combine between a formal year-plan and ‘put-out fires’ involvement; the latest is the dominant involvement in the Miftan. They raised the fact that the parents are ashamed that their child is in the Miftan and the kids are ashamed of the poverty of their life. This situation might be a barrier to parents becoming involved.

Table 4.67: Additional thoughts -Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>To set up a programme aimed at increasing parental involvement, especially with hard-to-reach parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational I D</td>
<td>I ask myself how we can involve parents to a greater extent, as it is important for the child in the different areas. In order to improve functioning within the family, have better relationships and increase involvement, they have to get assistance from outside, such as guidance on how to raise the child, child care, adolescent problems, the psychology of the child and how to make the child’s life easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom T. C</td>
<td>There is a need to separate these two systems: they will be parents in their home and we will work in the Miftan. It is necessary to know and to acknowledge the parents minimally, only what is compulsory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The staff said that there is a need to set up a programme of parental involvement; the involvement is important and the basic condition to improve the child’s life is to give support and education to the parents. Homeroom teacher C insisted that there is no need to involve parents, except for minimal involvement; he emphasised the fact that there is a need to separate home and school.

Section two - parents findings

Introduction

This section presents the parents’ profile and the findings according to the research questions, analysed by criteria, parameters and categories. Tables 4.68 and 4.69 present the profiles of the parents in each Miftan.
Table 4.68: Parents’ profile - Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Number of children at home</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Manufacturing worker</td>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>The daughter translated the interview as the father has language difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Five</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Rehabilitation work</td>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>High vocational school</td>
<td>The daughter translated the interview as the father has language difficulty. The father has 100% invalidism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>The mother has been in hospital for several months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Geriatric aid</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.69: Parents’ profile - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Number of children at home</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Extra information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1. She is on weaning process from drugs. 2. Until this year the child lived with a foster family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Poult y keeper</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Married second time</td>
<td>Six</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>Ten years</td>
<td>The second husband is not the child’s father.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defining involvement**

The warming question was: “*What is your definition of parental involvement?*” and the answers were as follows:

**Miftan A**

“*Continuous bond throughout the year, at fixed times, every few weeks.*” **Parent A**

“*To be up-dated in the different areas: behaviour, studies, work in the workshop, trips, approval for journeys, different activities, summer resort, party and ordering products from the carpentry.*” **Parent B**
“To respond and to refer positively to the staff, in order to help, to do what is needed for the child.” Parent C

“ To know what going on with the children.” Parent D

Miftan B

“To be with a ’finger on the pulse’, to be up-dated in the different areas on the one hand without strangling on the other, and to respect the staff.” Parent A

“A common task is to improve her self-image in order to integrate in the society.” Parent B

“To know exactly what the child is doing in different areas, his difficulties, the curriculum, the staff has to know that the family is behind the child.” Parent C

“To be interested in her studies, behaviour, to check that she is studying, to visit her in the Miftan.” Parent D

Areas and levels of involvement
The questions was: “What are the levels and areas of parental involvement in the Miftan?” The findings are divided into two categories; parental needs and parental contributions. The first category is divided in four parameters: communication, liaison, education and support. The second category is also divided into four parameters: information, collaboration, resource and policy.

Parental contributions
Tables 4.70 and 4.71 present the summary of the parental contributions’ category, which includes the policy, resource, collaboration and information parameters.
Table 4.70: Parental contributions - Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Parent A</th>
<th>Parent B</th>
<th>Parent C</th>
<th>Parent D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Programme production of furniture for home. Rehabilitation programme. Transfer to a rehabilitation centre.</td>
<td>Programme production of furniture for home.</td>
<td>Work programme outside the Miftan. Transferring from one workshop to other. Programme production of furniture for home.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Yes, especially in the child specific problem.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the parents are involved in policy or resource. The parents are involved in the information parameter and they collaborate with the staff in the production of furniture (3), the child’s transfer (2), rehabilitation and outside work programmes.

Table 4.71: Parental contributions - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Parent A</th>
<th>Parent B</th>
<th>Parent C</th>
<th>Parent D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Helping in the classroom. I am the one who received a donation for the dentist for my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Health/study/mental/social/behaviour</td>
<td>Health/study/mental/social and behaviour programmes</td>
<td>Behaviour programmes</td>
<td>Health/study/behaviour programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>I am the one who received relevant information.</td>
<td>Yes, especially when he goes through difficult times</td>
<td>Yes. (Sometimes too much!)</td>
<td>Yes, especially in the health area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and he misses the class.

None of the parents are involved in policy and only one out of four was involved in resource parameter; she helps in the classroom. The parents collaborate in health (3), study (3), mental (2), social (2) and behavioural (4) programmes. The parents are involved in information; parent A said that she was the one who had received the information from the staff, as she is only now learning to be a mother. One parent said that sometimes she gave too much information, which leads to a very difficult situation with the child.

Parental needs
Tables 4.72 and 4.73 present the summaries of the parental needs’ category, which includes the collaboration, liaison, education and support parameters.

Table 4.72: Parental needs-Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Parent A</th>
<th>Parent B</th>
<th>Parent C</th>
<th>Parent D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>By phone and circulars (few).</td>
<td>By phone and circulars (many).</td>
<td>By phone, circulars (and one thanks letter).</td>
<td>By phone and circulars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
<td>Informal/personal. Getting great help and support to solve any problem.</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no formal involvement in education and support; education and support are given by the staff in informal and personal ways. All the parents are involved in
communication, mostly by phone and circulars. They are all involved in liaison, each of them participated in at least one parent-teacher meeting, they received the staff in their homes and they participated in the final year ceremony.

Table 4.73: Parental needs - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Parent A</th>
<th>Parent B</th>
<th>Parent C</th>
<th>Parent D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>By phone (few) and circulars.</td>
<td>By phone (many) and circulars.</td>
<td>By phone (many) and circulars</td>
<td>By phone (almost every day) and circulars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Home visits (many). One interview meeting when registered and at the final year ceremony. The general parent-teacher meeting was cancelled.</td>
<td>Parent-teacher meetings (eight).</td>
<td>Parent-teacher meetings (once, sometimes twice a month). Home visits (three, one by the principal). Final year ceremony.</td>
<td>Parent-teacher meetings. (six) Home visits (two) Final year ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Formal and informal; to know the child better and how to raise him.</td>
<td>Formal and informal, how to handle the psychiatric state of the child.</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
<td>Informal/personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Formal and informal support (mostly by the social worker).</td>
<td>Formal and informal support (mainly in the psychiatric area, and mostly by the social worker).</td>
<td>Informal/personal Very much</td>
<td>Informal/personal Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parents are involved in communication, mainly by phone and circulars (4). They are involved in liaison, there were many parent - teacher meetings (4), they received the staff in their homes (4) many times and participated in the final year ceremony. They all emphasised the final year ceremony, which was very important to them and very special. Two parents said that they received formal education, while two received informal/personal education. Two parents said that they received informal/personal support while two received formal and informal support.

**Initiation to and issues in involvement**

The initiation to involvement and the issues are presented by Figures 4.3 and 4.4; these answer the question: *“Who initiates the involvement and in what issue(s)?”*.

**Figure 4.3: Initiation and issues (parents)**

Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent A</strong></td>
<td>Seeking advice/help in behavioural issues (at home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshop programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent B</strong></td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent C</strong></td>
<td>Seeking help (job)Help in living Army problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care behavioural problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent D</strong></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two parents claimed that they do not initiate involvement with the Miftan, two parents claimed that they initiate involvement when they have troubles, from time to time, in life and personal matters and not in regard to the child and the Miftan. Three parents claimed that a member of staff was almost always the one to initiate their involvement. The behavioural issue is the main reason for the staff’s initiation. Parent D never initiates involvement since “I don’t have to be involved, since I have good kids and they don’t have any behavioural problems”.

Figure 4.4: Initiation and issues (parents)

Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent A</strong></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: how to raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to know the child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent B</strong></td>
<td>To be up-dated when there are health problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When making a mental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme. Behavioural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent C</strong></td>
<td>To be up-dated in the child’s functioning especially in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural problems</td>
<td>the behavioural issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent D</strong></td>
<td>Almost every day to be up-dated about her behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation in health issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three parents claimed that they initiate their involvement by phone in order to be updated about their child’s behaviour, which is done frequently. The staff initiate involvement as well, according to the events, especially when behavioural problems arose, and guiding the parents. An additional initiation by the principal is the issue of a donation to improve the child’s health, these donations come from outside the Miftan.

**The effect(s) of parental involvement**

Tables 4.74 and 4.75 present the effect(s) of parental involvement, both benefits and harms. These findings answer the question: “What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the child, parents and staff?”.

Benefits in involvement

The benefits to the stakeholders are divided into three categories: benefits to the parents, to the child and to the staff.

**Table 4.74: Benefits in involvement-Miftan A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>To the parent</th>
<th>To the child</th>
<th>To the staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>Calmer. Up-to-date, self-confidence, support and encouragement.</td>
<td>Good feeling, motivation to produce (furniture), behaviour and attitude towards his friends, self-confidence, self-image.</td>
<td>Get to know the child better. Get help to solve problems. Get a better attitude from the child.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent B | Calmer, up-to-date. | Calmer, improved discipline, higher achievements in the workshop and in the classroom, he collaborates in activities/social, behavioural areas. Applies the rules. | None |
There was a consensus that parental involvement is beneficial to the parents and to the child as well. Three parents said that parental involvement is beneficial to the staff. The benefits to the parents are: calmer (4), up-to-date (3), self-confidence (2), self-image, strengthened the relationships and good feeling. The benefits to the child are: good feeling (2), motivation, achievements, behaviour/attitude (3), get a better attitude from the staff, self-confidence and self-image. The benefits to the staff are: get to know the child better (2), get a better attitude from the child (2), get help to solve problems.

Table 4.75: Benefits in involvement -Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>To the parent</th>
<th>To the child</th>
<th>To the staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>Calmer. Good feeling. Backing-up</td>
<td>Self-confidence, (feels that he is not by himself, not abandoned, I care about him,) better achievements in study/behavioural/social/ areas</td>
<td>Feel my support in their work Vocational positive results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>Calmer. Gain better understanding of the staff’s work and the processes. Good feeling</td>
<td>Self-confidence. I care about him (there is a family behind the child). Appreciation of what he is doing.</td>
<td>Feel my support in their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>Gain better understanding about what the child is going through, relaxation at home. Better communication. Less anger, improved self-image, positive feeling. Calmer.</td>
<td>Improvement in behavioural/study areas (was not removed from the Miftan), good feeling (we care about him), calmer, better communication, self-confidence and self-image, improved the staff’s attitude towards him.</td>
<td>Positive feeling. Support, they are not alone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent D | Self-confidence, calmer, support and encouragement to know she is doing better. | Achievements in behaviour/study, self-confidence, care feeling, beloved, calmer, happier. | Blank cheque. Get support, easier to work with her

There was a consensus that parental involvement is beneficial to the parents, to the child and to the staff as well. The benefits to the parents are: calmer (3), gain better understanding of the staff’s work, support (2), good feeling (2), better communication, self-image and self-confidence. The benefits to the child are: good feeling (3), achievements in studies (3), behaviour (4), social, calmer (2), self-confidence, self-image, improves the staff’s attitude. The benefits to the staff are: good feeling, getting support, easier work and positive vocational results.

**Harmful effects of involvement**

Tables 4.76 and 4.77 present the harmful effects of parental involvement on the stakeholders, the findings are divided into three categories: harmful effects on the parents, the child and the staff.

**Table 4.76: Harmful effects in involvement -Miftan A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>On the parent</th>
<th>On the child</th>
<th>On the staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a consensus that there are no harmful effects of parental involvement on the parents, the child or the staff.
Table 4.77: Harmful effects in involvement -Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>On the parent</th>
<th>On the child</th>
<th>On the staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>Damage the relationships with the child.</td>
<td>Bad feeling (that I am against him). Damages the relationship with the parents.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three parents said that parental involvement does no harm at all. One parent said her involvement harmed her (it damaged the relationship with her child) and harmed the child (bad feeling and damaged his relationship with his mother).

Reasons for involvement

Tables 4.78 and 4.79 present the parents’ reasons for being involved with the Miftan and are in answer to the question: “What are your reasons for being involved in the Miftan?”.

Table 4.78: Reasons for involvement-Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reasons for involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>It is my duty especially because I am a single parent, I want him to succeed in his life. I know him better than anyone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>The best for the child. We care about him, we know him the best. We want him to be a good person and to acquire a profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>Bring the child to independence, to succeed and to function well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>The children will succeed in their studies/work. Behaviour is not an issue, since they are good kids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the parents said that their involvement in the Miftan is for the child’s success, to be a good person, to get a profession. Their reasons are: parent’s duty and knowing him the best.
Table 4.79: Reasons for involvement - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reasons for involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>The child will feel that he is not alone, that he has someone to count on, that I am with him all along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>The child has to know that I care about him, even when he is not under my supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>I care about the child and want to help the staff in order to promote the child to succeed. I am up-to-date about the various areas (control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>The child has to know that I care and I am interested in her. To improve her studies, to learn to read and write (to succeed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the parents want the best for their child; the reasons for the parents’ involvement are to give the child support and good feeling (4), to succeed (2) and to help the staff.

Staff’s attitude towards parental involvement

Tables 4.80 and 4.81 present the parents’ answers to the question: ‘What is the staff’s attitude toward your involvement?’.

Table 4.80: Staff’s attitude towards involvement - Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Staff’s attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>They encourage my involvement, they phone and up-date me, looking for my help, they show care and love to the child, they care about any detail and problem, they do it because they care and worry about us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>They encourage my involvement, they up-date me about everything and request my collaboration in behavioural issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>They encourage my involvement, they up-date me about everything and request my collaboration in behavioural issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>Not too much; they phone from time to time but don’t request my help since the kids are doing well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three out of four parents said that members of staff very much encourage their involvement; they request their collaboration. One parent said that the staff do not encourage her involvement too much (they up-date me).
Table 4.81: Staff’s attitude towards involvement - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Staff’s attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>They do not block my involvement. The relationships are new between us. They invited me to the final year ceremony and they visited me once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>They do not encourage my involvement due to the fact that they understand my hard situation - difficult family problems, and the long distance to the Miftan. They do not avoid my involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>They encourage my involvement. They contact me a lot and share with me the good and the bad along the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>They encourage my involvement in the behavioural and health issues. They treat me very kindly, they are accessible at any time and in any situation, they care very much about us (especially the principal).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two parents said that staff encourage their involvement and two parents said that the staff do not encourage them because of their special situation and difficulties.

**Barriers to involvement**

The findings of the questions: “Do you think that there are barriers to involvement?” and “What are the barriers to parental involvement?” are presented in tables 4.82 and 4.83.

Table 4.82: Barriers to involvement - Miftan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>Yes. The Hebrew language, but I overcome it. The involvement would be higher if I knew the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>None. On the contrary, they tell me positive things, which I love to hear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>None. On the contrary, the staff knows how to work with the kids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three parents said that they have no barriers to involvement. One out of the four parents said that the language is the only barrier to higher involvement, and that is a low barrier.
Table 4.83: Barriers to involvement - Miftan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent A</td>
<td>Long distance to the Miftan. The Miftan’s location is not accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent B</td>
<td>Long distance to the Miftan. One and a half hours on several buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent C</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent D</td>
<td>Lack of time and busy mind. (I am busy with family and kids problems.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One parent said that there are no barriers to involvement, while three parents said that the barriers to involvement are the long distance to the Miftan (2), lack of time and personal problems.

Expected involvement

To the question: “What kind of involvement do you wish to have in the Miftan?” the parents answered:

Miftan A

“As it is now.” Parent A

“As it is now.” Parent B

“Without any change.” Parent C

“It is enough just as it is. Not too much involvement. This is home and this is school.” Parent D

All parents wish to have the same involvement in the Miftan as it is now. One parent claimed that she did not want too much involvement since the school and the home are two different frames.

Miftan B

“I told them that I am ready to contribute, to help in the classroom.” Parent A
“To spend a few hours in the classroom and in the workshop. I am prepared to teach English voluntarily, to guard in the yard, to play snooker, everything that I can do, whatever they request.” Parent B

“To have extended, continuous and accessible relationships. The staff will be prepared to give up-to-date answers in the various areas, to be present at any event.” Parent C

“To participate in the activities, have a ‘fun day’ with her, go on a trip, be present in the classroom, even to be present once a week in the classroom.” Parent D

All parents wish to be more involved with the Miftan, to contribute on the one hand and to be more informed and up-dated by staff on the other hand.

Additional thoughts on the parental involvement issue
The last question was: “Do you have anything to add/ask on this issue?”
None of the parents in either Miftanim responded to this question.

Section three- Documentation
Introduction
The informative documents were given to the author by the Miftanim secretaries, the content of the confidential documents was given by the social workers and the content of the record/contact books was given by the homeroom teachers. Each Miftan has two types of documents: informative and confidential. The analysis of the documents refers to both Miftanim since the contents and the purposes are similar. They differ by the Miftanim’s logo and the written style. One of each informative document is presented in detail, as the author received them, the confidential documents are presented according to the information recalled from interviews given by the staff.

Informative type of documents
The purpose of the informative type of documents is to inform the parents about events/activities: these documents are divided into informative documents; circular documents and invitations.
Informative documents
The informative documents included the cost the parents have to pay over the scholastic year to cover study material for the workshops and the classroom and accident and personal insurance. The cost does not include the year trip and other events in the Miftan. The cost can be paid in four instalments and parents who wish to claim a discount may refer to the secretary. This document is informative and sensitive to the low SES parents. Although the Miftanim’s parents have to pay a low cost to the Miftan, they have the right to request an additional discount.

An additional document, which informed the parents that the child would be removed from the Miftan for several days, included the staff’s decision to remove the student and the dates the student should stay at home. The purpose of this document is to inform the parents about a decision which the staff have already taken and it is a fact as there is no indication in this written document that there is a right of appeal against the decision (see appendix 27).

Circular documents
One circular document listed the student’s and his/her parents’ personal details: names, ID, gender, country of birth, the year of coming to Israel, location, phone number, parents’ job, parents’ education, parents’ birth country, parents’ year of coming to Israel, number of children at home, the last school of the student and the name of a person to contact. The parents’ signatures are required at the bottom of the document in order to provide written approval for different activities such as army youth, sport, trips, horse riding or any other activity that requires any physical effort. An additional sentence refers to medicine the student does/does not take and the name of the medicine is required. This document is designed to gain parental agreement for activities, and to get information about the child, especially in the health area (see appendix 28).

Because of the “privacy law” in Israel, an additional circular document, called the “secrecy renouncement”, is required. This is signed by parents and allows staff to exchange any written/verbal information with anyone concerning the child, without any reservations, according to the staff’s discretion. The parent’s signature also has to be witnessed by a third party (see appendix 29).
Additional documents were sent close to activities, with the details of the event; location, time, items required and a request for the parents’ signature (see appendix 30).

**Invitation documents**
Invitation documents included invitations for parent’s day and the invitation for the final year ceremony. The first is the formal invitation to parent-staff meetings and includes the date and time of the meeting, the chat with the homeroom teacher and the vocational instructor, the chat with the social worker and the principal in accordance with the need. An additional sentence aimed to emphasise the parents’ participation: “*We will happy to see you, your presence is vital*” (see appendix 31). The latter invitation included the location and the date of the ceremony together with details of the content, including the trainees’ exhibition, Mayor’s speech, trainees’ performance with a well known artist, other artists’ performances, a trainees’ film, the departure ceremony for the graduates and the excellence certificate ceremony.

**Confidential documents**
The author was not allowed to see the confidential documents, as the content is confidential, secret and sensitive. These documents are kept in the trainees’ personal files, in the social worker's room. The documents are divided into two types: the first required the parents’ signature to give approval for different treatments, for example, that the child be given a medicine (such as Ritalin) by the staff. The second type are the personal contracts, these aim to share with the parents the responsibility for the child’s behaviour in the Miftan, such as to be aware and to escort the process. Each contract included future additional steps such as strengthening involvement with the parents by the record/contact book, a phone call once a week, or the parent’s participation in additional meetings.

An additional type of confidential document is the record/contact book, which is designed to communicate between the homeroom teachers and the parents. These are the child's property. The homeroom teacher writes information about the child and the parents respond. The frequency of this communication depends on what was agreed between parents and teachers.
A further type of document is the “home visit” document, (see appendix 32), which is designed to write a report of the content of the conversation, the house conditions and the background.

**Section Three - Combining the Data**

**Introduction**

The purposes of gathering both quantitative and qualitative data are detailed earlier in the chapter. In addition, the author emphasised the reasons for different research questions, which required different methods to answer (Punch, 1998). The questions in the questionnaires deal with the areas and levels of involvement, the initiation, the attitude to involvement, the positive effects (benefits) of the involvement on the different stakeholders and the barriers to involvement. The reasons for involvement were added to the parents’ questionnaires. In addition to those questions, the questions in the interview were the negative (harmful) effects of the involvement on the different stakeholders; the staff’s reasons for involving parents, the initiation issues of the involvement, the influence of the families’ characteristics on the involvement, the ways the staff reinforced their attitude towards the involvement or the most appropriate involvement in the future. Thus, the survey and the case studies illuminated the same questions in order to make triangulation of the findings on the one hand while the additional questions were used to get a wider picture of the issue, especially when sensitive issues were raised and when more descriptive data were needed. This section presents the combination of the survey and the case studies findings.

**Profiles of the Miftanim, staff and parents**

The Miftanim profiles are similar apart from the fact that most of the trainees in Miftan B are not living in the Miftan’s location. Most of the staff in both Miftanim have an academic education and are veterans in their work in the Miftan.

The parents in Miftan A are three males and one female; three are married and one is a single parent; three parents have ‘well below average’ incomes and one has a ‘below average’ income. None of them have a profession; three are working; two parents have a primary education and two have high school education. One parent is an immigrant (three years in Israel) and, although they have language problems and one needed
translation, the others are veterans in Israel. One parent has five children; they all live in rented houses belonging to the government. All the parents in Miftan B are females; two are single parents, one is re-married; one parent has an ‘average’ income and three have ‘well below average’ incomes. Three parents do not have a profession, two are working; three of the parents have four and more children living at home. Two parents have high school educations, one has a primary school education and one has ten years school education. Two parents live in rented houses belonging to the government, one parent lives in a private rented house in a village and one parent owns a private house; three parents were born in Israel; they all speak the language well.

**Areas and levels of involvement**

The findings of the areas and levels of involvement present parental involvement in the Miftanim (Mean from 2.25 to 2.95) show that there is no high involvement of the parents in the Miftanim; although there are minor differences between the groups, social workers/educational counsellors (Mean, 2.25), the principals (Mean, 2.44), the parents (Mean, 2.77), the vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers (both Mean, 2.95). The latter believe that there is slight involvement in the Miftanim. The principals and the social workers/educational counsellors answer that the involvement of the parents is higher in the contributions category than in the needs category. However, the vocational instructors, the homeroom teachers and the parents believe that the involvement is higher in the parental needs category than in parental contributions.

With the exception of the social workers/educational counsellors, there is a consensus that, in the contributions category, liaison is the highest parameter and in the needs category, information is the highest parameter, while according to the social workers/educational counsellors, collaboration is the highest parameter in the contributions category and education is the highest parameter in the needs category. According to the social workers/educational counsellors, the vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers, the lowest parameter in the contributions category is policy, while according to the principals and to the parents the lowest parameter is in resource.

With the exception of the social workers/educational counsellors group, there is consensus that the lowest parameter in the parents’ contributions category as a cluster is resource with each group referring to his specific area. ‘The parents fundraise for the
Miftan’ (Principals); ‘Parents help to prepare material for workshop work’ (Vocational instructors); ‘Parents help with preparing material for classroom work’ (Homeroom teachers) and ‘You help with preparing material for the workshops (carpentry, locksmith’s work, hair-dressing)’ (Parents). The lowest parameter in the social worker/educational counsellors’ group is policy - ‘PA is active with you’.

Table 4.84 presents the eight parameters according to their placing in the model and their relation to the different groups.

Table 4.84: Graded parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Princ.</th>
<th>Soc. w/ed</th>
<th>Voc. in</th>
<th>Hom. t</th>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Placing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to the different groups as one unit, the involvement in the needs category is higher than the contributions category. There is a higher involvement in liaison and in communication parameters than in education and in support parameters in the needs category and there is a higher involvement in information and in collaboration parameters than in resource and policy parameters in the contributions category. There is a consensus about the highest and the lowest involvement; the highest involvement is made by phone and the lowest is made by e-mail.

The case studies data strengthened the above findings, and gave additional and enlarged information. According to the staff, in the contributions category, all parents are involved in information, most of them collaborate when there is a need to do so as a result of
difficulties and behavioural problems; none of them are involved in resource or policy. In the needs category, all parents are involved in communication; most of them are involved in liaison and a few are involved in education and support, according to the specific needs of the parents and the staff. In both Miftanim there is a need to require parental presence on trips. When there are serious behavioural problems with the child, the parents’ presence is a condition to allowing the child to participate in the activity. The social worker and the educational counsellor, who are the experts in this field in the Miftan, involved the parents in formal education and formal support.

Miftan A and Miftan B do not have any parental involvement in policy or resource; there is involvement in collaboration, information, communication, liaison, and (informal) education and support. The involvement in collaboration with the staff is mostly (almost always) after behavioural problems arise. The collaboration with the social workers and the educational counsellor is mostly after problems in different areas arise. All the parents give relevant information about their child. Most of the communication is made by phone. The liaison is by parent-staff meetings; there are a few meetings according to need. The involvement in education and support is mostly informal and personal, except with the social workers and the educational counsellor.

The staff in both Miftanim emphasised that the purpose of the collaboration with the parents in the behavioural programmes is due to the fact that behavioural problems arise. This collaboration is only with parents of the very disturbed children and most of this collaboration leads to a written contract between the parent, child and the staff. Almost all participants claimed that the collaboration with the parents was “to put out fires” and not a predefined involvement.

According to the parents in Miftan A, none of them contribute in policy or resource. Three out of four collaborate with the staff on behavioural and furniture issues. All parents gave information. There is involvement in communication and liaison and the parents are involved in education and support only in informal ways. Except one parent in Miftan B, who said that she is involved in resource (once), the parents are not involved in policy or resource. They are involved in collaboration, information, communication and liaison. Two parents are involved in education and support and two parents are involved in education and support only in informal ways.
The documents in both Miftanim involved the parents in collaboration, information, communication and liaison. The collaboration with the parents is to inform them and to get their approval on the one hand, and to set up contracts with them on the other hand. The information is to get their child’s personal and health details. The communication with the parents is both one-way and two-way; the former is to inform the parents when decisions have already been made and the latter are circulars and the record/contact book at the relevant times. The liaison with the parents is the parent-staff meetings and invitations to ceremonies.

The triangulation of the findings and the additional information strengthened the fact that there is a slight parental involvement in the Miftanim; most of the involvement is in the parameters where parents and staff’s time and expertise are lower than parameters, which required more parents and staff’s time and expertise.

**Reasons for involvement**
According to the survey, there was a consensus about the reasons for the parents’ involvement: the highest reason was ‘Parents are involved because it is important for them that their child succeeds’. This main reason was reinforced by the parents’ interviews; the parents in both Miftanim were involved with the Miftan for the child’s success. Parents in Miftan A emphasised the academic area while the parents in Miftan B emphasised the importance of the psychological area, both to the child and to staff.

Although the main reason of the staff for involving the parents is the child’s success and the child’s welfare, parental involvement assisted and made the staff’s work with the child easier, especially when behavioural problems arose, moreover, sometimes, it was the main reason for involving the parents.

**Attitude to and initiation in involvement**
According to the survey, the staff group believe that they are the ones who initiate contact with the parents. The vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers believe that parents are not the ones who initiate the contacts with them, while the principals and the social workers/educational counsellors believe that the parents do slightly initiate the contacts with them. The staff encourage the involvement of parents in ascendant order as
follows: principals, vocational instructors, social workers and, lastly, the homeroom teachers.

However, parents believe that they initiate the involvement with the staff, mostly with the homeroom teachers and the vocational instructors. The data from the interviews show that in both Miftanim the staff claimed that they were almost always the ones to initiate the involvement with the parents. Most of the initiations were as a result of behavioural problems and the disturbed attitude of the trainees. This initiation is the staff’s wish to collaborate with parents by getting help. One exceptional issue in initiation refers to a large donation to a trainee and the parents by the principal from Miftan B. In both Miftanim the staff make the most of the initiation to involvement, the parents are initiating the involvement mostly when difficulties arise, especially in life matters.

The staff in Miftan A encourage parental involvement; they emphasise and bring to prominence positive information and the child’s positive experiences. Two staff members in Miftan B claimed that they do not encourage the parents to be involved, they do so only where compulsory. The others encourage involvement, especially due to the importance of the continuity of the child’s behaviour after the Miftan, in his free time. In both Miftanim, the staff encourage involvement by using support, liaison, information, communication and collaboration parameters. Two participants in each Miftan would involve all the parents; the others in Miftan A claimed that they would not involve violent parents and the others in Miftan B claimed that they would not involve addicted and/or violent parents. Three parents in Miftan A and two parents in Miftan B claimed that the staff encourage their involvement.

The effect(s) of parental involvement on the stakeholders
A question regarding the positive effect (benefits) of parental involvement was included in the questionnaires while in the interviews the question included the negative effects (harms) as well.

The five groups in the survey believe that parental involvement in the Miftanim is beneficial. They are, from the highest to the lowest, parents, social workers/educational counsellors, principals, homeroom teachers and, lastly, vocational instructors. Parents,
homeroom teachers and vocational instructors believe that the involvement is more beneficial to the staff in the first place, to the parents and lastly to the child. Principals and social workers/educational counsellors believe that it is beneficial to the parents in the first place; principals believe that it is beneficial to the child and then to them, while the social workers/educational counsellors believe that it is beneficial to them and then to the child.

There is a consensus in the five groups with regard to the highest and the lowest benefits to the child; the highest benefits are ‘Improves the child’s self-image’ and ‘Improves the child’s behaviour’. The lowest benefits are ‘Improves the child’s social relationships’ and the principals added ‘Improves the child’s achievement’. The five groups believe that ‘Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work’ is the highest benefit to the parents. With the exception of the vocational instructors, staff believe that the highest benefit to them is ‘Improves the child’s attitude toward the staff’. The principals believe that the child improves its attitude toward the staff while the social workers/educational counsellors and the homeroom teachers believe that the parents improve their attitude toward them. Contrary to this, the vocational instructors believe that these benefits are the lowest ones to them. They believe that the highest benefit to them is that parental involvement ‘Improves my morale’; however, the homeroom teachers believe that this is the lowest benefit to them.

The interview data show that, although there are some differences between Miftan A and Miftan B with regard to the benefits and harmful effects of parental involvement on the stakeholders, there is a consensus about the fact that parental involvement is both beneficial and harmful to the stakeholders. The staff in both Miftanim claimed that involvement is beneficial to the child; most of the staff in Miftan B claimed that it is beneficial to the child, to the parents and to the staff as well. However, in Miftan A, only some of them claimed the same. Although there was a consensus about the benefits to the child, both Miftanim emphasised the fact that the improvement is in the very short term, especially in the behavioural issue.

There was no consensus concerning the harmful effects of involvement in either Miftanim; all staff in Miftan B claimed that involvement harmed the child and most of the staff in Miftan A claimed the same. There was a consensus about the harmful effects
of involvement on the staff. Most of the staff in both Miftanim claimed that involvement does not harm the parents; most of Miftan B staff said that involvement does harm them, while only few in Miftan A claimed this. There was a consensus that involvement confuses the child; the staff emphasised that this is due to the fact that the parents do not give unequivocal messages to the child; their messages in front of the staff are different to their messages at home, in front of the child. Except for one parent in Miftan A, who claimed that parental involvement is not beneficial to the staff, the parents in both Miftanim claimed that parental involvement is beneficial to the parents, to the child and to the staff as well. Except for one parent in Miftan B, who claimed that involvement is harmful to the child and to the parent, none of the parents in either Miftanim claimed that involvement is harmful, to the parent, the child or the staff.

There were no documents regarding this issue.

**Barriers to involvement**

According to the staff group, although there are slight, almost no, barriers to parental involvement, there is a high consensus that demographic details of the parents are higher barriers than personal/professional barriers. The vocational instructors believe that there are slight barriers to involving parents. With the exception of the vocational instructors, who believe that the highest personal/professional barrier to involving the parents is ‘Parents do not have the vocational knowledge I have’, the staff group believe that it is ‘Parents might criticize (offend) the child’. The staff group believe that the lowest barrier is ‘Parents might lower my self-confidence’.

Principals and social workers/educational counsellors believe that the highest demographic barrier to involving parents is ‘Parents might be violent toward the child’ while the vocational instructors believe that ‘Parents are caught up in their own personal problems’ is the highest barrier. With the exception of the social workers/educational counsellors, who believe that the lowest barrier to involve parents is ‘Parents are unemployed’, the highest barrier is ‘Single parents’. According to the parents there are slight barriers to their involvement; the highest is ‘Parents lack time to be involved with the Miftan’, while the lowest is ‘Parents do not understand/hardly understand Hebrew’.
The data from the interviews show that half of the staff from both Miftanim claimed that they have personal/professional barriers to involving parents. The main barriers in Miftan A are ‘lack of time’ and ‘lack of a programme’ while the barriers in Miftan B are ‘unqualified staff’ and parents’ interference in the staff’s professional work’. There was a consensus about demographic barriers to involvement: only one member of staff in each Miftanim claimed that he had no demographic barriers to involvement. According to Miftan A, the main barrier to involvement is ‘parents who might physically and mentally harm the child’, Miftan B also refers to ‘violent parents’. In Miftan A, one parent claimed that the barrier to involvement is ‘language difficulty’, while three have no barriers at all. In Miftan B, three parents claimed that the barriers to involvement are ‘the long distance to the Miftan’ and ‘personal matters’.

There were no documents regarding this issue.

**Expected involvement**
The staff in Miftan A wish to have a higher parental involvement than Miftan B; both Miftanim wish to have more involvement in parental contributions than in parental needs. The main parameters staff of Miftan A wish to have are resource, collaboration and liaison, while the main parameter for staff in Miftan B is resource. The parents in Miftan A wish the involvement to remain as it is at present, which is not too much involvement. However, the parents in Miftan B wish to have a higher involvement in the Miftan, mostly to be up-dated about their child’s progress in the academic and behavioural areas.

**Additional issues**
Miftan A claimed that parental involvement is important although the involvement is low in the Miftan. Miftan B claimed that the purpose of involvement is to strengthen parents’ support and education. Both Miftanim stress the importance of the need to set up a programme to involve parents. According to one staff member in Miftan B, an additional parental barrier to involvement might be the fact that the parents are ashamed that their child studies in the Miftan. A child’s barrier is the shame of the poverty of their life; this fact does not encourage them and they even avoided some of the staff’s home visits. None of the parents in either Miftanim added to this issue.
Summary

The different methods used in this research illuminate the parental involvement issue from various and different angles. Each method contributes to the issue, by adding to and reinforcing the data. Although the questionnaires did not explore the whole issue of involvement, using the survey in the first stage of the research enabled the author to use case study methodology and choose the specific cases. The survey gave a broad view of the explored phenomenon, while the case studies supplied extra data and reinforced the data from the survey. The integration of these methods enabled the author to reduce inappropriate certainty (Robson, 1993); it contributed to understanding the issue from different aspects (Bryman, 1988) and the different angles of a phenomenon (Greene et al, 1989).

The next chapter presents the discussion of the findings according to the research questions and with a view to the literature.
CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION

Introduction
The number of terms and definitions of parental involvement led the author to refer to this issue as a “developing term” since it is the result of continuous change of definition. These changes result from education, beliefs, politics and culture. Moreover, it includes various relationships to different people, in different schools, with the policy and credo referring to the involvement of parents. Although it is not a stable term, the author emphasised that parental involvement is based on a two-way relationship. Staff involve the parents, parents are involved as well; the staff initiate the involvement and the parents respond and vice versa. In this study, parental involvement in the Miftanim refers to the staff in the Miftanim on the one hand, and the parents on the other hand. These form a puzzle, which has to include both pieces to be complete.

This chapter presents the discussion of the findings of this research, according to the research questions and with a view to the literature, in order to gain a better understanding of the conclusions. The author was aware that, although she compared this study with the literature, each study is unique, both from the point of view of the researcher, and in the methodologies and the methods used, the chosen populations, the aims, the research questions, the politics and the resources.

Areas and levels of involvement
Parental involvement found in the literature is not uniform; the nature, the level, the kind, the areas and the amount of involvement differ according to the definitions, location, population, policy, attitude, barriers, beliefs and credo of the participants in the relationship. The findings of the first research question aimed to present the relationships between the parents and the staff in the Miftanim; they focused on the areas and the levels of involvement and were analysed on the basis of the Hornby (2000) model (see chapter 2, page 52, figure 2.6), which encompasses two categories; needs and contributions. The contributions’ category includes policy, resource, collaboration and information parameters, and the needs’ category includes communication, liaison, education and support parameters.
Although the needs and the contributing categories are divided into different parameters, there is no “pure” parameter, since one activity might encompass more than one of the parameters. For example, one of the activities in the liaison parameter is a parent-teacher meeting; in addition to the liaison parameter, this might also include information, informal education and support. Although the findings show minor differences between the different groups regarding the areas and levels of involvement, there was a high consensus about the fact that there was slight involvement in the Miftanim. There was almost no involvement in the levels where more time and expertise were required from both the parents and the staff; these levels were policy and resource in the contributions’ category and education and support in the needs’ category. The low involvement in these parameters reinforced Hornby (2000), who claimed that high levels of involvement are a result of time and expertise required. The more time and expertise required from the staff in the needs’ category, the less parents will be involved. The more time and expertise required from parents in the contributions’ category, the less parents will be involved.

Higher involvement in parental needs, where involvement was mainly in communication, which was made by phone contact, than in parental contributions, might be a result of the combination of at-risk families. They have greater needs and less capability to contribute and the fact that the staff in school resist parental involvement since parents are not expert. They lack time and principals will not involve the parents, especially in decision-making and in low SES schools (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986). Principals and staff control or try to limit the involvement of the parents since the parents are difficult (Dodd, 1995). The staff prefer to keep a ‘professional distance’ from the parents, because they are less able and vulnerable, they need treatment and have personal problems. Moreover, the staff regard the child’s problems as a result of poor parenting (Hornby, 1995). When the child’s difficulty in behaviour is linked to the home situation, parents are seen as problems rather than partners to work with (Armstrong, 1995).

The findings of this study showing a slight involvement in communication, liaison, information and collaboration and almost no involvement in resource, policy, education and support seems to correlate with Cohen and Givon’s (1999) study. Parental involvement in the Miftanim were in the areas of liaison; parent-teacher meetings, private talks and home visits, and information; receiving and giving information. The main involvement, according to the staff and parents, was information and updating the
parents about the trainees; there was no involvement in education, support, resource and policy. Although cutbacks in education enabled parents to be more involved in the control of resource, income, budgeting and decision-making, (Goldring, 1990; Goldberger, 1998) and forced parents to fund hours cut from the curriculum with their own money and battle for school renovations and building (Goldberger, 1998), the parents in the Miftanim were far removed from these activities, which are the highest levels in involvement where more time and expertise of parents is required. In this study, none of the parents in the Miftanim were active in the PA.

With regard to the issues of involvement, the findings of the present study show that the main involvement was communication. This was made mainly by phone, when behavioural problems arose, when changes were seen in the child’s attitude, or in order to produce furniture for home. During the interviews with the staff, a shared expression was repeated which was “To put out fires”. The involvement was not applied as a result of a plan or programme, but was mainly due to the fact that the staff needed the parents’ assistance when problems arose. This involvement represents a “negative communication”; as Davies (1988) claimed. Staff who involve the parents only when focused on the children’s behavioural and learning problems are using negative communication. Many of the teachers had preconceived ideas regarding children from such backgrounds and anticipated disciplinary problems and poor school performance. Connors and Epstein (1994) emphasised the “negative communication” and pointed out the negative correlation between involvement and positive results when teachers turn to parents to get attention and help when students have academic or behavioural problems. Moreover, the author claims that, in the present study, not only was this involvement negative, it was, in a way, a threatening involvement, which aimed to threaten the child and the parents in order to put pressure on them.

Involving the parents when behavioural problems arise has to be part of a holistic concept that presents the need for communication when the issue is behavioural problems, as a continuative collaboration throughout the year. Lindsey (1994) claimed that the purpose of this collaboration was to manage the difficulties by working together, so the children who witness the parents and the staff working on this issue “will experience more consistency and feel more contained” (p.164), and not be threatened as was found in this study.
Contrary to this “negative communication” with the parents, the staff in this study revealed the issue of the child’s participation in the decision to involve the parents and in which issues. For example, home visits of the staff “at the request of the child” or when giving very personal information: “I will not share with parents when there is child resistance, when the issues are abortion, contraception or drugs”. This issue of sharing the intention to involve the parents, and in what respect, with the child is ambivalent. There is the openness, respect and consideration towards the child on one hand, and the duty and accountability to the parents on the other hand. The staff have to raise questions regarding this issue, especially when working with at-risk families. What should be said to the parents, do the staff have to tell everything? What will be the harmful effects on the child as a result of this information? How to be both sensitive and honest? What is the staff’s purpose when giving delicate information to the parents?

Is the involvement in the Miftanim a partnership process or is it a kind of threat to the child? Is the purpose of the involvement a relationship which aims to better answer the needs and contributions of the parents with regard to the child in the centre according to the parents and the staff’s capability and needs, or is the involvement a compulsory or compelled involvement. As Tomlinson and Vincent (1998) said, instead of dealing with ways that parents and teachers should cooperate, they try to enforce school discipline when making contracts with the parents. Three terms of involvement used by the staff were found in this research “compulsory involvement”, “threatened involvement” and “conditional involvement”. The term compulsory involvement was raised more than once, on various occasions, by members of staff, who emphasised the fact that they would not involve the parents if they could choose, but do involve them as it is compulsory: “I do what I have to do when it is compulsory and not for the reason that there is any effect or any benefit from it”; “I compel the staff to make home visits”; threatened involvement; “the parents come to parent-teacher meetings only when I threaten them”. Conditional involvement, when the staff is going to make additional activities if parents will not be involved. The low level of parental involvement in the Miftanim, which is mostly focused on the behavioural issue, not on academic issues, raises the question of the main reason for the parents to be involved and the main reason for the staff to involve the parents.
Reasons for involvement

The literature raises various reasons for involvement by the different stakeholders, the child, the parents, the staff and the community. This study presents the view of the parents and the staff. Although the parents in this study focused on the child’s success, and the case studies added and emphasised the care of the parents and their wish to transfer this feeling to the child by their involvement, additional reasons were raised. The staff also focused on the child’s success and, like the parents, raised additional reasons.

The parents in Miftan A emphasised the improvement of their child as the main reason for their involvement: “They are involved since it is of their duty, they know the child the best and their involvement will be helpful”; “It is my duty especially because I am a single parent, I want him to succeed in his life. I know him better than anyone else”; “We want him to be a good person and to acquire a profession”. Although the reasons for involvement of the parents in Miftan B are similar to the parents in Miftan A, for the child’s success, they refer to their relationship with the child and their mental health: “The child will feel that he is not alone, that he has someone to count on, that I am with him all along”; “The child has to know that I care and I am interested in her”. In addition, one parent raised the issue of being of help to the staff and to being informed: “I care about the child and want to help the staff in order to promote the child to succeed. I am up-to-date about the various areas (control)”. These findings are similar to the reasons for parents to be involved found in the literature, although the literature refers mostly to high SES parents, who were involved because they understood that the more they were involved in the child’s education, the better their child would perform at school (Goldberger, 1998), or because they wished their child to succeed and desired more information from the school (Coleman, 1988; Epstein, 1995). Reasons for involvement such as realisation of the parents’ talent, social meetings of the parents, occupation and social involvement within the community (Mahter, 2001), were not found in this study, since such reasons do not refer to at-risk families.

Although the main and general reason for involvement found in this study was the child’s success and welfare, as was found in the literature, additional reasons relevant to the child-parent-staff relationships were found: the staff in both Mifتانيم refer to the three stakeholders: the child, the parent and the staff, with regard to the relationship between them. The reasons for involvement of the staff in Miftan A were to make the
work easier, especially when behavioural problems arose: “easier work for me”; “to reduce behavioural problems”; “to get help in the behavioural area” and to improve child-parent relationships in order to help them to be better children and better parents: “it is a circular process”; “working on parent-Miftan-children relationships will create a supportive family, the parents will be conscious of the child’s needs”; “the parents will accept the fact that the child is in the Miftan”; “the child has to know that the parents are interested and care about him”.

Although two members of staff in Miftan B claimed that they involved the parents only because it was compulsory, the staff’s reasons for involving the parents in Miftan B refer to the staff: “Makes the work and the treatments easier”; “To help when behavioural problems arise”, to the child: “understanding the process will bring expected results” and to the child-parent relationship: “When parents see the child’s products, the child is encouraged, has the feeling that they care about him”. The staff’s reasons for involvement found in the literature were, in the first place, as a result of the assumption that the parents with access to information will function well as parents (Valentine and Stark, 1979), and emphasised the contribution to the child’s education (Wolfendale, 1983; Bastiani, 1987; Davies, 1988; Goldring, 1993; CERI, 1997).

An additional reason to involve the parents was stressed by the staff in both Miftanim more than once. They emphasised their care and their concern for the child after Miftan hours. They felt that involving the parents was important and vital since the parents and the child are one unit, the child goes home after Miftan hours and needs to have the continuity of the chosen behaviour: “the child and the parents are a whole unit; I involve parents because I care for the child. They are responsible for what happens to him after Miftan hours”.

That families wished their children to succeed (Coleman, 1988; Epstein, 1995) is a repeated statement in the literature. If the main reason for the parents to be involved is that they wish the best for their child, why are the parents only involved in some parameters, and why is their involvement so slight? If the main reason for the staff to involve the parents is the child’s success and welfare, why is the involvement so slight? Why is the behavioural issue the main reason to involve the parents and why did the issue of compulsory involvement arise?
The low involvement in the Miftanim is reinforced by the conclusion found in the literature, that the parents who are the most involved with schools are parents from high SES (Friedman and Fisher, 2003). Moreover, parents who are better educated, in conventional families, parents who encourage their child’s education and have positive attitudes, parents who are actively involved in their child’s life, are actively involved in their child’s academic education (Eccles and Harold, 1996).

The low involvement in the Miftanim might be a result of various variables, such as barriers from both sides, and meaning and understanding involvement in different ways. Epstein (1992) and Marrsfield (1994) claimed that, although families wanted the best for their children and loved them, they often did not know how to translate this concern into constructive involvement in their child’s education. Marrsfield (1994) added that the parents do not always know how to achieve their concern and suggested that regular information exchanged between the school and the child’s parents can contribute to the child’s development and progress and help to solve minor problems before they grow larger. Thus, the relationships between the parents and the staff have to be based on and to gush forth from a shared denominator, which is the best for the child, in order to reach a mutual relationship. The relationships between the parents and the staff raise additional questions in regard to the initiation of involvement. Who initiates the involvement? What is the issue of this initiation? Who on the staff are the parents most involved with?

**Initiation of involvement**

Relationships between the parents and the staff are bonds, translated into activities, which require initiation from both the parents and the staff; it includes initiation and a reaction to the initiation and vice versa. A reaction might be both responsiveness and unresponsiveness. The amount and the issues of initiations vary according to the nature and the needs of the stakeholders, and the nature of these relationships. There was a difference between the findings in the Miftanim: half of the parents (two out of four) in Miftan A do not initiate involvement with the staff, while the others initiate involvement when they have troubles in life and in personal matters, not in regard to the child in the Miftan. The parents’ findings reinforce the staff’s findings, that the staff initiate involvement mostly when behavioural problems arise.
Contrary to the parents in Miftan A, the parents in Miftan B (three out of four) initiate involvement with the staff to be up-dated about their child concerning behavioural and health issues. According to the parents, the staff initiate involvement especially when behavioural problems arise, seeking collaboration for a health programme and guiding a parent on how to be a parent.

According to the staff’s findings, two differences were found between the Miftanim in this issue: the first difference was between the principals in the Miftanim. The principal of Miftan A initiates involvement with the parents only when the issue has not been resolved at staff level, and parents initiate involvement with the principal only when exceptional problems arise. The principal in Miftan B initiates involvement, and parents initiate involvement with him, regarding specific issues. The second difference in the Miftanim was the fact that, in Miftan A, no parents initiate involvement with the educational counsellor or the two homeroom teachers at all. One exceptional homeroom teacher from Miftan B claimed that he does not initiate involvement with the parents since “I work with the child, not with the parents”. On the other hand, staff in both Miftanim are the ones who mainly initiate involvement with the parents. The latter reinforces Friedman (1989), who claimed that the most common involvement of the parents in their child’s education was passive education, which is characterised by a lack of initiation.

Although the issues of the initiations of involvement are various, the staff in both Miftanim emphasised the child’s behavioural problems as the main issue; the contact with the parents is made by phone calls. Moreover, this initiation is according to the needs that arise from the work, in order to “put out fires”, most contacts are made during the day. The statement “to put out fires” is a repetitive one, and it reveals more than once the fact that involvement is mostly made according to events in the Miftanim and not according to a programme. Moreover, “to put out fires” does not mean to solve the problem properly and in the long term, but to solve the problem at a shallow level and in the short term. The initiations made “during the day” include information issues but the most common are behavioural problems. These two aspects expose two vital questions: why the staff’s initiation to involvement is mostly focused on behavioural problems arising during the day? And why this involvement in making contact with the parents is made during the school day and not after school hours?
This in turn raises the question of the “negative involvement” of the staff; is this involvement meant as a threat to the child to change his behaviour? Is it a kind of pressure on the parents? The initiation in involvement, including the issues, has to be based, in the first place, on positive experiments with the child in order to build partnership with the parents. The initiation which is focused on behavioural problems seem to be a “threat” involvement, as a scourge upon the child and the parent, or a kind of ‘informing on’ instead of giving information. It reinforced the view of Epstein (1995), who claimed that the staff had a tendency to contact families when problems and difficulties arose, unless they developed a partnership programme which aimed to report on positive situations. Low involvement in the Miftanim and the main initiation to involving the parents raises the questions of “why” and “what”? Why the involvement in this study reflects a poor involvement, and what are the reasons for non-involvement; the barriers to this involvement?

**Barriers to involvement**

The literature concerning parental involvement has, in recent years, addressed the importance of parental involvement and its positive impact on educational outcomes. Parental involvement had a positive and visible effect on the children, their parents, the community, the staff and the school. The natural result of this statement had to lead to a flourishing parental involvement in schools and to extraordinary relationships between the parents and the staff. If so, why is the reality in schools different? What are the reasons for the non-involvement of the parents in schools? The literature discussed the various barriers to involvement put up by the parents, the children and the staff. Barriers to involvement are two-way: parents’ barriers to being involved on the one hand, and staff’s barriers to involving the parents on the other hand. Some barriers were found to be the same barrier to both: for example, lack of time can be described as a barrier for the parents, who have no time to be involved, as well as a barrier for the staff, who have no time to involve the parents.

Although the barriers found in the literature are not classified into personal/professional barriers and demographic barriers as the author chose to do, the findings in this study match some of these barriers. Moreover, this study enhances the staff’s demographic barriers to involvement and reveals additional barriers. Although the staff had almost no
barriers to involving parents, there was a consensus in regard to barriers which stem from the demographic details of the parents. The principals and the social workers/educational counsellors agreed that their barrier to involving parents is the fact that the parents might be violent toward the child, while the vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers’ barrier to involving parents is that the parents are caught up with their personal problems. This difference in the findings in the questionnaires might stem from the fact that the vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers are closer to the parents as they have the most relationship with them, they listen to them and know them better than the principals and the social workers/educational counsellors.

The consensus about the fact that demographic barriers are higher than personal/professional barriers is clear and is reinforced by the interview findings; the main barrier is that ‘parents might be violent and might harm the child’. Other barriers were ‘parents might damage the child’s rehabilitation process’, ‘uneducated parents’, ‘addicted parents’ and ‘parents who don’t accept the reality’. These findings are reinforced by the literature, which raised the fact that staff who work with parents of children with special needs see parents who are less able and vulnerable, who need treatment and are seen as being the cause of their children’s problems as a result of poor parenting, and parents who refused to accept the reality when they disagreed with results or programmes (Hornby, 1995).

A barrier mentioned by Friedman and Bendas-Jakob (1990) and Marrsfield (1994) is that some teachers regard parents as a threat because of their high education and the fact that they ask probing questions. Not only was this barrier not raised in this study as the population is at-risk families, but one member of staff mentioned the fact that she wished to have parents who were interested in their child’s school life, wanted to be more involved and were able to ask relevant questions: "to ask relevant questions, be active, not to take everything for granted, to be critical, also towards me. I don’t feel any criticism or response to my work or to me”.

Although there were almost no personal/professional barriers to involving parents, the staff claimed that barriers to involving the parents were ‘lack of time’, ‘lack of programme’ and ‘unqualified staff’. They regarded involvement as ‘interference in their work’, and that ‘parents might criticize the child’. These barriers match the barriers
found in the literature, which stressed the objective barriers of the staff, lack of qualification, time and programmes to work with the parents (Turnbull and Turnbull, 1986; Epstein and Dauber, 1991; Vandegrift and Greene, 1992; Williams, 1992; Moles, 1993; de Acosta, 1996).

The issue of home visits in the School Reach Out project was raised by Davies (1991) who claimed that this activity was vital and emphasised the duty of the system to supply training to have essential skills. Home visits are made by outside home visitors, who are not a part of the staff who work directly with the child. Although the staff of the Miftanim work directly with the child and are qualified as professionals in their area, the issue of home visits is a central activity of the staff, and reconsideration of the purposes, the benefits, the harms and the training skills of the staff is needed. The lack of qualification of the staff was emphasised and reinforced by the principal of Miftan B, who wondered about the duty of the home visit by the staff to the family, which is compulsory. He raised questions as follows: what are the questions that the staff should ask? How long should the visit be? What is it important to look at? What should be said and what should not be said?

The issue of lack of time was raised in this study, and reinforced the main barrier to involvement found in the National PTA study (1992), the LEAs study (Jowett and Baginsky, 1988) and in the American Office of Educational Research and Improvement study (Epstein, 1990), which was also lack of time. This barrier was a barrier to both the parents and the staff. The parents had fewer barriers to involvement than the staff; they lack time, the children are already grown-up and they are more responsible, they are not professional as the Miftan staff are, they are busy with work, and the children object to parental involvement. Lack of time and a busy mind were mentioned by both Miftanim in the case studies, and the long distance to the Miftan was added by the interviewees in Miftan B. The parents in Miftan A had no barriers to involvement. The difference in the last barrier might be explained by the fact that most of the families in Miftan A live in the Miftan town, while many families in Miftan B are living in towns other than the Miftan town. The gap between the barriers to involvement of the staff and the parents in the Miftanim might be as a result of the possibility that the parents have barriers to involvement but they lack awareness of their presence.
The gap between the barriers to involvement of the staff and the parents in the Miftanim might be as a result of the possibility that the parents have barriers to involvement but that they lack awareness of their presence.

The parents did not regard the following as barriers to involvement: ‘the Miftan staff do not treat the parents well’, and ‘they have negative recollections of their own school days and they do not understand/hardly understand Hebrew’. Although most of the parents are very pleased with the fact that their child attends the Miftan and are grateful to the staff, some of them are sorry that their child attends the Miftan. Moreover, the parents in the case studies reinforced their satisfaction that their child attends the Miftan and did not see it as a barrier to involvement.

Two additional barriers to the parents being involved were raised in this study by Miftan: A staff interviewees who claimed that, in their opinion, there is low involvement of the parents in the Miftan because the parents are ashamed to send their children to the Miftan. Further, some children are ashamed of their parents; they do not want the staff to be in contact with the parents or to visit them because they live in poverty.

Barriers such as ‘parents have negative childhood memories from schools’ (Moore, 1991; Noy, 1990; Wanat, 1992; Brink and Chandler, 1993; Moles, 1993; CERI, 1997) were not found in the present study. Contrary to parents who did not wish to be involved if they sensed that the staff were patronising (Hoover et al, 1987; Lindle, 1989), were indifferent or antagonistic toward them (Moore, 1991) found in the literature, most of the parents in both Miftanim reported having a positive feeling. They felt that the support and the care of the staff towards the family encouraged their involvement: “They encourage my involvement, they phone and up-date me, looking for my help, they show care and love to the child, they care about any detail and problem, they do it because they care and worry about us”; “They treat me very kindly, they are accessible at any time and in any situation, they care very much about us”.

Moreover, the parents supported the staff when they did not request their involvement: “They do not encourage my involvement due to the fact that they understand my hard situation - difficult family problems”; “They do not block my involvement. The relationships are new between us”. (This mother is on a weaning process from drugs and...
she is functioning as a mother only this year.) There is clear evidence that the parents felt welcome to be involved, and felt the caring feelings of the staff towards them. The reasons for the staff not to involve the parents because of their difficulties are not seen as a barrier and negative but, on the contrary, they seem to the parents to be a result of the caring attitude of the staff.

The literature raised the issue of barriers to involvement of the teachers, who are different to the families in terms of culture and attitudes to education, which could cause antagonism in teachers towards their students’ families (Moore, 1991) and reinforce their belief that parents must be distanced from their child’s education (Comer and Haynes, 1991; Moore, 1991). In cases where parents are alcoholics or drug addicts, live in refuges, where the child’s family structure has altered, or where the child’s background is socio-economically disadvantaged (Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Shahar, 1992), the staff in the Miftanim do not feel antagonism because of the differences between them and the families because they are well aware of the special population, based on the knowledge that they are dealing with at-risk families.

The staff in both Miftanim agreed that most of the families were at-risk families (99%) and they did not feel antagonism to all the parents as a unit, automatically. They did, however, involve or prevent the involvement of parents according to their belief and their experiences: most of the staff involved the parents despite the fact that they were at-risk parents and claimed that they involved the parents with limits, especially when there was a chance of harm to the child: “There is a tendency to involve those parents who cooperate, without any connection to the families’ characteristics”; “The families’ characteristics don’t influence me, since all the parents are problematic“; “Any at-risk family characteristic will not be a reason for me to prefer one parent over the other, unless there is a risk of harm to the child”; “I will refer to all parents equally, unless there is any danger of violence to the child”; “No matter the kind of family, no characteristic will dictate to me who to involve”; “I will involve any family, all the families are at-risk families.” However, a few members of staff would not involve the parents because they were at-risk families: “Because I work with at-risk families, I don’t involve them, the less the parents are involved, the better it is”.
The literature raised the barriers to involvement which might harm the teachers on the one hand, such as getting teachers into trouble when the parents ask questions, their involvement might be a burden, (Noy, 1984; Friedman, 1989) or create work for teachers (Shahar, 1992), and which might harm the child on the other hand, such as the fear that the involvement of the parents might lead the teachers not to behave positively towards the child (Noy, 1984; Friedman, 1989). However, these barriers were not mentioned in this study.

The barrier raised by Leitch and Tangri (1988), that teachers were apathetic due to the parents’ consistent lack of response, was raised by the staff in this study: “Sometimes I give up where there is no cooperation and the response is very poor”. Moreover, in addition to the non-responsiveness of parents, the issue of rejection was raised: “It is difficult to work with the parents and we often meet with rejection” and the issue of the incapability of the parents to be involved: “I don’t expect the parents to be able to help, their capability is limited”. The staff blamed the parents themselves for the barriers to involvement; since parents were incapable of helping they did not see school matters as important enough to take time off from work (Leitch and Tangri, 1988), a fact that was also found in this study.

Despite the fact that the staff’s barriers to involving the parents were slight, the staff had more barriers to involving the parents than the parents had to involvement, especially barriers which stemmed from the demographic details of the parents. The parents in this study did not blame the staff and they had no complaints towards the staff. Although barriers to involving the parents were higher than the barriers to involvement of the parents, there were barriers on both sides. The question to be asked by the staff in each Miftan is: ‘What can be done to reduce these barriers in order to build partnership with the parents’. Programmes for low SES families designed to overcome the barriers by guiding the parents to understand the goals and the school’s expectations by a two-way communication, based on the feeling that the parents are welcome (Lareau, 1987), good interpersonal skills, including listening and counselling, and communication skills are needed to maintain contact and involvement of the parents (Hornby, 1995).

Programmes to overcome the barriers are positive, but the first step to overcoming the barriers, by both the parents and the staff, is to be aware of the presence of these barriers,
to understand their nature and to be able to work on the relationships, although some of the barriers will remain;

“Teachers need to communicate the attitude that nothing is hopeless and that every situation can be improved, even if perhaps not all of the problems experienced by parents can be completely solved.”

(Hornby, 1995, p. 7)

Attitudes towards parental involvement
As a result of time, expertise and research, a transformation has been made in all aspects of parental involvement in education. Concepts have changed, involvement has become more promising, with the focus on cooperation aimed at increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the education system to the children’s advantage. The attitude towards involvement is a more positive one, no more ‘two separate systems’, and the parents are not regarded in a negative light (Wolfendale, 1983; Cullingford, 1985; Epstein, 1985, 1991; Bastiani, 1987; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Davies, 1988; Sallis, 1988; Bastiani, 1993; Goldring, 1993; CERI, 1997).

The issue of the influence of the demographic details of the parents on the staff was raised in this study in order to better answer the questions as follows: Do the staff encourage/discourage parental involvement? Do the demographic details of the family influence the staff in regard to the involvement of the parents? How is this attitude applied?

The demographic details of the parents in the survey and in the case studies are similar: most of them are married; more than half have a job; most of them have no profession; most of the parents have a low income (below average and well below average); most of them have a low and elementary education and none of the parents were active in the PA. With the exception of the marital status, which presents an almost normative family which includes father and mother, the demographic details of the parents in this study reinforced the characteristics of the at-risk families found in Cohen and Givon’s (1994) study. The staff reinforced the above characteristics and added very personal details (without identification): parents addicted to alcohol, drugs and gambling; parents who
are physically and verbally violent; some of the parents are in prison; there is incest in a few families; hard to reach parents; low SES; personal, family and health problems; living and adaptation difficulties; uneducated parents; unemployed parents, and single parents. These findings reinforce the direct connection between the characteristics of the families and the low involvement in school; the better educated parents were more involved at home and at school than less well educated parents (Dauber and Epstein, 1993), parents tended to avoid involvement with the school due to personal problems (Lightfoot, 1978; Smilanski et al, 1981; Boger et al, 1986; Comer, 1986; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1987; Leitch and Tangri, 1988; Moore, 1991; Noy, 1990; Wanat, 1992; Brink and Chandler, 1993; Moles, 1993; CERI, 1997), as well as family structure, income and education (Feitelson, 1979; Comer, 1986; Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Lareau, 1987).

Despite the fact that 99 percent of the families in the Miftanim are at-risk families, most of the staff encouraged the parents to be involved. The exception was two members of staff in Miftan B, who did not encourage parental involvement in any way and claimed that they involved the parents only because it was compulsory. Although most of the staff encouraged parental involvement, only three of them would involve all the parents, while most of the staff had red lines and would not involve violent parents, drug addicts, non-cooperative parents and subjective parents. In order to reinforce their attitude towards parental involvement, the main behaviour of the staff was to give the parents positive information about their child, make home visits, support them and encourage the parents to visit and to take part in activities. The staff who encouraged the involvement of the parents were well aware of the demographic details and of barriers to involvement; for example, the fact that these parents suffered from failures in regard to their child in the education system and from frustrations, especially in the past; “because of past frustrations and failures”. Moreover, most of the staff encouraged parental involvement on the one hand, despite the fact that they were well aware of the harms that could sometimes occur from this relationship on the other hand.

The staff’s attitude towards the parents in this study is similar to that identified by Noy (1990), who claimed that there are teachers who keep parents away from school, others who avoid contact with them, teachers who do not initiate any contact and teachers who work cooperatively with the parents. The latter point does not seem to match the findings
of this study. The staff’s attitude towards parental involvement in this study represents the contradictory approaches in the way schools regard parental involvement. Some view it as a nuisance and disruption and others adopt a more positive stand, welcoming and encouraging parental contributions (Johnson and Slotnik, 1985; Noy, 1992; Goldring et al, 1995). Is the attitude of the staff towards the parents a result of the human character? Barriers? Experience? School policy? Although the attitude might be the result of one and/or more of these variables, the attitude, as well as the relationship, has to be the result of balanced and deep consideration by the staff concerning the effect(s) of parental involvement on the stakeholders.

The effect(s) of parental involvement on the stakeholders

Most scholars support close relationships and agree that parental involvement is beneficial to the child, to the parents and to the staff as well (Epstein, 1982, 1984a, 1989; Munn, 1993; Marrsfield, 1994; Katz, 1997). Some scholars link benefits and parental involvement, such as the level of involvement and the child’s outcome and behaviour (Lee, 1993). Zill (1996) links activities of the parents in schools with benefits to the child. Marrsfield (1994) clearly states that regular information exchanged between the parents and the school can contribute to the development of the child and his progress, since dealing with and solving minor problems is a step towards avoiding bigger problems. Coleman, (1987), Lareau (1987) and Loucks (1992) stress that the most beneficial parental involvement is parents who support and encourage school activities.

Although the literature stresses the importance of the parents being involved, and emphasises the benefits in involvement, most scholars did not find a direct correlation between specific involvement and benefit. Moreover, a few scholars stress that involvement might be harmful and recommend the staff to be aware of this when involving parents (Lareau and Shumer, 1996; Cooper and Mosley, 1999). The author would add that, despite the distinction between the benefits to the child, the parents and the staff, the benefits are not to a specific stakeholder only, but influence another stakeholder in an indirect way. For example, the benefit to the parents that ‘parents gain a better understanding’ is beneficial to the child, to the parents and to the staff as well, since this might lead to a different and positive behaviour, and positive feelings for them all.
Benefits to the stakeholders

The findings in this study reinforce the two positions that involvement is beneficial and harmful as well. The findings show that involvement is beneficial to the stakeholders; the parents are the ones who most believe that involvement is beneficial (parents - mean 1.81; social workers/educational counsellors - mean 1.84; principals - mean 1.98; homeroom teachers - mean 2.25 and vocational instructors - mean 2.91). The findings in the survey were, in a way, surprising, since not all the participants agreed that, as a result of parental involvement, the child is the one who benefits most. Although there was a consensus that involvement of the parents is beneficial to the stakeholders, there were differences in the hierarchy of the benefits to the different stakeholders between the groups.

The benefits in the survey were ranked in ascendant order, according to who parental involvement was the most beneficial to. None of the groups claimed that involvement was beneficial to the child in the first place. Moreover, except the principals who ranked the child in second place after the parents and before the principal, the social workers/educational counsellors, vocational instructors, homeroom teachers and the parents ranked the child in third place.

Although there was a consensus about the benefits to the child, both Miftanim emphasised the fact that the benefits were in the very short term, especially in the behavioural issue. This is an extraordinary finding in regard to the main purpose of parental involvement, which was defined as parents and teachers working in close collaboration for the good of the child (Morgan et al, 1992).

Benefits to the child

The findings in this study reinforce some of the benefits to the child found in the literature. Parental involvement in the Miftanim improves behavioural/social/study/work/emotional and health areas. It improves the child’s self-image and positive feeling, improves the child’s behaviour, improves the child’s social relationships, improves the child’s achievements, (Noy, 1990, 1992; Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1992; Moles, 1993; Brian, 1994; Henderson and Berla, 1994), reduces drop out (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990), improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan and the staff.
(Rasinsky and Fredericks, 1989; Chapman, 1991; Epstein, 1991; Fullan and Stiegelbauer, 1991; Macbeth and Ravn, 1994; Sussell et al, 1996; Katznelson, 1999), it increases the regular visits to the Miftan (Hoover et al, 1987), and the child receives better understanding from his parents, (Henderson, 1987; Epstein, 1992; Liontos, 1992).

However, the following benefits of parental involvement found in the literature were not found in this study: the child’s world is enriched as a result of meetings with parents from different backgrounds (Noy, 1990), and the child attains a higher standard of homework (Epstein, 1982, 1987a; Bauch, 1989; Rasinsky and Fredericks, 1989; Chapman, 1991). The first might be a result of the low involvement in the contributions’ area or/and being parents at-risk. The second might be as a result of the fact that a higher standard of homework is a less important goal for the teachers than other goals in the education process, or no homework is set, or homework given to the child does not require a high standard and assistance from the parents. The staff in the Miftanim emphasised the importance of the mental benefit to the child and his behaviour on the one hand, but on the other hand claimed that when involvement is beneficial, it is in the short term, they have to contact the parents again and again, especially in the behavioural issue. Thus, if the benefits are in the short term, what are the staff’s strategies to convert the short term to the long term?

Benefits to the parents

The benefits to the parents found in this study reinforce the benefits to the parents found in the literature: there was a consensus that parental involvement had a positive personal effect on parents (Weil, 1985). According to the staff, parents ‘gain better insight into the staff’s work’ was the highest benefit to the parents (although this benefit relates directly to the parents, the result influences the child and the staff as well); additional benefits to the parents were ‘improves parent’s self-image’; ‘improves the parent’s attitude toward the staff’; ‘feel support, become calmer, have positive feelings, gained a better understanding of the processes, makes closer relationship with their child, get to know their child better’. The parents claimed that, as a result of their involvement, they are updated and they become calmer, they have a good feeling and do understand better the staff’s work and the processes. In the literature, gaining a better understanding of the schools and education was found to be the highest benefit to the parents (Jowett and Baginsky, 1988), as well as the main benefit to the parents in this study.
Satisfaction with the school is a result of the involvement of the parents in the school programmes (Karther and Lowden, 1997). They understand both the teachers and the school more (Henderson, 1987; Epstein, 1992; Liontos, 1992; Sussell et al., 1996; Karther and Lowden, 1997). Moreover, the findings in this study stress the importance and the need for the involvement of the parents in the child’s rehabilitation programme in order to agree and support the child’s processes in the Miftan. As Lindsey (1994) wrote: “…parental participation has generally been shown to enhance their understanding of the concerns and actions taken by professional” (p.164). Thus, in order to reach this situation, staff have to be aware of the importance of the parents’ participation and, in addition, to choose the best ways to apply the parents’ participation in regard to the specific population.

The main benefit to the parents, that they gain better understanding of the staff’s work, is vital, since one of the staff’s barriers to involving the parents was that the parents do not understand the processes, they disagree with the staff, they disturb the child’s rehabilitation process and interfere with the staff’s work; “the parents might damage the staff work since they do not accept the reality “ and “because they lack understanding of education in general, and of study processes in particular, they might interrupt the child’s rehabilitation process, sometimes it prevents me from sharing with them the different processes the child undergoes”. Parents understanding the process and the work of the staff might lead to appreciation of the teachers’ work and acknowledgement of the complexities and problems involved in teaching (Wolfendale, 1983; Noy, 1990; Shahar, 1992). Moreover, and in addition to the benefit above, as a result of the cooperative work of parents and staff, which includes receiving information regarding educational programmes and the school’s work, the parents become more supportive of their children (Henderson, 1987; Epstein, 1992; Liontos, 1992). Understanding the process is clearly a triple benefit; for the parents who are calmer and might have positive relationships, for the teachers who gain appreciation, and for the child, who receives a better attitude and support from his parents. A shared benefit for the child, the parents and the staff is the fact that the parents understand and do not damage the process.

The following benefits to the parents found in the literature did not arise in this study; involvement helped the parents to achieve greater self-fulfilment (Davies, 1988), and it
sometimes encouraged them to catch up on their education and improve their employment standing (Henderson, 1987; Epstein, 1992; Liontos, 1992). The reason these benefits do not appear in the present study are clear as they do not refer to at-risk families, however, to help parents to catch up on their education might be an aim on the part of the Miftanim, not to supply them with a conventional education, but to guide them in how to become better parents.

Benefits to the staff

Although there is a slight difference between the survey findings and the case study findings with regard to the benefits to the staff, the findings show that involvement benefits the staff slightly, with the exception of three members of staff in Miftan A, who claimed that involvement was not beneficial for them. The benefits of involvement to the staff in this study reinforce the benefits found in the literature, which are ‘parental involvement improves the child’s attitude toward the staff’; ‘parental involvement improves the staff’s morale’; ‘parents serve as a pressure group on the authorities in order to gain assistance for the principal’s work’; ‘it improves the relationship between the trainee and the staff’, ‘it enhances the estimation and recognition of the child towards the staff’, ‘the staff have positive feelings’, ‘improves the self-image and self-confidence of the staff’ and ‘they get support from the parents’.

There was a consensus about the benefits to the staff between the groups in this study, which reinforces the literature. The findings include the emotional and personal benefits, such as getting support, relaxing, improves self-confidence, good feeling, satisfaction, getting a better attitude from the child, reduces mishaps (Wolfendale, 1983; Noy, 1990; Shahar, 1992; Sussell et al, 1996), as well as the professional benefit; easier/better flow of work, getting help with the child’s behavioural problems and solving problems; getting help and tools to work more effectively with the child; enhances the staff’s professional work with the child (Comer, 1984, 1986; Davies, 1988; Epstein, 1992; Liontos,1992). The literature emphasised the emotional support that teachers received from parents when collaborative relations existed between them as the highest benefit (Noy, 1984, 1990; Lareau, 1989). Moreover, this conditional statement emphasised the importance of the collaboration between the parents and the staff in order to achieve this emotional support. The question is not whether collaboration is essential, but how to build it and what should be the content and the nature of this collaboration.
Harms in involvement

Contrary to those who saw parental involvement as beneficial to the different stakeholders, others referred to parental involvement as harmful to different stakeholders. Although most of the staff in both Miftanim claimed that involvement does not harm the parents, and most of the staff claimed that involvement might harm the staff, there was a consensus in regard to the harmful effects of involvement on the child. The following were the most common; it confused the child, he might be physically and mentally harmed, lose trust in the staff, might behave worse and be dangerous. Contrary to the staff, who claimed that involvement might harm the different stakeholders, the parents did not see their involvement as harmful, on the contrary they confirmed the benefits of their involvement.

Although the harmful effects of parental involvement found in the literature are minor in relation to the benefits found, they match the present findings. Lareau and Shumer (1996) and Cooper and Mosley (1999) claimed that involvement of the parents might have negative results or might harm the child. Friedman and Fisher (2003) added that the staff might be harmed if the parents criticised the teachers’ professional work. Harm to the staff is, to a certain extent, different in this study; the staff claimed that involvement of the parents disturbed their professional work in regard to the rehabilitation process of the child, might harm the staff’s authority and might damage the self-image and the child’s trust towards the staff.

Cooper and Mosley (1999) claimed that harm in involvement is a result of difficulties in families, which might lead to problematic relationships and even harm the child. They claimed that teachers sometimes ignored the issue of the negative sides of parental involvement. However, the staff in this study raised the issue of the negative sides and the negative results in involvement; moreover, because of the awareness of the harms, the staff were flexible and took into account the nature of the parents with whom they work. They did not treat the parents as a homogenous group, but referred to each parent differently, based on information: “I know who the addicted and/or violent parents are, and I will not involve them” (educational counsellor); “I know how to flow with them, according to the type of family, I will navigate in accordance” (homeroom teacher).
An additional harm in involvement found in the literature and not found in this study relates to the State responsibility to give a unique and equal education and refers to the parents’ SES; the parents who are involved are high SES parents, they are more involved than low SES parents, and this might increase the gap between the different classes and races (Friedman and Fisher, 2003). This argument is not relevant to the present study since the Miftanim population is at-risk families and 99 percent of them are low SES families.

If parental involvement might harm the child and the staff, especially in families with difficulties, as are most of the families in the Miftanim, what would be the involvement that would benefit the stakeholders and not harm the child, the parents or the staff? What are the areas and the levels of involvement of the parents that might harm the child and what might harm the staff, and why? Do all the families have to be involved? Do the families have to be involved the same way or should the involvement be differential, according to the families’ characteristics and nature? What has to be done in order to gain benefits rather than harms?

The author would support Cooper and Mosley (1999), who claimed that relationships between the parents and the school might be problematic, might harm the child and produce negative results under certain conditions, such as divorce, child abuse or neglect, when there were difficulties with behaviour, studies or defiance. These characteristics match the characteristics of the families in the present study with the difference that the staff in this study present a harder picture. Most of the families are at-risk families (99%): difficult families, addicted to alcohol, drugs and gambling, physically and verbally violent parents, there is incest in some families, hard to reach parents, low SES, personal health problems, uneducated parents, unemployed parents, single parents, and some of the children are orphans and are living with their siblings. The staff in the Miftanim are well aware that involvement of some of the most difficult families might harm the child, they have to take the harms into account, and to involve the parents following consideration of the harms and the benefits. As Cooper and Mosley (1999) recommend, teachers should take the families’ difficulties into account and present the benefits in a balanced way when it comes to involving the parents.
A clear connection can be found between demographic barriers and harms of involvement; the fact that the staff claimed that they have barriers and that they are involving the parents because it is compulsory might lead the staff to reconsider whether compulsory activities in parental involvement are necessary. What are these activities and, if they are necessary, what are the appropriate ways to implement them? The questions raised regarding the effect(s) of the parents involvement on the stakeholders is not whether they exist, but how the benefits can be achieved? Are the staff aware of the benefits in parental involvement? Do the staff agree and believe in these benefits? If so, what are the ways to achieve them? Are the benefits similar in different schools, populations, background, different families, at-risk children? Do individual schools have to achieve all the benefits or focus on the benefits vital to the stakeholders? If so, what are the strategies to achieve this? What can the staff do to diminish the harms to the minimum? These questions are some of the questions that have to be raised when discussing the issue of benefits and harms in parental involvement prior to setting up programmes for parental involvement.

**Parental involvement - the meaning of the term**

*Introduction*

This section presents the definitions of parental involvement according to the parents and the staff in the Miftanim, the involvement as it is applied in the Miftanim and the involvement the parents and staff wish to have in their Miftan, in order to compare between them. This issue raised the following questions: does the involvement, as defined by the parents and the staff from their personal point of view, match the reality of the involvement? Is there a connection or a gap between the definitions and the reality? Can the future involvement desired by the parents and the staff be applied in the Miftanim? Are the findings similar in both Miftanim? What are the ways to reach this elected involvement?

*Definitions of parental involvement*

The parents and the staff defined ‘parental involvement’ according to their needs, their experiences and their understanding of the term. In Miftan A, the parents’ definition of the term ‘involvement’ included communication and information in the needs category: “To be up-dated in the different areas”; “Continuous bond throughout the year, at fixed times, every few weeks”, and collaboration in the contributions category: “To respond
and to refer positively to the staff, in order to help, to do what is needed for the child”.

They did refer to the information parameter as receiving information and being up-dated about their child. Some referred to the need of the staff to be helped. None of the parents referred to the policy, resource, education and support parameters. These definitions were focused on receiving information from the staff, and emphasised the fact that involvement is focused more on the parents’ needs than the parents’ contributions, the parents are responding and are not the initiators. One parent referred to involvement as a programme; “continuous bond at fixed times”, which is a constant and consecutive involvement, contrary to the ‘put out fires’ type of involvement.

Parents in Miftan A did not wish to be more involved in the future than they are now (slight involvement). Moreover, one parent claimed that he did not want too much involvement, since “this is home and this is school” (Parent D). There is clear evidence that the parents in Miftan A do not wish to have more involvement with their Miftan than they have now. In the contributions category, none of the parents was involved in the policy and resource parameters; all the parents were involved in the information parameter; most of them were involved in the collaboration parameter, this was in the programme’s production of furniture for home; half of the parents collaborated in the issue of the child’s transfer and only one parent collaborated in the rehabilitation programme. The parent who claimed that home and school are two different systems, was involved only in the information parameter. This parent was the one who claimed: “I don’t have to be involved, since I have good kids and they don’t have any behavioural problems”. There is a correlation between the definitions of the involvement applied in the Miftan and the future involvement from the point of view of the parents in Miftan A.

On the other hand, the staff in Miftan A defined the term ‘parental involvement’ to include policy, resource, collaboration, information, communication, liaison and support (the latter refers to the parents’ support for the staff’s work and not the support for parents). According to the staff in Miftan A, the parents are not involved in policy or resource. The parents are involved in collaboration, information, communication, liaison, while involvement in education and support was only in informal ways. In addition to this slight involvement, the general view of the principal regarding involvement was: “most contacts with parents are due to children’s behavioural problems, and are made in order to ‘put out fires’. Involvement is made without fore-planning and without any
purpose” (Principal Miftan A). The staff wished to have involvement in the following, ascendant order: resource (“greater readiness of the parents to volunteer for projects”); and collaboration (“to collaborate with the parents within a structured framework”); liaison; (“to participate in a higher percentage of parent meetings, events, parties, ceremonies, trips”); education (“to participate in parent-child workshops in different areas”); communication (“to contact and to ask about the child”); support (“to participate in parent group support”); information (“to check and to be interested in their child”); and policy (“active PA, parents who will contribute”). These parameters match the parameters in Hornby’s (2000) model, with the difference in the parameter support, which refers to the support and back up of the parents for the staff and not the staff’s support for the parents.

The staff were critical towards the parents and wished that the parents were better parents: “to be better parents to be more interested in their child”; “real involvement, where the parents will understand the processes”, “to be interested in what the child is doing”, “to be aware of the problems”. The staff were also cynical about the parents: “the parents have to collaborate more in the educational and rehabilitation process of their child, even in the furniture production, as they collaborate in the cost accounting of the items”, “they don’t have the capability, the will and the knowledge to ask, to know, because they depend too much on us as professionals”.

An extraordinary view of the future was raised by two members of staff, who blamed the fact that parental involvement is slight on the stigma and the name of the Miftan: “changing the name of the ‘Miftan’ for instance to “New Technology Centre’, will increase parental involvement”; ”to improve the Miftan’s image, and to remove the Miftan stigma in order to encourage increased parental involvement”. The staff wished there was more involvement in the Miftan and, in an indirect way, blamed the parents for not being good parents. Thus, an additional barrier to parental involvement was raised, the image or the stigma of the Miftan might deter the parents from being involved with the Miftan, and the suggestions were to change the Miftan’s name or to improve the Miftan’s image.

Contrary to the parents, the staff in Miftan A wished to have more involvement than at present. There was a clear gap between the expected involvement that the parents wished
to have and the expected involvement that the staff wished to have. The low expected involvement of the parents in the present study matched the findings found in the literature, that often parents from disadvantaged backgrounds had low expectations of their child’s capabilities and a low estimation of their own ability to be involved. However, they did not match the findings that most of the parents wanted to be more involved and exhibited interest in their children’s education and most of the parents were reachable (Davies 1988).

On the one hand, the staff in Miftan A added that they wished to have involvement with the parents and raised the issue of the daily life difficulties of the parents; "it is a dream to have involvement, because most of the parents are busy with daily and many other problems”. On the other hand, the principal and the educational counsellor in Miftan A, the principal in Miftan B and the social worker in Miftan B raised the need to develop the involvement from their personal involvement with the parents to a more general involvement: “not enough has been done on this issue. I think that I have to invest in it. We need to build programmes ahead of time and not only involve parents when there are immediate needs to ‘put out fires’. We have to combine the two” (Principal A). “This issue has to be further improved, it is a very tough area which is very important. I ask myself the question: if I think that involvement of parents is so important, why it is done so rarely? I have to continue to think about this, in order to continue with this issue. After exposure to your survey I have become, to a certain extent, more occupied with this issue. My thoughts are more organised” (Educational counsellor). “I compel the staff to make home visits” (Principal B). “To set up a programme aimed at increasing parental involvement, especially with hard-to-reach parents” (social worker). The principal, the educational counsellor in Miftan A and the social worker in Miftan B all belong to the management team in the Miftanim.

Although there are principals who do not encourage parental involvement, especially in schools where the families are of low SES (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986), other principals refer to involvement as an issue worth developing, with the assumption that it will bring meaningful benefits to education (Goldring, 1990). The role of the principal as an agent who makes the bond between the school and the parents is contradictory; the principals made very little effort to involve parents from low SES in decision-making and were not keen to waste energy on parental involvement when they assumed that the
parents lack time or knowledge in regard to the school programmes (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986). The principals have the opportunity and the power to lead and to promote parental involvement, since the principal is the key and the main and most important actor in regard to the parental involvement issue. He has the power to decide the policy towards involvement and the extent of the involvement (Goldring, 1988). The principal has a critical role in the relationships between the parents and the staff (Goldring, 1993). Relationships between principals and parents are not static but dynamic relationships, they are unique, according to each school and are influenced by the policy and faith of the school (Goldring and Shapira, 1996). Thus, programmes for principals in the first place, and then for the staff with the principal, might lead to relevant programme for parental involvement being built.

In Miftan B, the parents’ definition of the term ‘involvement’ included the contributions’ category in the following parameters: collaboration; “a common task”; information; “to be up-dated”; and included in the needs’ category: communication; “to know exactly what the child is doing in different areas, his difficulties”; liaison; “to be interested in her studies, behaviour, to check that she is studying, to visit her in the Miftan”. The parents did not include in their definition policy, resource, education and support. They did refer to the information parameter as receiving information and being up-dated about their child. The parents referred to shared activities and to initiation in involvement; “to check, to visit”.

Contrary to the parents in Miftan A, the parents in Miftan B were more involved with the Miftan and did wish to be more involved in the future than they are now. In the contributions category, the parents were not involved in the policy parameter and only one was involved in the resource parameter. They were involved in the information parameter on both sides, receiving and giving information, and in the collaboration parameter; in health/study/mental/social and behaviour programmes. In the needs category, the parents were involved in the communication parameter, in the liaison parameter, the education parameter (two parents) and in the support parameter (two parents). Their expected involvement included resource; “I am ready to contribute, to help in the classroom”; “To spend few hours in the classroom and in the workshop. I am prepared to teach English voluntarily, to guard in the yard, to play snooker, everything that I can do, whatever they request”; collaboration; “to have extended, continuous and
accessible relationships”; information and communication; “the staff will give up-to-date answers in the various areas”; liaison; “to be present at any event”, “to participate in the activities, have a ‘fun day’ with her, go on a trip, be present in the classroom, even to be present once a week in the classroom”. All parents wished to be more involved with the Miftan, to contribute on the one hand and to be more informed and up-dated by the staff on the other hand. None of the parents referred to policy, education and support.

In Miftan B, the staff’s definition of the term ‘parental involvement’ included policy, resource, collaboration, information, communication, liaison, education and support; the latter refers to the parents’ support for the staff’s work, not support for the parents. They emphasised that the parents have to be interested in their child, take responsibility and back up the staff. However, in contrast, one said that parental involvement has to be shallow, no deep involvement but information; to up-date the parents, and liaison; to participate in social events. With the exception of two members of staff who claimed that “the best involvement is no involvement at all” and “the less the parents are involved, the better it is”, the staff wished to have a higher involvement than at present in the Miftan in the following, ascendant, order: resource, liaison, policy communication and collaboration, education and support. With the exception of the information parameter, these parameters match the parameters in Hornby’s (2000) model.

The staff wished to have a higher parental involvement than currently, they particularly wished to have more involvement in the resource parameter, especially in the behavioural issue. According to the staff, the involvement applied in the Miftan includes the collaboration parameter; “behavioural/study/psychological/social programme” and the information parameter. It did not include the policy and resource parameters in the contributions category. It included communication, liaison, education and support in the needs category. The general picture of the involvement was added to by the principal, who claimed that: “Most of the involvement in the Miftan is latent, the majority of parents encourage their children to go to the Miftan, and they agree to the child’s participation in activities and trips announced via circulars”.

This short review represents a poor relationship between the parents and the staff. Two members of staff emphasised the importance and the value of parental involvement in the Miftan, and suggested additional ideas: “To set up a programme aimed at increasing
parental involvement, especially with hard-to-reach parents” (social worker) and the vocational instructor referred to the need to supply education and support to the parents: “I ask myself how we can involve parents to a greater extent, as it is important for the child in the different areas. In order to improve functioning within the family, have better relationships and increase involvement, they have to get assistance from outside, such as guidance on how to raise the child, child care, adolescent problems, the psychology of the child and how to make the child’s life easier”.

Contrary to them, homeroom teacher C laid stress on the fact that parental involvement has to be minimal, only what is compulsory: “There is a need to separate these two systems: they will be parents in their home and we will work in the Miftan. It is necessary to know and to acknowledge the parents minimally, only what is compulsory”. There is a consensus in this Miftan between the parents and the staff in their wish to be more involved in the future. The staff and parents both raised the issue of resources: the parents wished to contribute to the Miftan and the staff wished that the parents would contribute to the Miftan in the resource parameter. This finding reinforced Ronen’s (1996) finding, which claimed that 62 percent of the parents would like to be more involved at school and 79 percent of teachers would prefer more involvement from parents.

In the expected involvement, parents in both Miftanim did not include the policy, resource, education and support parameters (except two parents from Miftan B). Lack of experience in these parameters or the fact that they did not feel that they could be involved in these parameters might be the reason for this finding. This reinforces the argument that:

“...for parents’ needs at a higher level, more time and expertise are required by teachers in order to meet these needs. Similarly, the parents who make a greater contribution require a higher level of expertise and time available.”

(Hornby, 2000, p.22)

The lack of consensus in the definitions given by the parents and the staff points to the fact that the staff is well aware that, by definition, involvement includes needs and contributions, focused on the fact that ‘parents have to be there’, while the parents
focused on their needs, especially the need to be up-dated which can be receiving information, more than on being partners in processes or making decisions with the staff. Wanat (1997) claimed that the parents’ definition of ‘parental involvement’ was based on the activities that the parents engaged in with their children, while the schools’ definition of ‘parental involvement’ focused on the parents’ roles. This distinction can be identified using needs and contributions according to Hornby’s (2000) model, and matches the parents’ definition but not the staff’s definition, since the staff were well aware of the parents’ needs in addition to the parents’ contributions.

The parents in Miftan B wished to be more involved, to contribute more to the Miftan on the one hand and to be more up-dated on the other hand; "to help in the classroom and in the workshop, to teach, to guard, to play"; “to have extended, continuous and accessible relationships, to be present at any event; the staff will be prepared to give up-to-date answers in the various areas”. The actual involvement in the Miftanim matched more to the parents’ definition than to the staff’s definition, as there was almost no involvement of the parents in the resource, policy, education and support parameters. Why was the gap so obvious between these two? In regard to the involvement the parents and the staff wished to have, there was no consensus in the parents’ and the staff’s findings.

The sharp difference between the parents in Miftan A and Miftan B are obvious. The parents in Miftan B are optimistic, which opened the way to set up and develop future programmes with them. The reasons for the difference might be found in both parents and staff. The fact that parents do not want further involvement, and wish the involvement to remain as it is, which is very low, does not lead to the conclusion that they are pleased with the present situation. They might lack positive experiences in the Miftan or/and the staff lacks time and expertise to produce a beneficial involvement. Having parents who do not want to be involved does not mean that the staff should give up, but should set up more positive experiences and programmes according to their needs and their capability to contribute. Working with these parents might require more time and expertise, based on the condition that each programme of involvement will be based on differentials. These programmes should aim to enable the parents and the staff: “to learn from each other about successful practices and solutions to major challenges” (Sanders and Epstein, 1998, p.34).
An additional reason for the low involvement of the parents in the Miftan might be a lack of understanding of the meaning of ‘parental involvement’ as was reflected in the parents’ definitions. These programmes, which aim to improve parental involvement and to enhance the parents’ cooperation and participation, are, in a way, optimistic, since the relevant question in this issue, is what can the staff do, in order to reach the at-risk families in the Miftanim?

Relationships is a wide term which includes involvement of the parents with the Miftan, while involvement is one of the relationship activities; not every relationship is involvement but involvement is a kind of a relationship. The fact that the term ‘parental involvement’ is amorphous (Epstein, 1995) is emphasised by the fact that there are several definitions relating to the links between staff and parents, and these change according to whose definition is being used (Chrispeel, 1996). According to the author, the term ‘parental involvement’ is multifaceted – multiform, since it is changing and is based on the shared activities of staff and parents, which aim to fulfil the individual purposes of the child, the parents and the staff, according to their needs and their capability to contribute. Although parental involvement can be spontaneous, responding to ongoing life, the author would emphasise the importance of the involvement being mostly based on individual plans and purposes, pre-defined by the parents and the staff, in regard to the child, not only from the point of view of his needs and the duty of accountability to the parents, but also from the point of view of respect and care, when involving parents might harm or damage the relationship between the child and the parents, or might embarrass the child since involvement against the child’s will might lead to negative results. For example, “I will not share with parents when there is a child’s resistance, when the issues are abortion, contraception or drugs, or when the child is opposed to the staff making a home visit”.

Although involvement of parents is influenced by the families’ characteristics, by barriers, attitudes and beliefs, programmes of involvement aim to improve parental involvement in their child’s education. Various strategies and programmes were found in the literature to develop partnership with the parents but most of them do not refer to the at-risk population. Hornby’s (2000) model is the most appropriate model for involvement, especially for the at-risk population. It is based on needs and contributions, embraces activities and links in involvement. Although this model can be a positive
model and a basis and archetype for the staff in the Miftanim, the author claims that the staff have to set up and develop programmes based on the above model but, in addition, implement, in the first place, the parameters which aim to build positive relationships between the families and the staff; collaboration, information, communication, liaison, education and support, resource and policy should follow since they require more time and expertise from the parents. Moreover, to set up programmes to involve parents through partnership requires time and expertise from the staff, as it is setting up a curriculum. The programme has to be general and a basic one for all the Miftanim on the one hand, and has to be flexible and up-graded according to the specific needs of the families and the staff on the other hand. Moreover, although the parameters are similar, the content will be different according to each family and each member of staff.

The nature and quality of parental involvement is influenced by both the parents and the staff, since it is a process based on a two-way communication (Chrispeels (1996), influenced by values and assumptions (Valentine and Stark, 1979). The nature of the involvement is affected by what the parents and the teachers “bring” to these relationships (Bastiani, 1988). Although all the parents loved their children and wanted the best for them (Epstein, 1992; Marrsfield, 1994), they were not equal; moreover, in addition to the differences in their values and in what they “bring”, the issue of the types of parents is central. The characteristics of the parents in the Miftanim are identified with the major types of parents with difficulties, who are, as Hornby (2000) claimed, “the parents who are difficult for teachers to work with” (p.143). These include unsupportive parents; uncooperative parents; hostile, complaining, threatening parents; abusing parents; parents with personal, marital or family problems; vulnerable parents; parents who expect too much or too little and parents from different cultural backgrounds. Thus, “teachers must be aware of the types of difficulties they are likely to encounter, and need to know of appropriate techniques for dealing with them” (Hornby, 2000, p.142).

The types of families in the Miftanim have one or more of the difficulties mentioned above, thus the staff face double challenges; the first is to identify and to be aware of the specific difficulties in order to understand the nature of the parents and the relationships between the parents and the child, and the second challenge is to choose appropriate and differential strategies in order to build a partnership process with the parents according to their needs and as a result of a training course in involvement.
Involvement of the parents in the Miftanim might represent any type of involvement, according to the families and the staff; from high involvement in various areas and levels to low involvement in various areas and levels. Special attention has to be given to the levels of wakefulness and identification towards the school, as Friedman (1990) claimed that involvement is a result of the wakefulness and identification dimensions. One purpose of the staffs’ strategies to build partnerships with the parents is to convert the indifference or the low wakefulness of the parents to wakefulness, and convert the low identification towards the goals and values to a higher identification. This is the basis of the relationship, to fertilize the land to the creation of a differential involvement of the parents since:

“...making better connections among the key parts of the system is important for all children, but for the children who are at risk of academic and social failure it is essential.” (Davies, 1988, p.12)

Based on the idea that marketing schools aimed, in the first place, to motivate schools to raise standards and to develop a closer relationship with parents as consumers (Glatter et al, 1996), the Miftanim have to focus on improving the Miftanim picture, and refer to marketing not just as about selling the product and supplying services, but identifying the nature of what is required by the clients (Davies and Ellison, 1997). The Miftanim have to regard the at-risk families as consumers/clients and develop a positive attitude towards the parents as consumers/clients, and not for the purpose of competition between schools, since choosing schools is not relevant in Israel. Above all, the Miftanim have to focus on identifying, together with the parents, the nature of the relationship required, according to the child, the parents and the staff, in order to set up an optional programme for the specific Miftan, in the specific year. To be effective schools, the Miftanim have to raise the issue of involvement, realise its importance and translate this into practical measures in order to provide opportunities for parents to be supportive and cooperate in their children’s education (Murphy, 1992; Goldring et al, 1995). These practical measures have to be adapted to the capabilities and the nature of the stakeholders involved.
Setting up programmes to work with parents has to be based on the staff’s belief that parents can be real partners in a process which will lead to the most benefit. Although the Miftan population are at-risk families, the staff in each Miftan have to define the nature of the partnership. The nature of the partnership is, as Noy (1992) claimed, a continuous process, paved with conflicts, and partnership will be promoted when the conflicts are shared mutually. Thus, the parents and the staff in the Miftanim have to be realistic and optimistic as well, to be aware that conflicts and difficulties might arise during the process, and without the expectation that things will run smoothly. This partnership should be derived from the needs and capability to contribute of both the parents and the staff, and from the time and expertise of both. The author would reinforce Epstein (1995) who claimed that:

“The main goal of partnerships is to develop and conduct better communications with families across the grades in order to assist students to succeed in school.”

(p.213)

Moreover, developing and conducting better communications is the basic, primary skill required to build a shared programme to assist students to do better in schools. The author would change the words “across the grades” to the words “across all the different kinds/natures of parents” but with reservations regarding the word communication, this word has to be flexible: the amount, the level, the frequency and the content have to be according to the staff’s consideration.

Summary

There is a chain of evidence, from this study and from the literature, that parental involvement is a two-way relationship, which can be applied on the condition that both the parents and the staff are interested in this relationship. The value and importance of the involvement of parents in their child’s education in the schools is clear. Parental involvement is a result of ongoing experiences, affected by the reasons to involve/to be involved, the barriers to involvement and the time and expertise of both the parents and the staff. Although parental involvement is defined differently in the literature, it is a wide and multifaceted term. Effective and fruitful involvement is a result of a flexible definition of involvement, which has to be defined by the parents and the staff in each
Miftan. Parental involvement in one Miftan will never be alike to parental involvement in another Miftan, since each involvement is a result of the needs and capability of both the parents and the staff.

Although the history of parental involvement has progressed and various programmes and plans to enhance the involvement of the parents have been set up in the world and in Israel, this study screams of a very low and narrow involvement, which is mostly focused on the behavioural issue. There are no plans or programmes to be implemented during the school year, moreover, there is no training for the staff in regard to parental involvement, and the lack of time and expertise of the staff are added to the present situation.

The next chapter presents the conclusions of the study, the limitations of the study, the recommendations and the author’s reflections.
CHAPTER SIX - CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter is in four sections: the first section presents the conclusions drawn from the findings of the survey and the case studies. The second section presents the limitations of the study together with ways to overcome some of these limitations. Unfortunately, some limitations cannot be overcome. The third section presents recommendations to the staff in the Miftanim and to researchers who wish to follow up this research. These recommendations answer the question “What can be done with the knowledge acquired to change/improve parental involvement in the Miftanim?” The fourth section presents the personal reflections of the author, who expresses herself directly.

Conclusions

Areas and levels of involvement

Although the term “parental involvement” in the literature is presented as a changing term using various definitions according to the point of view of the participants and the professionals in education, the location, the changes and the vision, it includes links and activities between the parents and the teachers. Parental involvement encompasses the various activities of parents and teachers which aim to better answer to the needs of both. Parental involvement can be defined by various general definitions, as it is multi-faceted. It is flexible and can be defined differentially, based on shared activities, according to each Miftan and each participant; it is influenced by the population, culture and SES.

Parental involvement does not solely involve the parents but they are an integral part of this mutual bond. Parental involvement includes needs and contributions not only of the parents, but of the staff as well. For example, not only do the parents need support and education, the staff do as well; not only do the staff need resources from the parents, the parents need resources from the staff (for example, economic help); not only is information given to the staff by the parents, it is given to the parents by the staff. The needs of the parents are supplied by the staff’s contributions and the parents’ contributions supply the staff’s needs. For example, the need of the parents for support is supplied by the capability of the staff to contribute this support.
The involvement in the Miftanim was slight; most of the parents were involved in the parameters where less time and expertise were required: from both the parents and the staff, these were collaboration, information, communication and liaison. The involvement was higher in parents’ needs than in parents’ contributions. The highest and most common involvement between the parents and the staff was communication, which was made by phone calls, especially from the staff to the parents. Collaboration between the staff and the parents was mostly focused on the behavioural problems of the child. The main liaison between the parents and the staff was the home visits of the staff and the least was parent-teacher meetings.

There was almost no involvement in policy and resource, and involvement in education and support were mostly informal. The parents received education and support in indirect ways, mostly as a result of conversations with the staff. Formal education and support were given when exceptional events occurred, for example, when a parent had to function as a mother for the first time in her life, or when a child of fourteen years of age left his adoptive family to live with his biological mother. There was almost no involvement of parents in resources, they did not help in the classroom or the workshop, and neither did they fundraise for the Miftan. However, they did receive resources from the staff by getting economic help and help with dental care for their child. There was almost no involvement in the policy parameter and, although the secretaries reported having a PA in the Miftanim, there was no active PA in the Miftanim that participated in this study.

There was no plan or/and programme in parental involvement. There was no file named “parental involvement”; each document examined in this research was found in other files, for example, in files named “trips” and “invitations”. The involvement was according to the on-going life of the Miftan, according to the rhythm and events of the day. Except for the contracts between the parents/child and the staff, which were the result of a shared process and required the participation of the parents during the set-up period, the documents examined were circulars and for information. The documents presented information, facts and processes which most of them had been decided by the staff already.
Only involving parents when problems arise is “negative communication”, since the involvement is based on the negative activities of the child, instead of “positive communication”, which is based on positive activities designed to strengthen the parents and the child, to give them a positive feeling in order to build a better relationship; these parents have experienced this negative communication in their past when their child failed in previous institutions.

Compulsory, threatening and conditional involvement also arose in this study:

**Compulsory involvement**: in some cases, when the staff were certain that involvement of the parents was not beneficial at all, or was beneficial in the short term, they involved the parents only because it was compulsory, particularly in parent-teacher meetings and home visits, or because the principal compelled them to do so.

**Threatening involvement**: when the staff put pressure on or threatened the child that involvement of the parents would occur when and if the child misbehaved or when the involvement was the direct result of behavioural difficulties.

**Conditional involvement**: when the staff compelled the involvement of the parents. For example, to attend parent-teacher meetings, otherwise activities would be denied, or to escort the child on a trip, otherwise the child would not be allowed to participate in the trip.

The majority of parental involvement in the Miftanim was latent, passive and minimal, rather than a partnership process with shared activities. The involvement in the Miftanim was mostly “*to put out fires*”, there was no set programme and no constructed plan to involve the parents.

**Reasons for involvement**
The parents’ reasons for involvement in their child’s education was the welfare and the success of the child; they wanted to be up-dated on the one hand and they wanted to transmit to their child a positive feeling that they care about him/her. Although the staff’s reasons for involving the parents were also the child’s welfare and success, they added
the need for the parents’ help when behavioural problems arose, and improving the relationship between the parents and the child. The staff emphasised the danger of the hours after the Miftan, when the child spends time at home but mostly on the streets. This statement was a strong reason for involving the parents. The staff in the Miftanim demonstrated a deep care, love, respect and honour for the child and sensitivity when involving the parents, despite the fact that some members of staff were critical of and cynical about the parents.

**Initiation in involvement**

Members of staff were the main initiators in involving the parents; the issues were when problems arose, such as health/study/behaviour, when there was absenteeism and when there were changes in the child’s behaviour. The main area the staff involved the parents in was the communication parameter; contact was made by phone calls during the day. Members of staff who did not encourage parental involvement avoided contacting the parents unless it was unavoidable, for example, when the child was absent; they did not contact them when problems arose, as they do not believe their work is with the parents. The issue of behaviour was the most emphasised, while the academic issue was less emphasised.

The parents’ initiation of involvement was slight and mainly when they were seeking help with personal difficulties. For example, seeking guidance with external institutions when problems related to their child arose, seeking work, helping their child to become a soldier or in order to be up-dated about their child, especially in the behavioural area. The parents initiated the involvement with the member of staff who could help the most according to the specific issue. With the vocational instructors and the homeroom teachers who work directly with the child when the issues were behaviour, studies and work and furniture in the workshop, and with the principal, social worker and the educational counsellor when the issues were guidance, financial problems, health and army problems.
Barriers to involvement

Barriers to involvement were found in this study; staff had more barriers to involving the parents than the parents had to being involved. The parents’ barriers to being involved were lack of time, busy mind and long distance from the Miftan. The staff had more demographic barriers to involving the parents than personal/professional barriers. Most of the staff blamed the parents, considering that they do not care about the child and are not interested in his Miftan life.

The personal/professional barriers to involving the parents mentioned by the staff were lack of time, lack of a programme and staff unqualified to involve the parents. The demographic barriers mentioned by the staff were that the parents might be violent and might harm the child, might damage the child’s rehabilitation process, were uneducated or addicted, and some did not accept the reality. The shame of living in poverty and the shame of having a child attending the Miftan were additional barriers raised in the Miftanim.

The issues of non-acceptance of the reality and disagreement with processes are barriers which can be overcome by appropriate education and support. Members of staff were sensitive towards the child and aware that involving parents might have harmful effects, such as physical/mental violence, thus the staff took into account the child’s request not to involve the parents.

The staff’s main barrier to involving the parents was the possibility of a violent response from the parent towards the child. Most of the staff in the Miftanim involved the parents within limits, taking into account the parents’ responses to the child, their collaboration and the benefits in the involvement.

There was a sharp difference between members of staff towards involvement of the parents; while most of the staff involved the parents despite the barriers, some of them did not involve the parents at all or involved them only when they had to because of the compulsory work. The parents in both Miftanim had no barriers to involvement, they did not believe that their involvement might harm any of the stakeholders; on the contrary, they believed it was beneficial.
Attitudes towards parental involvement
The staff had no high expectations of the parents being involved, caring, being interested in their child’s education and getting help when needed. Most of the staff encouraged parental involvement, but did not know exactly how to implement it. The staff encouraged the parents to be involved by presenting positive reports and the child’s handiwork. Other members of staff did not encourage parental involvement, and in addition, they avoided and prevented parental involvement. Their reasons for not involving the parents were as a result of their belief and their experience of working with at-risk parents who cannot contribute to this relationship, but may even harm the child and damage the staff’s work. From their point of view, the best involvement was no involvement at all.

Most of the staff encouraged the parents to be involved while being well aware of the at-risk population who attended the Miftanim whose parents might harm the child. The staff encouraged the parents to keep in touch, to be interested in the child’s education and to be closer to the child. The parents felt that the staff were encouraging and welcomed their involvement. They did not have any antagonism or feel the staff were patronizing them.

The effect(s) of parental involvement on the stakeholders
Parental involvement was found to be important and vital, especially in at-risk families where the time spent after Miftan by the children is important and might be dangerous when parents are not involved. The benefits to the stakeholders are not “pure” and one benefit to one stakeholder reflects on the other stakeholder; the bonds in this trio of the parents, the child and the staff are influenced in a mutual way. Although the parents and the staff believe that parental involvement is beneficial to the stakeholders, the child was the last to benefit. The benefits for the child from the involvement were improvements in the behavioural/social/study/work/emotional and health areas. The improvements, especially in the child’s behaviour, were in the short term.

The benefits for the parents from the involvement were that they gained a better insight into the staff’s work, it improved parent’s self-image and their feelings, they got to know their child better, they became calmer and it made for a closer relationship with their child. The benefits for the staff from the involvement were slight; it improved the child’s
attitude towards the staff, it improved the relationship between the child and the staff, and improved the morale, self-image and self-confidence of the staff.

In the literature, despite the fact that the majority of researchers claim that the involvement of parents is beneficial, some claim that involvement of parents might be harmful. It is important to present both views in a balanced way. The staff have to raise the issue of the benefits and be well aware of the harms in involvement in at risk families. When setting up programmes to involve the parents, staff must consider this issue carefully and monitor parental involvement. A clear connection has been found between at-risk families and harms in involvement: parental involvement in the Miftanim might be harmful, especially to the child. The staff were well aware that the fact that the population who attended the Miftanim were at-risk families and might harm the child. Thus, the staff involved the parents with regard to the specific population, with consideration of the results of their involvement; others did not involve the parents, in order to avoid harm to the child.

**Expected involvement**

There was no consensus about future involvement; the parents in Miftan A did not wish to be more involved than they were at present, which is a very low involvement, while the parents in Miftan B wished to be more involved; to be up-dated and to contribute to the Miftan by escorting the child on trips, helping in the classroom and any additional contributions required by the staff. The staff in both Miftanim wished the parents to contribute more, to be involved in their child’s education, to be up-dated and to be a caring parent.

**Limitations of the Research**

“There is never perfect. It could always have been done differently or better.”

(Blaxter *et al*, 2001, p.239)

Some of the findings in this study were found to be similar to or to correspond with the findings found in the literature, while others were not. With the exception of the comparison of the findings of the present study to the findings of the Miftanim study,
that the population and the institutions are similar, the comparison of the findings with similar studies found in the literature is limited since there were differences in location, population, culture, politics, methodologies and methods.

Exploring the relationships between the parents and the staff in the Miftanim by collecting the data from the memory of the experienced participants is concrete and based on reality, since it is fact and it was physically experienced in the past. However, seeking the barriers to involvement and asking for a future and desired involvement is collecting data which is abstract, since they are beliefs, attitudes, biases, credo and feelings.

Most of the participants in the interviews did not agree to be recorded. Only two parents and six members of staff agreed. This demonstrated a great difference between the tape-recorded data from the interviews and the written interview data; the amount of the former was higher and richer than the latter. Despite the fact that the author was well aware of the gap between the different ways of collecting data, she was, in the first place, committed to the ethical issue- to balance between her desire to collect data and to contribute to her study and the will and privacy of the participants. This limitation became a strength since, despite the limitation mentioned above, the data in this study were rich and not all of them were used. The author focused on the meaningful, relevant data, and did not use every detail in order to present an interesting and meaningful study and to prevent weariness from the readers.

The participants in the survey and in the case studies were volunteers. The choice of the case studies was based on the fact that the rate of responses in these Miftanim was high. The parents who participated in the two Miftanim were chosen personally by the vocational instructor in Miftan A and by the social worker in Miftan B. The parents might be more collaborative, more involved with the Miftan and have good relationships with the staff, and the findings may reflect the involvement of these specific parents.

The author being a homeroom teacher in the Miftan was a two-edged sword. It was an advantage, since it enabled the author to understand deeply the issue and the population, to ask relevant questions and to seek for relevant subjects, to be familiar and sensible towards the population, and to be received openly. Furthermore, being a staff member
enabled the author to be comfortable in the research field, to be made welcome by the interviewees, and to be very much aware of any bias. However, this could also be a disadvantage since it could lead to bias, by understanding in a narrow meaning and emphasizing private matters that arose in her work. To overcome this, the author tried to be more objective by asking open questions; she did not lead the participants and did not “help” them to say what she might wish. The author was well aware of bias and subjectivity and, although she aspired to be as objective as possible, there is no “pure” research, since choosing the topic of parental involvement from so many topics in education, and asking the specific research questions, is subjective in itself. In addition to the desire to add knowledge in this specific area, there are interest, concern and curiosity.

Identification of problems in the research

Lack of time, security matters, economic and political reasons in Israel raised in the author’s mind the apprehension that there would be a problem getting approval for the research on the one hand, and receiving low collaboration and a low rate of response on the other hand. To overcome these difficulties, the author shared her research and her purposes with the rehabilitation service manager face-to-face and requested approval for the research. This approval was not given in a written document.

There were two reasons why children were not included in the study; the first and main reason was the will of the author to explore the issue from the point of view of the parents and the staff only. The second reason was the difficulty of getting approval when children were involved; it required written approval from the parents, who have to agree that their child can participate in the research.

To overcome the low rate of response in the study, the author contacted key members, principals, inspectors and secretaries, by fax, phone and letter using suggestions and recommendations found in the literature whilst remaining well aware of the ethical issues.
The Strengths and Contributions of the Study

This study was a pioneer in the issue of parental involvement. It did not focus solely on the areas and levels of involvement, but included the initiation, the benefits, the barriers and the reasons for involvement, in order to shed light on parental involvement in the Miftanim from various points which are part of the whole issue.

The contributions of this study are both immediate and future; the immediate contribution was the personal touch of the author with the parents, and especially with the staff in the issue of parental involvement. They reported that being a participant in the survey and answering questions in the interview made them think of involvement with more attention and in a deeper way than before. This awareness will not lead for sure the staff to take additional steps in the future in the issue of involvement, thus the contribution is immediate and might be only a vanish episode.

The future contribution will be made by the author, who intends to publish an abstract of the research in the Miftanim paper and to give a lecture at the Miftanim rally, which takes place once a year and includes all the staff in the Miftanim in Israel. The intention is to expose the issue and to stimulate the staff to consider it with more attention and to suggest training courses to set-up differential programmes in parental involvement.

Recommendations

The findings and the knowledge acquired in this study present involvement in the Miftanim in various issues. What can be done with this knowledge is a natural question, since a research aimed to seek for answers. The following recommendations aim to pave the way for future research and to employ this knowledge to better understand the parental involvement process, to make it more appropriate to the specific population and to up-grade it.

The gaps found between the definitions of “involvement”, the active involvement in the Miftanim and the future involvement reinforce the suggestion that setting-up programmes and workshops is vital in order to reorganise the issue of involvement by differential involvement.
As parental involvement is multi-faceted it requires a different definition by each Miftan; the Miftanim have to set-up a general programme of parental involvement, which includes the areas and levels of parental involvement, to define parental involvement according to the nature of the involvement, which is not uniform but unique, based on the needs and the capability of the contributions of the parents and the staff.

Each Miftan has to develop this archetype to a unique involvement, according to the nature of involvement required. Moreover, based on this unique involvement, parental involvement has to be differential based on each child, each parent and each member of staff, according to their needs, since one involvement can be appropriate to one group of stakeholder but not to others.

Models and suggestions are not intended to be implemented as they are because each involvement is influenced by variables, but to be used to set–up an involvement which aims to better answer the needs of the stakeholders. Each Miftan has to convert the theory of the differential involvement to practice, to translate the practice to activities which can be applied by the parents and the staff, according to their individual plan.

Figure 6.1 presents the up-grade of parental involvement in the Miftanim (based on Hornby, 2000)
Figure 6.1: Parental involvement in the Miftanim

- **Contributions**
  - (parents and staff)

  - **Policy**
  - **Resource**
  - **Collaboration**
  - **Information**

  - **General involvement**
    - Understanding the various issues in involvement

  - **Support**
  - **Education**
  - **Liaison**
  - **Communication**

  - **Needs**
  - (parents and staff)

  - **Archetype**
    - Each Miftan

  - **Differential Involvement**
    - Each child, parent, staff
Each involvement programme has to be based on education and support of the parents in the first place, in order to build the rest of the areas and the levels. Understanding the meaning of parental involvement, being aware of the variables which influence the involvement, including the results of the involvement, is vital. There is a natural tendency to think that, since the involvement is mostly in the parameters where parents and teachers’ time and expertise are required, it would be logical to recommend that the staff focus on them in the first place. However, as a second thought, the author would recommend the focus be on the education and support parameters in the first place. There is a need to use and develop involvement where the parents are strengthened and in parallel, to strengthen the parents where they need more expertise. The issue of time is a result of money and could be solved by giving rewards to the staff and by raising the issue of involvement as an investigation of the child, to explain and lead the parents to understand the importance of this time and that this activity is of the greatest importance.

**Future researches**

This study focused on the Miftanim in the Jewish sector and did not include the non-Jewish, two Arabic Miftanim and one Druze Miftan, since there is a clear difference between the cultures and this study did not refer to a multi-cultural population but explored one culture only. A second reason not to include the Arabic sector was the security aspect as there were riots in some villages during the period of the study. The author recommends that parental involvement in this sector be explored and compared to the present study. An additional recommended research is that parental involvement be explored from the point of view of the child in regard to the benefits, the barriers, the will of the child and his expectations, in order to compare with the present study and add this knowledge to the programmes in the training courses.

**Reflections**

Beyond the advantage of collecting data from the survey and the case studies in order to research evidence from different and several points of view (Johnson, 1994), and to understand the phenomenon from different aspects (Bryman, 1988), conducting interviews in the case studies was an exceptional opportunity for the author “to touch”, personally, the parents and the staff. This experience was positive, interesting and the most exciting part of the research, getting to know parents and staff from Miftanim other
than the author’s own. The personal touch revealed thoughts, feelings, anger, appreciation, hope, difficulties and some secrets. After the author informed interviewees that she had been a homeroom teacher in a Miftan for 22 years, she felt that most of them welcomed her, were warmer, talked more honestly and frankly and were more cooperative. This conclusion is based on the body language; they sat more openly, smiled and transmitted their positive feelings towards the interview and the fact that they could contribute to the research and be heard.

Contrary to the positive feeling of the interviews, the survey was frustrating and disappointing. This resulted from the low cooperation of the participants and people who, by various ways, evaded or opposed participation in the research, or did not help where they could. The process of distributing the questionnaires and the need to request again and again, in various ways, that the participants complete the questionnaire was, in a way, a great strain. The waiting time and the additional requests for approval, requesting the Miftanim to participate, more than once, and the race to receive back the completed questionnaires was exhausting; it made the author feel a sort of nagger, especially because she did not want to push too much and put pressure on the participants. The satisfaction of the second phase of the research, which included the interviews, balanced the heavy feelings of the first phase, and led the author to more optimism and less stress, especially when the data were gathered.

In this study the author chose to explore and focus on only some of the many questions in the issue of parental involvement. To better answer these questions, to understand the phenomenon and to get conclusions, she used the survey and the case studies. Although the study led to answers, conclusions and recommendations, new questions arose during the research process.

**The rewards of the study**

Beyond the fact that this study contributed to the knowledge of parental involvement in the academic domain and will contribute in the future by promoting the issue and suggesting the setting up of training courses, the author benefited from this study. The experiences in writing the thesis, although stressful and frustrating, were also interesting, challenging, amazing and great intellectual efforts were made. The personal human experiences were even stronger; the personal contact with colleagues in the summer
school, as well as personal experiences, and the personal contact with the participants in
the research. The latter was the summit of this very personal experience.

An additional reward from this study was making the author, as a teacher and as a parent,
familiar with issues, dilemmas and problems in parental involvement that were not in her
professional and personal repertoire.

Summary
This study aimed to seek answers to questions dealing with the relationships between the
parents/families and the staff in the Miftan. Relationships include involvement of the
parents and encompass associated issues which influence and have a direct effect on the
nature of the involvement, such as barriers, reasons and benefits. This study shed light on
questions that arose and suggested various ways to overcome difficulties and barriers on
the one hand; it raised additional questions on the other hand.

This study presented the involvement of the parents in various ways; the main conclusion
regarding the question of involvement as positive or negative has no one definite
conclusion. Moreover, the recommendation is to refer to involvement from a mindful
consideration of the various angles and approaches to the issue. This study is a first
swallow in the issue of the relationships of the parents in the Miftanim, aimed to be
followed by additional researchers, but mostly aimed at being as a spring gushing forth,
continuing and developing this issue.

The main recommendation of this study is that it is vital that both parents and staff
acquire knowledge in the issue of parental involvement in order to set-up and build
differential involvement which aims to give the best answers to this complicated issue.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1

MIFTAN PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Principal
One of the requirements of my doctoral studies is the submission of a questionnaire about the attitude of parents and the Miftan staff toward the Miftan.

I would be very grateful if you would fill in this questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED ONLY FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Michal Saad

Personal details

Name (not necessary)____________________
1. Gender____________________
2. Age____________________
3. Education____________________________________________________
4. Period in this profession_______________________
5. Period of service in the Miftan____________________

Instructions
Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements(out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.
A. To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Parents help with organizing different events (bazaars, celebrations, sports days).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 You have talks with the parents about their personal matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Parents participate in drawing up /choosing their child’s curriculum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Parents can have talks with you only by appointment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 You have talks with parents about different matters arising between the staff and the child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Parents can have talks with you at any time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Parents help solve these problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Parents attend private talks concerning their child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 You encourage parental involvement in the Miftan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 You brief the parents on Miftan matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 You visit parents at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?</td>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The parents are the ones who initiate the involvement with you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by phone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by e-mail.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The PA is active in the Miftan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The parents participate in different events (exhibitions, performances, bazaars, trips).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Parents attend general parents-staff meetings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parents attend “open days” in the Miftan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>You have general talks with parents about different issues relating to the Miftan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Parents participate in making decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parents fundraise for the Miftan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Do you have anything else to add to this issue?--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions
Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

**B. To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Improves the child’s self-image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Improves parent’s self-image.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Improves the child’s behaviour.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Improves the child’s achievements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Improves the child’s social relationships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Improves the child’s attitude toward The principal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Improves the parent’s attitude toward the Miftan staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Involved parents serve as a pressure group on the authorities (Ministry of Education, Local Authorities) in order to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gain assistance for my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have anything else to add to this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

C. To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 Parents are uneducated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Parents might be detrimental to my professional status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Parents might be violent toward the child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Single parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Parents are unemployed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Parents might lower my self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Parents could criticise (offend) the child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Parents are caught up in their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Parents just get in the way of the professional’s work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Parents are more educated than I am.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Parents might criticize my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Parents might put pressure on me when making decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Parents might put pressure on the different authorities in order to put pressure on me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Do you have anything else to add to this issue?------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you again for your collaboration. Please insert the questionnaire in the envelope and send it to me. A stamp is not needed.
Appendix 2

SOCIAL WORKER/EDUCATIONAL COUNSELLOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Social Worker/Educational Counsellor

One of the requirements of my doctoral studies is the submission of a questionnaire about the attitude of parents and the Miftan staff toward the Miftan.

I would be very grateful if you would fill in this questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED ONLY FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Michal Saad

Personal details
Name (not necessary)____________________
1. Gender______________
2. Age ________________
3. Education________________________________________________
4. Period in this profession _____________________
5. Period of service in the Miftan____________________

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

A. To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You hold meetings with parents to offer guidance and help regarding the different authorities (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, National Insurance Institute, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You have talks with the parents about their personal matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You give current information to the parents about their child (social area, personal area and study area).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parents participate in the child’s therapeutic/rehabilitation programme.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parents can have talks with you only by appointment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>You have talks with parents about different matters which arise between the staff and the child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Parents can have talks with you any time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Parents help solve these problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parents attend private talks concerning their child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You encourage parental involvement in the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by the record/contact book</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>You visit parents at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The parents are the ones who initiate the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement with the parents by letters/circulars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement with the parents by e-mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PA is active with you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Do you have anything else to add to this issue?                           | .......................................................... |
|                                                                           | ........................................................................|

### Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

### B. To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s self-image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves parent’s self-image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s achievements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following sentences?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Improves the child’s social relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Improves the parent’s attitude toward the social worker/educational counsellor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Parents gain better insight into the staff’s work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Do you have anything else to add to this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Instructions**

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

**C. To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Parents are uneducated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Parents might be detrimental to my professional status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might be violent toward the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might lower my self-confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might criticize (offend) the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are caught up in their own personal problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents just get in the way of the professional staff’s work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are more educated than I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might criticize my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have anything else to add to this issue?---------------------------------  
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thank you again for your collaboration. Please insert the questionnaire in the envelope and send it to me. A stamp is not needed.
Appendix 3

HOMEROOM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Teacher

One of the requirements of my doctoral studies in education is the submission of a questionnaire about the attitude of parents and the Miftan staff toward the Miftan.

I would be very grateful if you could fill in this questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED ONLY FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES.

Thank you for your collaboration.

Michal Saad

Personal details
Name (not necessary)_____________________
1. Gender_________________________________
2. Age ________________________
3. Education
4. Period in this profession _____________________
5. Period of service in the Miftan_____________________

Instructions
Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.
A. To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents help in the classroom work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have talks with the parents about their personal matters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents participate in drawing up their child’s curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents help with organizing class activities (field trips, trips to exhibitions, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents participate in class activities (field trips, trips to exhibitions, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents help with preparing material for classroom work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents help solve these problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents attend private talks concerning their child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You encourage parental involvement in the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You contact the parents by the record/contact book</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You visit parents at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents are the ones who initiate the involvement with you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The involvement with the parents by letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You contact the parents by e-mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PA is active in the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have anything else to add to this issue?

---

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

B. To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28  Improves the child’s self-image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29  Improves parent’s self-image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30  Improves the child’s behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31  Improves the child’s classroom studies and achievements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32  Improves the child’s attitude toward the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s social relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s attitude toward the teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the parent’s attitude toward the teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents gain better insight into the teacher’s work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement improves teacher’s morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

C. To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Parents are uneducated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Parents might be detrimental to my status as a homeroom teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Parents might be violent toward the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Parents are unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Parents might lower my self-confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Parents could criticize (offend) the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Parents are caught up in their own personal problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Parents just get in the way of my professional work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Parents are more educated than I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Parents might criticize my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Do you have anything else to add to this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you again for your collaboration. Please insert the questionnaire in the envelope and send it to me. A stamp is not needed.
Appendix 4

VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Vocational Instructor

One of the requirements of my doctoral studies in education is the submission of a questionnaire about the attitude of parents and the Miftan staff toward the Miftan.

I would be very grateful if you could fill in this questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED ONLY FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES

Thank you for your collaboration.
Michal Saad

Personal details

Name (not necessary)______________
1. Gender______________
2. Age ________________
3. Education___________________________________________________
4. Period in this profession _____________________
5. Period of service in the Miftan______________________

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.
A. To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Parents help in the workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 You have talks with the parents about their personal matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Parents participate in drawing up their child’s work plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parents participate in drawing up their child’s rehabilitation/personal programme.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Parents help with organising workshop activities (field trips, exhibitions, trips to enterprises, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Parents participate in workshop activities (field trips, exhibitions, trips to enterprises, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Parents help to prepare material for workshop work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 You ask for parent’s help when there are problems with their child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Parents help solve these problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Parents attend private talks concerning their child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 You encourage parental involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 The involvement with the parents is made by the record/contact book</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 You visit parents at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The parents are the ones who initiate the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement with the parents is made by letters/circulars.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You contact the parents by e-mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PA is active in the workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Do you have anything else to add to this issue?--------------------------
--------------

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

B. To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s self-image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves parent’s self image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s workshop achievements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s social relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the child’s attitude toward the vocational instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the parent’s attitude toward the vocational instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents gain better insight into the vocational instructor's work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement enhances my professional work with the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement improves the vocational instructor's morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.
C. To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to involve parents in your Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents are uneducated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might be detrimental to my status as a professional instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents do not have the professional knowledge I have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might be violent toward the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are disadvantaged socio-economically</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might lower my self-confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might criticize (offend) the child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are caught up in their own personal problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents just get in the way of my professional work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are more educated than I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents might criticize my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have anything else to add to this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you again for your collaboration. Please insert the questionnaire in the envelope and send it to me. A stamp is not needed.
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PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Parent

One of the requirements of my doctoral studies in education is the submission of a questionnaire about the attitude of parents and the Miftan staff toward the Miftan.

I would be very grateful if you could fill in this questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED ONLY FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES.

Thank you for your collaboration.

Michal Saad

Personal details
Name (not necessary)_____________________
1. Gender ______________________________
2. Family Status _________________________
   A. Married         B. Divorced        C. Widowed          D. Other__________
3. Number of children at home    ___________

4. Job
   A. Yes            B. No

5. Profession owner ____________________________

6. Monthly income in relation to the economy’s average income (6000 NIL):
   A. Well below average               B. Average                   C. Above average.
   D. Well above average

7. Education________________________________

8. Are you active in the Miftan’s Parent Association ?
   A. Yes           B. No
**Instructions**

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

**A. To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 You help with classroom work (individual help for child)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 You help with preparing classroom work (placards, work sheets, work cards)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 You help with preparing material for the workshops (carpentry, locksmith’s work, hair-dressing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 You help with organizing workshop activities (bazaars, visiting enterprises, trips, exhibitions, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 You attend private talks concerning your child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 You participate in parent’s workshops in the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 You participate in preparing your child’s personal/special curriculum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>You attend private talks concerning your personal matters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>You attend parents-staff meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>You fundraise for the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You donate to the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>You help your child with homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the homeroom teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the vocational instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>You initiate the involvement with the social worker/educational counsellor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The involvement with the Miftan is made by phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The involvement with the Miftan is made by letters/circulars, record/contact book</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The involvement with the Miftan is made by e-mail (electronic mail)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parents get to know their children better therefore their involvement is helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Parents are involved because they</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do the following statements reflect reality in your Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- have a good influence on their child

22 Parents are involved because it is important for them that their child succeeds

23 You participate in making decisions in the Miftan

24 Do you have anything else to add to this issue?

Instructions

Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.

B. To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26 Improves the child’s self-image

27 Improves parents’ self-image

28 Improves the child’s social relationships
To what extent does parental involvement in the Miftan affect each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Improves the child’s behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Improves the child’s performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Improves the child’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Improves the parent’s attitude toward the Miftan’s staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Parents gain better insight into the Miftan staff’s work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Do you have anything else to add to this issue?-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions
Please circle the number which most applies to you in each of the following statements (out of four).

There is no right or wrong answer. Any answer will be welcome.
C. To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to be involved in the Miftan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent could each of the following statements be a reason for you not to be involved in the Miftan?</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miftan’s staff do not treat the parents well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents lack time to be involved with the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are not professional as the Miftan’s staff are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children are already grown-up and they are more responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children object to parental involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are busy with work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have negative recollections of their own school days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents do not understand/hardly understand Hebrew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent are not pleased that their child attends the Miftan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have anything else to add to this issue?--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you again for your collaboration. Please insert the questionnaire in the envelope and send it to me. A stamp is not needed.
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INTERVIEW – STAFF

1. How would you define parental involvement?
2. What are the areas and the issues that you are involved in with parents?
3. Who initiates the involvement and in what issue(s)?
4. What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the child, parents and on you? Is there any benefit in involvement? Is any harm caused by involvement?
5. What are your reasons for involving the parents? What is the main reason?
6. Considering the families’ profile in the Miftan, what is your attitude to parental involvement? Do you prefer to involve some families over others? Which families and why? What are you doing to reinforce your attitude?
7. Do you think that there are barriers to involvement? What are the barriers to parental involvement? What is the main barrier?
8. What kind of involvement do you wish to have in the Miftan?
9. Do you have any questions or anything else to add on this issue?
Appendix 7

INTERVIEW- PARENTS

1. How would you define parental involvement?

2. What are the areas and the issues that you are involved in with the Miftan?

3. Who initiates the involvement and in what issue(s)?

4. What is/are the effect(s) of parental involvement on the child, parents and staff? Is there any benefit in involvement? Is any harm caused by involvement?

5. What are the reasons that you are involved with the Miftan? What is the main reason?

6. What is the staff’s attitude toward your involvement?

7. Do you think that there are barriers to involvement? What are the barriers to parental involvement? What is the main barrier?

8. What kind of involvement do you wish to have in the Miftan?

9. Do you have any questions or anything else to add on this issue?
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LETTER 1

Jerusalem, 14 September, 1999

To Mrs. Michal Saad

Topic: Parameters for obtaining approval for research, M.A and Doctorate in the Service

As a result of many requests by the research department and directly by managers in the Service, the parameters required are as follows:

1. The full research proposal.
2. The research design.
3. The questionnaires.
4. The interviews.
5. An approval of the research by the University and a letter from the University stating the name of the academic supervisor for the study.
6. A letter attesting to confidentiality.
7. An undertaking to send a copy of the thesis to the Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager.
8. An approval from the Ministry of Education.

With Greetings

Y.K Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager
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LETTER 2

Saad Michal
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia 7-4-2000
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75

Mrs. Y.K Shalom

I would like to thank you for your sympathy and your will to assist me in the research. I enclose the documents as requested and the handbook with the research on the Miftanim. It was helpful.

With my greetings

Saad Michal
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LETTER 3

State of Israel
Ministry of Education
Main Scientist Office

To Mrs. Michal Saad
Hello (Shalom)

To gain approval for your research you will have to submit the following documents:

1. The full research proposal.
2. The research design.
3. Names and location of the Miftanim.
4. The researcher’s CV.
5. Final versions of the questionnaires.
6. Final versions of the interviews.
7. An approval of the research by the University and a letter from the University stating the name of the academic supervisor for the study.

Good Luck

T. H
Organizer Research- Main Scientist Office
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LETTER 4

State of Israel
Ministry of Education
Main Scientist Office

25 March, 2002
292- 10.32

To the District Principals

Hello (Shalom)

Topic: Research exploring the relationships between the parents and the staff in the Miftanim

Mrs. Michal Saad has made a request to perform the above research in the course of her PHD studies with the University of Leicester- England.

The purpose of the research is to explore the relationships between the parents and the staff in the Miftanim, and to examine the pattern of involvement of the parents in these institutions.

In the first phase of the research, the researcher intends to give questionnaires on this issue to the staff (homeroom teachers, vocational instructors, social workers, educational counsellors and principals) in the Jewish sector, and to the parents. In the second phase of the research, the researcher intends to interview a number of the staff and the parents who participated in the first phase of the research.

To your knowledge, the office does not have any objection to the performance of the research in the Miftanim institutions, which are supervised by the secular State only, under the conditions as followed:
1) Entrance to the institution will be made with the principal’s permission and with advance coordination;
2) The interviews with the staff will be according the relevant requirements (sections 62.431 – 62.433);
3) The research will not include the institution in which the researcher is working.

In order to remove any doubt, this letter does not represent the Main Scientist Office opinion about the quality of the research.

The researcher has to introduce this letter to the principal on entrance to the Miftanim.

With Greetings
R. O.
Control and Follow-up Organizer

Cc: Mrs. Michal Saad
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LETTER 5

State of Israel
Ministry of Education
Main Scientist Office

22 August, 2002
873- 10.32

To the District Principals
Hello (Shalom),

Topic: Research exploring the relationships between the parents and the staff in the Miftanim
Reference: our letter dated Thursday 25 March 2002

Mrs. Michal Saad was given approval to perform the above research in the present scholastic year in schools which are supervised by the secular and the religious State (see the enclosed letters). As a result of her request to continue to perform this research in the next scholastic year, and with her promise that there will not be any change in the layout of the research and the tools, I would like to announce as follows:

We do not have any objection to the performance of the research in the next scholastic year in the Miftanim institutions which are supervised by the secular and the religious State, under the conditions mentioned in our previous letter on this issue.

With Greetings
R. O.
Control and Follow-up Organizer

Cc: Mrs. Michal Saad
**Appendix 12**

**RESEARCH DIARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Personal meeting with the youth rehabilitation services manager. (in Jerusalem) | 5/4/2000 | a. To get approval in principle for the research.  
b. To get information about the Miftanim, (research, studies, policy, articles).  
c. To get the Miftanim list (number of Miftanim, locations, principals and secretaries’ names and phone numbers). |
<p>| Piloting the questionnaires                                         | 21-24/2/02 | To receive constructive and frank feedback.                                                                                           |
| Requesting approval from the Ministry of Education                  |          | To gain approval for the research.                                                                                                   |
| Receiving approval (1)                                               | 25/3/02  | In order to start the research                                                                                                       |
| Contacting the principals and secretaries by phone                  | 4-7/3/02 | In order to get their approval to participate in the survey                                                                         |
| Sending the packages to the Miftanim                                | 8/4/02  | Starting the survey in order to gather quantitative data                                                                               |
| Letters/faxes to the secretaries/principals                         | 25/4/02  | In order to remind and encourage the participants to complete the questionnaires                                                      |
| 28/4/02                                                             |          |                                                                                                                                        |
| Additional letter to the Ministry of Education                       | 25/4/02  | To gain approval for the religious sector additionally.                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters to the inspectors in the religious sector</td>
<td>1/5/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20/5/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/6/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/6/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving approval (2)</td>
<td>20/5/02</td>
<td>In order to include the religious sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending approval to the Miftanim in the religious sector</td>
<td>21/5/02</td>
<td>In order to continue the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls to the social workers</td>
<td>9/6/02</td>
<td>To encourage the parents to complete the questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting the interviews</td>
<td>11-19/6/02</td>
<td>To receive constructive and frank feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faxes to the secretaries</td>
<td>18/6/02</td>
<td>In order to remind and encourage the participants to complete the questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending additional packages</td>
<td>19/6/02</td>
<td>According to the secretaries request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional distribution of questionnaires during an in-service course</td>
<td>16/6/02</td>
<td>To increase the number of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing and collecting documents</td>
<td>25/6-25/9/02</td>
<td>Gathering qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for extension of the approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>In order to continue the research in the second scholastic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving approval (3)</td>
<td>22/8/02</td>
<td>In order to interview two additional participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of data gathering process</td>
<td>25/9/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LETTER 6

Saad Michal
Shevil Haerez I Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75

5/4/2002

To principal----------------------------- Hello (Shalom)

Performance of research in the Miftanim

For my doctoral study I chose the issue of relationships between the families and the staff in the Miftanim. This issue is close to me as I have been a homeroom teacher in Accre Miftan for 22 years.

The research covers the Miftanim in the Jewish sector.

In order to perform this research, approvals were given by Mrs Y.K., the Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager, and by the Ministry of Education (a copy of the Ministry of Education approval is enclosed).

I would be very grateful if you could fill in the questionnaire and send it back to me as soon as possible in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope.
I am sure that your help and your cooperation will add valuable and important information to the Miftanim.

With my greetings
Saad Michal

Cc: Mrs. Y.K. Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager.
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LETTER 7

Saad Michal 5/4/2002
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75

To Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager, Mrs Y.K
Hello (Shalom)

As a result of our conversation which took place in Accre Miftan, I acknowledge your
request that a copy of my letters requesting participation in the research are sent to you
as well.

I am sending you the principal’s letter and the Ministry of Education approval.
Thank you for your cooperation and your assistance.

With my greetings
Saad Michal
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LETTER 8

Saad Michal 5/4/2002
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75

To -------------------------- Hello (Shalom)

Performance of research in the Miftanim

As a result of our earlier discussion with regard to the research, I enclose the questionnaires.

Please distribute the questionnaires according to the different participants.

I would be obliged if you could remind and encourage participants to complete it. It will take a short time. The questionnaire should then be returned in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope. Thanks a lot.

Approvals from the Youth Rehabilitation Services Manager and from the Ministry of Education were given.

The following documents are enclosed:

1) A letter to the principal.
2) A copy of the Ministry of Education approval.
3) Questionnaires for the principal, social worker/educational counsellor, vocational instructors, homeroom teachers and PA.
4) A personal letter for the social worker.
5) Stamped-addressed envelopes according to the number of questionnaires.
Thank you very much for your cooperation

With my greetings

Saad Michal
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LETTER 9

5/4/2002

To my colleagues - Social workers in the Miftanim

--------------------------- Hello (Shalom)

Michal Saad, who is a veteran homeroom teacher in Accre Miftan, has gained approval to perform a research in the Miftanim. The subject of her research in her PHD studies is the relationship between the families and the staff in the Miftanim. I would be grateful if you could complete your questionnaire and give the parents’ questionnaires to the PA. If there is no PA, please give the questionnaires to four parents and, if help is required, please help them to complete the questionnaires and to send them to Michal using the stamped-addressed envelopes.

Thanks a lot for your cooperation

O.N. Social worker Accre Miftan
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FAX 1

Saad Michal  
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia  
22327  
Phone/Fax- 049927553  
Mobile- 058-35-18-75  

25/4/2002

To ---------------------------------- Hello

As a result of our chat, you answered positively to my request to participate in the research.

I sent you the material and would like to remind you to assist me in this research, which is important for me and for the Miftanim families as well.

Please complete the questionnaires and send them to me in the stamped-addressed envelopes.

With greetings and thanks for your cooperation

Saad Michal
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LETTER 10

Saad Michal 25/4/2002
Shevil Haerez I Naharya
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75

To the Main Scientist Office
Hello (Shalom)

In my studies for my PHD degree I performed a research in the Miftanim in the Jewish sector.

I sent you the documents as required, among them the Miftanim’s names and locations which included the religious sector.

I received the requested approval but, maybe because of a misunderstanding, it was limited to the secular sector only. As a result, the Miftanim in the religious sector refuse to participate.

Since Mrs. Tami Halili is on holiday, my request is to solve this problem as soon as possible. The research has started and I am now unable to proceed.

Please send me the appropriate approval in order to continue the research.
The requested documents are in my file at your offices.

With Greetings
Saad Michal
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LETTER 11

State of Israel
Ministry of Education
Administration of the Religious Education

May 20, 2002
See reference- 4-5

To Mrs. T.H, Organizer Research - Main Scientist Office
Hello (Shalom)

Topic: Research exploring the relationship between the parents and the staff in the Miftanim.

Mrs. Michal Saad’s request to perform the above research in the religious sector’s institutions was checked and approved by us.

We request that the researchers, in their visits in the schools, will applied the institutions’ behaviour, in regard to the appearance in the religious sector.

With Greetings
Dr N. E.
Head of Religious Education Deputy

Cc: Mrs R. A, Planning, control and follow-up Organizer in the religious sector

________________________________________
Shefatia Street 27, B building, 91911
Phone number: 02-5604106/7  Fax: 02-560118
angelasa@education.gov.il
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FAX 2
(sent 1/5/02)

Saad Michal
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75
www.saadmich@netvision.net.il

Topic: performance of a research in the Miftanim

To Dr S.A.G - Shalom

In my doctoral studies I am performing a research which includes the Miftanim in the Jewish sector. The research examines the relationship between the parents and the Miftanim staff.

I received the requested approvals from the Youth Rehabilitation Services manager and from the Ministry of Education. The Youth Rehabilitation Services do not supply written approval, only an oral approval: for this reason Mrs Y.K advised me to copy the principals’ letters to her, in order to acknowledge to them the fact that approval has been obtained.

I enclose a copy of the written approval from the Ministry of Education and the letter to the principals.

With greetings
Saad Michal
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FAX 3
(sent 20/5/02)

Saad Michal
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75
www.saadmich@netvision.net.il

To Mr. Y.D Shalom

I am writing you as a result of my conversation with Dr S. A.G. on the issue of my research in the Miftanim.

I am sending you the written approval in order to encourage the staff in your area to participate in the research.

Thanks and with my greetings
Saad Michal
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FAX 4
(sent 9/6/02)

Saad Michal
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75
www.saadmich@netvision.net.il

To Mr. Y.D Shalom

As a result of our phone chat in which you confirmed your wish to assist me in my research, I request your help in Miftan x. The principal, Mrs. x has said that they will not participate in the research until they receive your approval.

Thank you very much for your intention to help me, especially when the response is very poor.

You can send the copy of the approval to my address or fax number.

With my greetings
Saad Michal
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FAX 5
(sent 2/6/02)

Saad Michal
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75
www.saadmich@netvision.net.il

To Mr. Y.D Shalom

As a result of our phone chat, the following Miftanim are the ones that need to be encouraged:

1. Miftan x
2. Miftan x
3. Miftan x
4. Miftan x
5. Miftan x

With my greetings and many thanks
Saad Michal
Appendix 24

FAX 6
(sent 28/4/02)

Saad Michal
Shevil Haerez 1 Naharyia
22327
Phone/Fax- 049927553
Mobile- 058-35-18-75

To ----------------- Shalom

I would like to thank you very much for your participation in the survey.

My request is for those who did not complete the questionnaire to help me in this research, which is not only important to me personally, but to the family of the Miftanim in the country.

Thank you for your cooperation

With my greetings
Saad Michal
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THANKS LETTER 1

October 2002

I would like to thank you very much for your participation in and your contribution to the research into the issue of the relationship between the parents and the Miftanim.

I wish the staff, the parents and the children a good, fruitful and healthy year.

Saad Michal
Appendix 26

THANKS LETTER 2

Hello (Shalom)

I would like to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your participation in and your contribution to the research.

I enclose your written interview in order to give you the opportunity to read it again, to approve it or to change/add to it, as you wish.

Please return the interview, with your comments, in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope.

No personal names, no personal or identifying details and no locations will be revealed in the study. The information given is confidential, for the research purpose only,

With my greetings and thanks again

Saad Michal
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REMOVAL LETTER

Miftan Logo

Dear parents

We have to inform you that as a result of The pedagogic meeting decided to remove from to.

Miftan’s management
Appendix 28

PERSONAL DETAILS – STUDENT

Miftan Logo

Personal Details - Student

Family name -----------------------------  First name -----------------------------
ID ----------------------------------  Date of birth -----------------------------
Gender --------State of birth--------  Date of Alia -----------------------------
Address ------------------------------  Phone number ---------------------------
Father’s name ------------------------  Mother’s name ------------------------
Father’s ID --------------------------  Mother’s ID --------------------------
Father’s work ------------------------  Mother’s work ------------------------
Phone number in work ----------------  Phone number in work ----------------
Father’s education -------------------  Mother’s education -------------------
State of birth -----------------------  State of birth -----------------------
Date of Alia -------------------------  Date of Alia -------------------------
Number of siblings -------------------
Latest school ------------------------  Contact person ------------------------

I approve/do not approve of the participation of my son/daughter ------------------ in the following activities: army youth, sport, trips, horse riding or/and any other activity that requires any physical effort.

My son/daughter takes/does not take medicine -------------------------------

Parent’s signature -------------------------------
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SECRECY RENOUNCEMENT

Miftan Logo

I, whose signature appears on this document, give you unlimited permission to get/or to give by heart or written information - without any exception, to any person, body and/or institution in regard to my son/daughter ---------------- ID------------------------------------ when it is required, according to your absolute opinion in your professional work.

Date -------------------------------
Teacher name ---------------------------------------
ID-------------------------------------------
Signature -----------------------------------

Parent’s signature, prepared and confirmed by -------------------------------
Signature ---------------------------------------------
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TRIP CIRCULAR

Miftan Logo

To the parents of -----------------------------

On (date)---------------------- we are going on a trip/event to -----------------------.
The trip will start at ----------------------------- to ----------------------------- approximately.

List of things to bring
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Parent’s signature -----------------------------------------------

Staff Miftan
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INVITATION TO PARENTS’ DAY

Miftan Logo

Parents - teachers meetings will be held on --------------------- at---------------------
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- The purpose is
to have conversation with the staff. Your presence is vital since it is important.

Hope to see you

With greetings
Miftan Principal
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HOME VISIT REPORT

Date of visit-----------------
Child’s name------------------------------------Father’s name-------------------------------------
Visitor’s name----------------------------------Visitor’s role---------------------------------------
Purpose of the visit------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Address-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Does the family know about the visit in advance? Yes/ No
1) The present persons at home-----------------------------------------------------------
2) The language----------------------------- Is there a need of translation  Yes/No
3) Physical conditions, crowding, cleanliness and relevant notes------------------------
5) The impression from other persons present at home------------------------------------
6) The attitude of the parents and the family toward the trainee and other children---
7) The atmosphere at home--------------------------------------------------------------------
8) The attitude toward the Miftan and the willingness to cooperate----------------------
9) The content of the conversation------------------------------------------------------------
10) Issues which need additional attention-----------------------------------------------------

Signature----------------------------------
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### INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Miftan</th>
<th>Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teacher</td>
<td>25-6-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>25-6-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>25-6-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>25-6-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational instructor</td>
<td>25-6-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>3-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational instructor</td>
<td>3-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational instructor</td>
<td>4-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>7-7-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teacher</td>
<td>7-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teacher</td>
<td>8-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>8-7-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>8-7-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>9-7-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teacher</td>
<td>9-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>27-7-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational instructor</td>
<td>21-8-02</td>
<td>Miftan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational counsellor</td>
<td>18-9-02</td>
<td>In a coffee bar in a Mall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>25-9-02</td>
<td>Parent’s home</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>