Preliminary communication
https://doi.org/10.32903/zs.66.2.4
UDK 37.064.1

EFFECTS OF APPLICATION OF EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT ON ASSISTANCE TO CHILDREN IN SCHOOL EDUCATION

Nusreta Omerdić
Faculty of Education, University of Travnik
Hazim Selimović
Faculty of Education, University of Travnik

Abstract

The future upbringing and education is based on the successful and quality building of the partnership between family and the school in which the child is in the centre. Collaboration represents a joint action and negotiation aimed at finding solutions, or a new, common starting point. Inclusion of parents in the life and work of the school is one of the most important factors that influence the success of a child. One way to involve parents is to train them to help children in school-based learning through school-based programmes. Because of the great importance of parental help, it was important to explore how this help could be more effective. The aim of the research is to determine the effects of experimental treatment on children in school learning. The sample of respondents consists of 96 parents of pupils of the primary school "Turbe" Central Bosnia Canton. Out of the total number of subjects, 49 make the experimental group and 47 respondents are in the control group. The experimental group was involved in an experimental program aimed at training parents to help children with school learning. The results of the research have shown that experimental treatment positively affects the help of parents to children in school learning. Workshops as a way of working with parents proved to be effective in both genders (male, female) of respondents, but also with parents with different levels of education as well as different working status.

Keywords: competencies, communication, collaboration, family, teachers.

INTRODUCTION

The partnership between parents and school is very important for school achievement of students. Based on research by Epstein et al. (2002) a low level of involvement of parents in the life and work of the school and inequality between parents and teachers is identified. However, due to the increased demands of the school to prepare students for different occupations and trainings, new theories and new practices, there is a need for families and schools to work together. In educational practice, teachers are not open to new models of family and school partnership. New knowledge and actions are needed from all participants. Studies by teachers and parents indicate that schools must plan partnership programmes that will allow families to participate in each school year in the education of their children. Parents also need to take on more responsibilities, communicate with their children, teachers, other staff and other parents in order to understand and support their children as learners. Family and school partnerships are a sustainable and essential way to increase opportunities and support for all students in order to improve their learning and progress. School pedagogues and psychologists play an important role, which should foster family and school partnerships through family cooperation with school. Teachers and coworkers should be persistent in working with young people and families living in challenging situations, thus encouraging the process of family partnership (Christenson, 2004).

Family is an irreplaceable form of association and gathering in which children and adults find a necessary refuge and a permanent source of emotional, social and material security, deeply imbued with culture, with which they will further enter into relationships (Pašalić-Kreso, 2004).

Ćatić (2005) points out that the cooperation of school with family should be programmed every school year. Parents' schools should be organized in schools, which have shown good results in many countries. Parents are no longer satisfied with mere formalistic reports on their children's grades. They want to learn how to help their children in particular subjects, they want to hear more about educational methods that they themselves can apply in the family.

The way in which parents provide instruction to their children significantly influences the formation of their metacognition (Suzić, 2005).

Sunko (2008) points out the need for parents to be raised and educated for quality parenting. The knowledge and skills needed for quality parenting are the basis of lifelong learning. As a solution, the author lists pedagogical workshops through which parents are educated for parenting, resulting in a quality adult-child relationship.

School and family share responsibility for the socialization and education of the child. One of the key factors in achieving common goals and coordinating practice is involving parents in school life, activities and decision making. Parental involvement can also be an important predictor of child's school success. By analyzing legal acts and other documents, we came to the conclusion that in most of the countries of Southeastern Europe, there are bodies, at the school level, consisting of parents (school boards, parents 'councils), but they are not represented at the level above the school participation of parents (Kovač-Cerović et al., 2010).

Parents can play a significant role in children's school success, depending on how actively they are involved in their schooling. Parents can help children master certain material, provide them with instructions or additional activities to improve their knowledge (Jacob, 2010).

Changes occurring in society create pressure on schools to assume a great deal of responsibility in developing children’s characteristics to function as a successful community member. In order for the school to fulfill its task it is necessary to help and cooperate with the family because the school can not solve all social problems alone or be a quality family replacement (Frýdková, 2013).

Despite the rapid social changes, the family-school relationship is slowly changing. It is still dominated by the view that the school is the main and responsible part of the education and upbringing of children, and parents will be involved when needed. Here it is suggested that parents either do not want or do not know how to cooperate with other forms of cooperation. In order to develop the partnership between the school and the family, it is necessary to work on raising the rights of parents as well as pointing to models of quality involvement in the work of the school, thus improving the educational activity of the school (Lenard, 2015).

Varunek (2016) also points out that the involvement of parents in the life and work of the school is an important predictor of school success of children. Schools should design and implement an effective model for inclusion of parents in order to raise the level of student achievement.

The terms cooperation and partnership were used in the paper. We believe that this is justified, considering that a partnership between the family and the school is developed through successful cooperation. Research conducted in the 1980s in the United States, Canada and Western European countries has shown that building partnerships between parents and schools gives particularly good results in children who have difficulty monitoring and coping with school obligations, who have certain social or emotional problems, who have certain

health problems, who belong to the category of children with special needs (talented children or those who lag behind in development), and who belong to a minority group (national, religious, linguistic) (Pašalić-Kreso, 2004).

Raising the level of student success is the motive for this research. The goal is to determine the impact of experimental treatment on the help of children in school-based learning carried out in the experimental parent group. The second goal is to examine the effectiveness of experimental treatment for respondents of different gender. The third is the examining of the effectiveness of experimental treatment on a different level of parents' education. The fourth is the examining of the effectiveness of experimental treatment on respondents with different working status.

Based on the goals set, the following hypotheses are defined:

Experimental treatment will have a positive impact on parents in helping children in school learning. Experimental treatment is expected to have an impact on both, fathers and mothers of students. Experimental treatment is expected to have a positive impact on parents of all levels of education. Experimental treatment is also expected to have a positive impact on parents with different working status.

METHODS

Procedure

In this research, an experiment with parallel groups was used, one of which was experimental (a group that was subjected to experimental treatment), and the other, control group (not subjected to experiment). Before the experiment, we performed the equalization of groups of respondents. Equalization of groups of respondents was made on the basis of the results of the questionnaire that referred to two elements of parental assistance to children in schooling.

After equalization of the groups, we approached the experimental treatment, which is the performance of workshops with an experimental group of respondents. The workshops were conducted during the second semester of the school year 2016/2017 at the Primary School "Turbe." The planned activities were implemented through 10 workshops, two workshops per month. We received the consent of the competent ministry for conducting the research. The aim of the workshops was to train parents to help children in learning. Through the workshops, we were practicing various activities through which parents can help children in school activities, but also monitor the progress of students.

In the last workshops, respondents re-filled the questionnaire to collect the final self-assessment of the parents of the experimental group.

Sample

The sample of respondents consisted of 96 parents of students of lower grades of the primary school "Turbe." Out of the total number of examinees, 49 (51.00%) parents were experimental group and 47 (49.00%) were in control group. By gender, 39 (40.60%) were male and 57 (59.40%) female respondents. Considering the age, we had 3 (3.10%) respondents from 25-30 years, 29 (30.20%) respondents aged 31-35, 35 (36.50%) respondents from 36- 40 years, 23 (24,00%) of respondents aged 41-50 and 6 (6,20%) of respondents were over 50 years of age. When it comes to the highest achieved level of education, 7 (7,30%) of parents with completed primary school were involved, 55 (57,30%) of parents with completed secondary school, 12 (12,50%) had ahigher education degree, 19 (19.80%) parents had a university degree and 3

(3.10%) parents had a master's or a doctorate. According to the working status, 70 (72,90%) were employed parents, 14 (14,60%) of them were unemployed, 6 (6,20%) of them were retired and 6 (6,20%) of them are housewives (in this study, housewives are exclusively female respondents with completed primary school and no current employment intention).

Instruments

For the purpose of the research we used the questionnaire RID (Parental instruction for children) taken from the Pedagogy for the XXI century (Suzić 2005, page 909), which we modified and adapted for the needs of our research.

Roditeljska instrukcija djeci (Parental instruction for children) (RID) is an instrument that uses the Likert type estimation scale, which consists of a five-step list of possible answers, two levels of agreement, one neutral and two disagreements. Respondents (parents) expressed their degree of agreement, neutrality and disagreement with these claims through this scale. At the beginning of the instrument there is a brief introduction of the respondent with the subject and purpose of the research. The first group of questions is intended to collect basic sociodemographic data on parents and children involved in the research: gender, age, educational level, working status, number of children in family and material income. Then follows the way of responding to the set of claims.

The respondents were filling in the instrument by marking the level of their agreement on the claims read by the testator. Parent Instruction for Children (RID) has 5 subtests: the metacognitive context of the instruction (6 items), the reduction of complexity of tasks (6 items), emotional support for children (6 items), monitoring the progress of children (6 items), development of cooperation with school (6 items). For the purpose of our research, we used two subscales, such as: reducing the complexity of tasks and monitoring the progress of children. The reliability of the instrument was determined by the Alpha-cronbach coefficient ($\alpha = 0,84$).

Results

We examined the effect of experimental treatment to help children in school learning by comparing the results of initial and final surveys in the experimental and control group.

The help to children in school learning is a doctoral dissertation project, and for the needs of this paper we examined the effects of experimental treatment through two subscales, namely, the Reducing the complexity of tasks (Claims 1-6) and Monitoring the progress of children (Claims 7-12). In Table 1, the results presented are the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation for each of the claims in the initial and final survey.

In order to determine the effect of our workshops on parental assistance to children, a t-test was used as a parametric test by which we determined the differences between the initial and final surveys both in the experimental and in the control group. We used the parametric tests because via Kolmogor-Smirnov test we established that the distribution results do not deviate significantly from the normal curve, so they meet the criteria of normal distribution.

In the control group at the initial survey we had ($KS = 0.083$; $p = 0.20$); and at the final ($KS = 0.089$, $p = 0.20$). In the experimental group at the initial survey we had ($KS = 0.097$; $p = 0.20$); and at the final ($KS = 0.138$; $p = 0.02$). Considering the observed deviation of results in the final survey of the experimental group, we checked the values of Skewness and Kurtosis as a measure for checking the deviation of the empirical from the normal distribution. The value of $Sk = -0.623$ suggested that we had a mild asymmetry with negative prognosis that goes in the direction of a more positive assessment of the parents about the impact of experimental

treatment on helping children in school learning. The value of Ku = -0.154 indicates a platicultural distribution. Findings of Skewness and Kurtosis say that this is a mild asymmetry and moderate flattening, which gives us the opportunity to use parametric tests in the field of inferential statistics.

In order to examine the effects of experimental treatment, before applying it, we examined whether the control and experimental group were unified. The result of Mann-Whitney U test of (U = 982.500 from = -1.241; p = 0.22 in the case of a non-parametric test and t = 1.453; p = 0.15 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the experimental and control group, therefore the groups are unified and the application of experimental treatment can be accessed.

Research findings in Table 1 show that the value of the arithmetic mean in the control group of the initial survey ranges from 2.68 to the first claim: *Do you teach the child to split the unit into small parts* up to 3.62 for claim number ten: *Do you reinforce the instructions when you see that they are insufficient.* The results show that parents sometimes help children in school learning.

In the final survey, the values of the arithmetic mean range from 2.83 to 3.77, which confirms that there has been a slight shift in parental help to children in school learning.

The values of t-test and level of significance indicate that there is no statistically significant improvement of parental help to children between initial and final testing.

The results for the experimental group show in the initial survey that the value of the arithmetic mean ranges from 2.65 for the claim: *Have you tried the technique of drawing, acting, singing, games, and so on while processing the curricula units* up to 3.80 for the claim*: Do you know how to evaluate the child, provide him with feedback about the curricula units processed.* Based on the results, it can be concluded that parents in an experimental group sometimes play half important role in helping children in schooling.

The findings of the final survey show that the values of the arithmetic means increased from the lowest 3.80 for the claim six up to 4.59 for the claim: *Does the child regularly report both good and bad grades?* Based on a detailed analysis, there has been significant progress in parental assistance, in all twelve claims. The value of the t-test for all claims shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the initial and final surveys in the experimental group, which means that the effect of experimental treatment was recorded.

Table 1. Results of descriptive and inferential statistics for experimental and control groups

R. Nu.	Claim (Q)	Control Group					Experimental group			
			M	SD	t-test	p	M	SD	t-test	p
1.	Do you teach the child to split the unit into small parts?	I	2.68	1.09	-1.478	0.15	3.22	0.69	-7.005	0.00
		F	2.83	1.01			4.27	0.84		
2.	Do you teach the child to divide the important from non-important?	I	2.87	1.12	-1.810	0.08	3.29	0.87	-6.879	0.00
		F	3.09	1.00			4.51	0.77		
3.	Do you teach the child to perform step by step?	I	2.85	0.88	-0.350	0.73	3.31	0.96	-6.377	0.00
		F	2.89	1.05			4.39	0.70		
4.	If you realize that the instruction is not efficient, do you go all over again, using the other way?	I	3.09	1.06	-1.308	0.20	3.39	1.24	-4.177	0.00
		F	3.26	1.19			4.33	0.90		
5.	Do you feel when the child is not able to express with words the task covered?	I	3.43	1.12	-1.546	0.13	3.04	1.04	-5.698	0.00
		F	3.17	1.36			4.16	1.11		
6.	Have you tried the technique of drawing, acting, singing, games, etc, while processing the curricula units?	I	2.74	1.42	-1.533	0.13	2.65	1.22	-4.899	0.00
		F	2.91	1.35			3.80	1.31		
7.	How often do you follow the achievement of your child in school, visit the school or talk to the teacher?	I	3.15	1.16	-1.401	0.17	3.14	0.94	-6.600	0.00
		F	3.26	1.26			4.14	1.02		
8.	Does the child report regularly the good or bad grades?	I	3.19	0.68	-1.458	0.15	3.47	0.92	-6.844	0.00
		F	3.38	0.68			4.59	0.79		
9.	Do you reduce instructions when you see that the child is improving?	I	2.87	1.10	-0.927	0.36	3.06	1.28	-3.514	0.00
		F	2.98	1.11			3.84	0.92		
10.	Do you amplify instructions when you see that they are insufficient?	I	3.62	1.13	-1.359	0.18	3.61	1.29	-4.116	0.00
		F	3.77	0.98			4.47	0.71		
11.	Do you have an insight into what the instructions were/weren't good at; eg separating important from unimportant?	I	3.49	1.23	-0.184	0.86	3.67	0.77	-3.720	0.00
		F	3.51	1.21			4.18	0.81		
12.	Are you able to evaluate your child, give him feedback on curricula units processed?	I	3.66	1.24	-0.476	0.64	3.80	0.84	-3.00	0.00
		F	3.72	1.21			4.22	0.90		

for the above mentioned results is also found in the total results of both groups. The results in Table 2 show that there is no statistically significant change in parents in the control group at the level of the entire instrument between the initial and the final interview. This confirms the t-value of -1,758; p = 0.09. In the experimental group the value t = -10.066; p = 0.00 indicates that there was a statistically significant change in parent self-assessment between initial and final interview. The respondents under the influence of experimental treatment improved their self-assessment in help to children in school learning.

Table 2. Results of descriptive and inferential statistics for the experimental and control groups(total)

Claim (Q)	Control group					Experimental group			
		M	SD	t-test	p	M	SD	t-test	p
Help to children in school learning	I F	3.14 3.23	0.61 0.61	-1.758	0.09	3.30 4.24	0.52 0.47	-10.066	0.00

Another aim of our research was to investigate the effect of experimental treatment on the gender of respondents. The results in Table 3 show that in the control group, both, male and female respondents did not change their relationship to helping children in school learning. Findings t = 0.722; p = 0.48 for males and t = -1.675; p = 0.11 for females show that there is no statistically significant difference in parent self-assessment of help to children in school learning between initial and final testing. Respondents in the experimental group compared to gender have statistically significant advances in helping children. Male parents have a value of t = -6.393; p = 0.00, and female parents have t = -7.620; p = 0:00. These values indicate the existence of statistically significant differences in both male and female respondents in the initial and final questionnaires.

Table 3. Differences between experimental and control groups in initial final measurement with regard to gender

Group	Variable	Mode	Num.	Average		t-test	p
				Initial	Final		
Control Group	Gender	male	22	3.20	3.25	0.722	0.48
		female	25	3.08	3.21	-1.675	0.11
Experimental Group	Gender	male	17	3.14	4.07	-6.393	0.00
		female	32	3.39	4.33	-7.620	0.00

The third aim of our research is to examine the impact of experimental treatment on respondents with regard to their educational status. Analyzing the results for the experimental group (Table 4) we notice changes in parents with different levels of education. A detailed analysis of the results shows a statistically significant increase in the number of pupils with secondary school qualifications t = -6,265 and p <0,01; in parents with high school t = -10,530 and p <0,01; in parents with higher education t = -4,975 and p <0,01. In the parents with the master and the doctorate, there have been changes in help to children's learning but these changes are not statistically significant.

Table 4. Differences between the experimental and control groups with regard to the level of parent education

Groups	Variable	Mode	Num	Average		t-test	Relevance difference p
				initial	final		
Experimental group	education	Prim.	1	4,00	4,25	-	-
		high	23	3,28	4,19	-6,265	**0,00**
		higher	7	3,02	4,29	-10,530	**0,00**
		higher	16	3,37	4,26	-4,975	**0,00**
		MA or PhD	2	3,75	4,54	-6,33	0,10
Control Group	education	Prim.	6	2,71	2,69	0,191	0,86
		high	32	3,20	3,24	-0,587	0,56
		higher	5	3,03	3,45	-2,795	0,05
		higher	3	3,42	3,47	-0,555	0,64
		MA or PhD	1	3,33	4,42	-	**-**

By analyzing the results for the control group (Table 4), we note that there was an increase in the mean from the initial to the final state but that the increase was not statistically significant. In parents with primary school, the average is reduced from 2.71 to 2.69. In parents with secondary education, high and higher education, the average has increased from initial to final measurement, but this increase is not statistically significant. And in parents with a master's degree and doctorate, we notice a significant increase in the average to helping children in school learning.

We have also investigated the effect of experimental treatment on respondents in terms of working status. The results for the experimental and control group are shown in Table 5. Based on the results of the experimental group we noticed that there was a change in the average from the initial to the final measurement. In case of employed parents, there was an increase in the help to children in school learning, and this increase was statistically significant t = -9,317 and p <0,01. Experimental treatment also had a statistically significant effect on parents who are retired t = -7,305 and p <0,05. Experimental treatment also had an effect on parents who are unemployed and housewives but this effect is not statistically significant.

Table 5. Differences between the experimental and the control group with regard to the working status

Groups	Variable	Mode.	Num.	Average		t-test	Relevance difference p
				initial	final		
Experimental group	Working status	employed	36	3,28	4,30	-9,317	**0,00**
		unemployed	5	3,52	3,98	-1,463	0,22
		retired	4	2,83	3,92	-7,305	**0,01**
		housewife	4	3,77	4,35	-2,214	0,11
Control	Working status	employed	34	3,23	3,32	-1,434	0,16
		unemployed	9	2,98	3,16	-1,184	0,27
		retired	2	2,88	3,00	-3,000	0,21
		housewife	2	2,54	2,33	1,000	0,50

In a detailed analysis of Table 5 for the control group we note that there has been a change in the help to children in school learning but that these changes are not statistically significant. From the initial to the final measurement, the average is increased with parents employed, unemployed and retired, but it is not statistically significant as in all we have p> 0.05. The average for housewives alone is reduced from the initial to the final measurement, and we also notice that the housewives' initial measurement had a lower percentage than the other respondents.

DISCUSSION

Some of the factors important for the life of every individual are school success, level of acquired knowledge during schooling or level of qualification. These factors are a prerequisite for the choice of future carreer, employment opportunities, further education and have a significant impact on the overall quality of future life. Students' success in school determines the choice of carreer, while the acquired knowledge is a prerequisite for future educational and professional success (Babarović, Burušić and Šakić, 2010). After the longitudinal study, Barnard (2004) concluded that involving parents in school is an important component in early childhood education in order to promote long-term effects.

At the beginning of our study, parents of control and experimental groups were examined. In order to determine the effect of our workshops on parental assistance, t-test was

used as a parametric test to determine the differences between initial and final interviews both in the experimental and in the control group. The result of Mann-Whitney U test (U = 982.500 from = -1.241; p = 0.22 for non-metric check t = 1.453; p = 0.15) indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between experimental and control group respondents; therefore the groups are homogeneous and can be accessed. The experimental treatment consisted of teaching units and activities to enable parents to help children in school learning. The parents of the control group continued with the traditional approach to school and school education. After completing the teaching units and all planned activities related to school learning, the final measurement was done. The final measurements showed the effect of the experimental treatment, as the results showed the increase in the help to children in the school learning (Table 1). So we conclude that experimental treatment motivated the parents to get more involved in school children's learning. In the final survey of parents of the control group, there was a change from initial to final measurement but we noticed that these changes were not statistically significant (Table 1). The results of descriptive statistics and t-test indicate that involvement of parents in activities affects parents' relationship to school and learning. So if the school wants the help of the parent then it must organize activities that will involve parents and provide them with educational content so that they can act educatively as well.

Numerous studies show that the success of a student depends on their parent's level of education and that children of educated parents achieve better results (Bowey, 1995; Rečić, 2003). By analyzing the results of our research in Table 4 we notice that helping children in school learning both in initial and final measurements is highest in parents with the highest level of education (parents who are master's or doctors).

The explanation for such findings lies in the fact that more educated parents have greater opportunities to provide their children with better education, set higher demands for a child, share views and beliefs about the importance of schooling, help children in learning, involve in the process of education and work better with school (Noack, 2004; Šimić-Šašić and Klarin, 2011).

For school success Markuš (2005) particularly emphasizes the importance of mother education, because she is more than a father involved in everyday school activities.

The results of our research and initial and final measurements have shown that mothers are more involved in helping children with school work than their fathers.

In traditional studies in the field of educational psychology the most frequently mentioned predictors of school success are: the cognitive abilities, personality traits and motivation of students. However, today, besides the above, the socio-demographic characteristics of students and their families are of great influence as well. In their research, Šimić-Šašić and Klarin (2011) came to the conclusion that female students have better school achievement than male students, the students living in towns achieve better results than those who live in villages, better success is achieved by pupils of educated parents and students whose parents are employed and with better material opportunities. The results of our research in Table 5 show that the highest average of involvement in school learning is shown by the employed parents (experimental group and housewife).

Students' school achievement is significantly influenced by the place of life, culture, the general family atmosphere, and relationships with parents (Šimić-Šašić and Klarin, 2011). Bedeniković (2009) highlights the importance of mother and her engagement in pupils' school achievement, and that children of educated mothers achieve better school success. The same author finds that the student's ability to learn, and thus the school's success, can largely depend on the situation at home, whether children have parents' support and encouragement. The research results conducted by Bedeniković show that mothers' involvement decreases with the child's upbringing from the first to the fifth grade, as well as all forms of involvement other than co-operation with the school, while at the same time school success from the first to the

fifth grade decreases. Based on the results obtained, practical measures are proposed to increase the quality of parent and school cooperation, the efficacy of parent involvement and the school achievement at the initial level and in higher school grades (Bedeniković, 2009).

Bakker et al. (2007) points out that the basic activity of parents' participation in school life, which significantly affects the success of children in school, is the support of parents in the learning they provide to their children. In their research Pahić, Miljević-Riđički and Vizek-Vidović (2010) state that in Croatia supportive learning implies active participation of parents in the development of child's homework. The results of their research show that parents agree that the support for learning at home is something that schools need to ask of them, that parents are considered capable of performing this task, see it as their duty and believe that it helps their children. Although the content that children learn is too difficult for some parents, most parents find it compelling to help their child. The results of the research conducted by Jurić (1995) in Croatia showed that two-thirds of parents consider school programmes to be overwhelming for children. Therefore, we can conclude that the involvement of parents in the help of homework is also largely dependent on the level of education of the parents.

Sunko (2008) investigated the influence of pedagogical workshops on parenting and education. Data were processed by multifactor analysis (MFA) and variance analysis (ANOVA). The results of the MFA describe parenting attitudes with 14 factors, including the supremacy of partner relationships with children, the dual role of father in the family, the tendency to shift responsibility for educational errors, neglecting the effects of negative forms of parental behavior, the strong need for external control of the child, passive parent relationship towards children, bad communication patterns with children enclosed in secrets. The ANOVE results show statistically significant change in attitudes (groups of respondents who have passed the parenting programme) to the role of the father in the family, the responsibility for personal behaviors and authoritative educational styles. The results suggest that investment in parenting brings multiple benefits: better self-parenting, better family functioning as a whole and more stable upbringing.

Conclusion

The results of the study showed that the experimental treatment we used influenced changes from initial to final measurements and that these changes were statistically significant (in the case of parents who were involved). Parental instruction in school learning proved to be a significant factor in school success. Involving parents in school activities has an important social function, while engaging parents in learning at home results in positive learning outcomes. In addition to these educational outcomes, there are a number of positive developmental goals including more regular school attendance, better social and emotional development, and improved pro-social behavior. Parental involvement is one of the integral parts of new educational reforms and initiatives. In addition, involving parents in school activities is key to developing a partnership. Each form of parental involvement increases the motivation to learn, work and deal with children's school obligations, and children whose parents have shown interest in their learning and work, achieved better results and sought additional sources of knowledge.

Considering the importance shown by the workshops in helping parents in schooling of children, we consider that they should be planned at the beginning of each school year by the school curriculum and programme and provide all the necessary conditions for their realization. Changes in the curriculum should make a shift from the transfer of knowledge to the development of competencies as a goal of education.

REFERENCES

Babarović, T., Burušić, J. & Šakić, M. (2010). Psihosocijalne i obrazovne odrednice školskog uspjeha učenika osnovnih škola: dosezi dosadašnjih istraživanja. *Suvremena psihologija, 13(2),* 235–56.

Bakker, J., Denessen, E. & Brus-Laeven, M. (2007). Socio-economic background, parental involvement and teacher perceptions of these in relation to pupil achievement. *Educational Studies, 33(2),* 177-192.

Barnard, W. M. (2004). Parent involvement in elementary school and educational attainment. *Children and Youth Services Review, 26(1),* 39-62.

Bedeniković, M. (2009). Uloga majke u školskom uspjehu djeteta. *Školski vjesnik, časopis za pedagogijsku teoriju i praksu, 58(3),* 331-344.

Christenson, S. L. (2004). The Family-School Partnership: An Opportunity to promote the Learning Competence of All Students. *School Psychology Review, 33(1)*, 83-104.

Ćatić, R. (2005). *Osnovi porodične pedagogije*. Zenica: Pedagoški fakultet.

Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G. & Hopkins, J. (2002). Family, School, and Community Partnerships. In Marc H. Bornstein (Ed.): *Handbook of Parenting 5 :* Practical Issues in Parenting (pp. 407-437). Mahwan, New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Frýdková, E. (2013). School and Parents Cooperation on Formation of Value Orientation of a Child. *Procedia – Social and Behavior Sciences, 106*, 2307-2315.

Jacob, J. M. (2010). *Parental expectations and aspirations for their children's educational attainment: An examination of the college-going mindset parents* (PhD Dissertation), University of Minnesota. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/11299/93924

Jurić, V. (1995). Zadovoljstvo obitelji školom. *Društvena istraživanja, 4(4-5),* 641-655.

Kovač-Cerović,T., Vizek-Vidović, V. & Powell, S. (2010). *South East Europe Cross Countries Survey of Parents' Views; School Governance and Social Inclusion, Involvement of Parents.* Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Education, Center for Educational Policy Studies.

Lenard, I. (2017). Zadovoljstvo suradnje sa školom – percepcija roditelja ruralne sredine. In Ž. Milanović (Ed.), *Context : zbornik radova* (pp. 559-575). Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.

Markuš, M. (2005). *Psihosocijalne determinante školskih izostanaka* (Diplomski rad), Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu.

Pahić, T., Miljević-Riđički, R. & Vizek-Vidović, V. (2010). Uključenost roditelja u život škole: Percepcija roditelja opće populacije i predstavnika roditelja u školskim tijelima. *Odgojne znanosti, 12(2),* 329-346.

Pašalić-Kreso, A. (2004). *Koordinate obiteljskog odgoja*. Sarajevo: Jež.

Rečić, M. (2003). *Obitelj i školski uspjeh učenika.* Đakovo: Tempo.

Sunko, E. (2008). Utjecaj provedbe programa za roditelje na jihove stavove o odgoju*. Odgojne znanosti, 10(2),* 383-401.

Suzić, N. (2005). *Pedagogija za XXI vijek*. Banja Luka: TT–Centar Republike Srpske i UNICEF.

Šimić-Šašić, S. & Klarin, M. (2011*).* Socioekonomske prilike obitelji i kvaliteta obiteljske interakcije kao prediktori školskog uspjeha srednjoškolaca u Hrvatskoj, Bosni i Hercegovini i Makedoniji. *Ljetopis socijalnog rada, 18(1),*31–62.

Varunek, V. (2016). Uključivanje roditelja u život i rad škole – vodič za ravnatelja škole. In A. Pašalić Kreso (Ed.), *Ka novim iskoracima u odgoju i obrazovanju* (pp. 221-236). Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet.