

Chapter 1

Transition to School: A Family Affair

Sue Dockett, Wilfried Griebel, and Bob Perry

1.1 Introduction

Transition is an elusive concept. Within the English language, we use the term *transition* to describe the passage from one state or stage to another – whether it be for individuals, organisations or systems – across fields as diverse as education, music, science, economics and politics. Transition in all of these areas involves the notion of change. In educational contexts, transition generally refers to the movement of children from one stage of education to another. Examples include the transition to school, transition from primary to secondary school, and the transition from school to work or tertiary study.

It is not only with English that variation in the understanding and use of the term transition is to be found. While terms such as *övergång* (Swedish), *übergang* (German), *pārejas* (Latvian), *transição* (Portuguese), *transizione* (Italian) and *прелазак* (Serbian), translate to the English term *transition*, some of our colleagues note that these terms fall short of capturing the complex processes that together constitute transition experiences in education. For example, the Polish term *przejs-cie* translates as ‘passage’, though the term *adaptacja* (adaptation) is sometimes used to describe children’s transition to school, even though it tends to refer to a one-way, rather than a reciprocal, process.

We highlight these variations as a way of foregrounding diverse approaches towards, and interpretations of, transition. With chapter authors drawn from several different countries and different language backgrounds, we appreciate the different

S. Dockett (✉) • B. Perry
School of Education, Charles Sturt University, Albury-Wodonga, Australia
e-mail: sdockett@csu.edu.au; bperry@csu.edu.au

W. Griebel
State Institute of Early Childhood Research (IFP), Munich, Germany
e-mail: Wilfried.Griebel@ifp.bayern.de

voices and nuances used in describing the experiences of transitions. As educators, we hope this exploration can contribute to further transitions research in other contexts.

Several points can be drawn from the linguistic exercise of exploring the term *transition*, its translations and the significance of the term *transition to school*. The first is that the term often is used to refer to movement – the passage – from prior-to-school experiences to school. This sense conveys one-way, sequential movement from one stage or setting to another, often accompanied by expectations that children must adapt to the new educational environment. Secondly, the term is used widely in English-based publications, but much may be lost in translation – both by using the English term and by failing to acknowledge other terms that may provide a more nuanced perspective of educational transitions. An example of the latter is the Swedish term, *övergång*. When used as a noun, *övergång* refers to a zone or overlapping arena, an intersection with only one direction. However, when used as a verb, the term implies a back-and-forth process (Helena Ackesjö, personal communication). A similar focus comes from the Australian Aboriginal term ‘fire-stick period’:

We not only use the term ‘transition’ which can imply a one-way journey towards something better, but also the term ‘fire-stick’ period (an Aboriginal term for a stick that is kept alight to ensure the availability of fire). This highlights the way in which culture is not something to be left behind, but is an integral part of lives...[Children] need to adjust to an extra range and layer of experiences, demands and expectations...the ‘fire-stick’ period equates with the time needed for [children and families] to learn how to navigate between their home and school cultures. (Clancy et al. 2001, p. 57)

Much of the research literature related to educational transitions emphasises the element of change – be it change of context, environment, experiences, expectations, roles, identities, and/or status – for those involved. Indeed, many of the chapters in this book draw on a range of theoretical perspectives to highlight the element of change and its centrality to educational transitions.

However, educational transition is not only characterised by change: there are also elements of continuity, as referenced by the ‘fire-stick’ period and the notion of overlapping contexts. Further, it is not only children who experience both continuity and change at times of educational transition. While recognising the importance of change, in this chapter we emphasise educational transitions as times of both continuity and change. From this position we explore the importance of families within educational transitions, particularly the transition to school. We do this on the basis that families provide one of the consistent contexts for children as they – and those around them – experience the transition to school.

1.2 Defining Transition

The concept of transition appears in and across many theoretical frameworks. Current perspectives draw on anthropological (Turner 1969; van Gennep 1960), sociocultural (Elder 1998; Rogoff 2003), ecological (Bronfenbrenner and Morris

2006; Weisner 1984), as well as psychological (Cowan 1991; Zittoun 2008) traditions and tenets. Each of these frameworks is utilised in the reports of research in this book.

What then do we mean by transition? Broadly, we define transition as times when ‘individuals change their role in their community’s structure’ (Rogoff 2003, p. 150). This definition locates transitions within social and cultural contexts and highlights the interactions of individuals and institutions as sources of potential support and tension. Transitions impact on the individual and their social contexts (Beach 1999). Role changes often occur as a result of specific events – such as starting school – but also involve ‘subtle, complex processes of ‘becoming somebody’ (Ecclestone et al. 2010, p. 7). Integral to transitions are changes to identity, agency, role and status – a change in the ‘sense of self’ (Beach 1999, p. 114). When children start school, they construct their identity as school students, adopt the markers of a school student (such as the uniform and school bag), experience a change in their agency as new factors influence their actions and choices, and participate in the institutional context of school. At the same time as they construct a school identity, children retain their home identity – moving regularly between home and school identities. Families, too, undergo transitions as children start school. Parents experience a role change as they become parents of a school student; the requirements and expectations of schools often result in changes to their agency, influencing choices and actions about what can or should be done in particular circumstances. Their status within the community or educational groups may change as they respond to changed roles and expectations.

1.3 Transition in Context

Major life events provide the impetus for people to change their sense of who they are and where they belong in the world. Transitions can be times of risk, uncertainty and anxiety; they can also be times of excitement and pleasure, as well as times of mixed, sometimes conflicting, emotions. Educational transitions – particularly the transition to school – have become a feature of policy attention in many countries around the world. Primarily, the focus has been on efforts to manage or ease transition experiences (see for example, Jindal-Snape 2010; Laverick and Jalongo 2011; Perry et al. 2014). This attention is tied to broader policy agendas, such as moves to increase educational participation, promote educational outcomes and respond to concerns about educational disadvantage and exclusion. The target groups for many transition policy initiatives are those described as vulnerable or disadvantaged. For example, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) (2009) has argued for increased attention to the transition to school as a strategy to improve ‘educational, employment, health and wellbeing outcomes’ (p. 4), ‘reduce inequalities in outcomes between groups of children’ (p. 6) and disrupt cycles of social and economic disadvantage.

These commitments assume that educational transitions will be problematic for some groups of children and their families and that, unless addressed, such difficulties

will be perpetuated in cycles of intergenerational disadvantage. As a consequence, policy documents tend to focus on transitions as problematic and identify specific groups in need of support (Dockett 2014; Perry 2014). Further, they emphasise the potentially negative aspects of transition, rather than the opportunities generated by new and different experiences and the possibilities of creative risk (Biesta 2006; Educational Transitions and Change (ETC) Research Group 2011). As several chapters in this book attest, it is important to critique the universality of these assumptions and to question expectations around the transition to school and the ways in which children and families manage this. In recognising the strengths of particular individuals, families, and communities, the chapters in this book move away from the deficit perspectives that drive many approaches to transition policy and instead highlight the strengths of refugee and immigrant parents (Chap. 3); parents of children with special needs (Chap. 4), and families described as ‘vulnerable’ or living in low socio-economic circumstances (Chaps. 5, 6, 13, 14, and 16).

1.4 Exploring Transition

In providing an overview of the chapters in the book, we explore conceptualisations of educational transition and the ways in which these are utilised by chapter authors. We follow this overview with examination of the ways in which families position themselves, or are positioned, as children make the transition to school. In concluding, we highlight the integral involvement of families in the transition to school.

Several elements contribute to conceptualisations of educational transition. These include a focus on some form of movement, identification of events that mark transition and recognition of the processes that constitute transition. Each of these is underpinned by a range of theoretical perspectives.

1.4.1 *Transition as Movement*

Movement is an explicit element of many educational transitions as individuals physically move between contexts, such as between an early childhood setting and school, from primary to secondary school, or from one grade to the next. Some educational transitions (sometimes described as ‘transfers’) are expected to occur only once and reflect the expected progression of life experiences. In this sense, the transition to school – signified by the first day of school – tends to be an age-related experience that occurs only once in a lifetime, reflecting the definition of transition as a ‘passage’. Life-course theory (Elder 1998) posits such transitions as key points, associated with changes in the roles, status and identities of individuals. From this perspective, transitions are considered sequential, one-way, vertical movements. In the case of educational transitions, it is expected that transition to preschool is

followed by transition to school, transition to middle school or secondary school, transition to university or work and so on.

The timing of vertical transitions varies in different social, cultural, economic and political contexts. As chapter authors report, the age at which children start school varies, with children in Germany, Poland and Sweden typically starting school at a later age than children in England, Canada and Australia. This has implications for both the nature of experiences and the expectations associated with that transition. For example, Chap. 12 reports the strong focus on children's academic readiness for school within England as children start school at age 4, and the pressure this generates for families to ensure that their children are "ready" for school. While the Swedish parents involved in Ackesjö's study (Chap. 10) also referred to elements of school readiness as their children made the move from preschool to the preschool class, both emotional and academic attitudes were highlighted.

In contrast to vertical transitions, horizontal transitions such as the daily movements between home and school, or transitions between school and school age care, occur on a regular basis and serve to connect different spheres of interaction and influence (Kagan 1991; Lam and Pollard 2006). While much of the international research focus on educational transitions addresses vertical transitions – for example, starting school – and the significance of this for later educational engagement (Dunlop and Fabian 2007; Perry et al. 2014; Pianta and Cox 1999), there is growing attention to the horizontal transitions experienced by children and the adults who support them (Hughes et al. 2010; Johansson 2007; Petriwskyj et al. 2005).

Horizontal transitions occur as people are simultaneously members of more than one community of practice, conceptualised by Wenger (1998) as groups of individuals participating in a communal activity, and constructing a shared identity through contributing to and experiencing the practices of that community. Moving between communities of practice requires recognition and crossing of the boundaries that separate these. In a "communities of practice" framework, transition occurs not only for the individual as they establish new identities and come to understand the new context, but also for the community itself, as new members influence practices. The same phenomenon is reported for families (Chaps. 2 and 15), as they make adjustments to their practices in response to children starting school; as parents navigate the perceived border between preschool and the preschool class in Sweden (Chap. 10); and as parents of children with intellectual disabilities work to provide a bridge between home and school environments to assist in the border crossing experiences (Chap. 4). These chapters also illustrate the ways in which horizontal and vertical transitions can occur concurrently and influence each other.

1.4.2 Events That Mark Transition

Vertical transitions may feature specific events which themselves are marked by special rites. In many instances, transition to school programs both mark the move to school and consist of events signified by special rites. In Australia, such events

include visits to the new school, purchase of the school uniform, meeting the principal and classroom teacher, and a tour of the school.

The first day of school is one event marked by special rites. Though it constitutes only one part of the transition process, the first day of school is marked by rites that hold both individual and social significance. For example, as part of the ceremonial start to school, German school starters are presented with *Schultüte*, a cone filled with sweets and/or school supplies before engaging in celebrations with family. New school students in Russia participate in *The Day of Knowledge*, the official start of the new school year, characterised by the exchange of flowers and balloons (Gessen 2012). In Australia, family traditions often include multiple photographs of the new school student in their new uniform.

Framing transition to school as a significant life event has prompted several researchers to draw on van Gennep's (1960) anthropological reports of 'rites of passage' and associated rituals. His structural model of transition rites included three phases: the preliminal, where the individual separates from their present status; the liminal, in-between phase, where the individual is between states; and the post-liminal phase where the new status is incorporated. Using a rites of passage framework, starting school involves children separating from prior-to-school experiences, waiting to start school (often during the summer holidays), and then joining a school community (Ackesjö 2013; Garpelin 2014). The various rites inherent in the transition process act as social markers – recognising the movement of individuals from one status to another.

The liminal phase – described by Turner (1969, p. 95) as a time of being “betwixt and between” – aligns with the notion of a bridge between contexts (Huser et al. 2016; Lam and Pollard 2006), and the processes of border crossing associated with transitions. While researchers have questioned the nature of children's experiences *on the bridge* as they wait to start school (Garpelin 2014), and examined children's learning journeys across borders (Peters 2014), the research reported in this book also considers the bridging experiences of families and their negotiations of border crossing. Chapter 10 describes the potential of borders as both barriers and meeting places – with the latter notion explored in Chap. 14's use of the Cultural Interface (Nakata 2002) framework to conceptualise the spaces where people come together. Considering transitions as processes of border crossing generates opportunities to consider the movement involved in vertical transitions (such as when children start school) as well as the web of horizontal transitions navigated by children and their families as they move between the linked contexts that characterise their lives.

The notion of rites marking change also featured in the work of Bourdieu (1991), who addressed the social function of rituals as well as the boundaries identified and crossed during transitions. In describing institutional rites, Bourdieu emphasised their separating function as they marked a fundamental division in social order, delineating those to whom the rites pertained from those to whom they were inaccessible. Bourdieu described the process of investiture, whereby the individual adopted a changed representation of him/herself and the behaviours that accompanied that changed representation. As a result of investiture, others also changed their representation of the individual and the ways they behaved towards them. When

considering transition to school, markers such as school uniform, school bag, and homework signify to children, and those around them, that they have become members of an institution. There are also marked changes for parents, as they adopt new roles and behaviours associated with being the parent of a school child and respond to the changed expectations of themselves and others.

The changes in status, identities and roles that accompany transitions are also a feature of life-course theory (Elder 1998). While recognising that individuals make a range of transitions throughout life, life-course theory highlights the importance of linked lives and social ties. Individual lives are interdependent, linked by social contexts and shared relationships. This is particularly relevant when considering the role of families within transition, as an individual transition often has implications for the experiences and relationships of others within the family. Recognition of life course perspectives generates opportunities to explore not only the experiences of children as they make the transition to school, but also the experiences of other family members. For example, Chap. 2 notes that change is stimulated for parents at times of educational transition, just as it provokes change for children, and Chap. 8 explores the role of grandparents and transition to school.

1.4.3 Processes of Transition

1.4.3.1 Proximal Processes

Life course theory links transitions with social context and social history. While history is created by the actions and interactions of individuals and groups, historical conditions – including family history – also influence children’s experiences (Elder 1998). Chapter 8 examines one set of contributors to family history, reporting the influence of grandparents sharing their educational experiences. The positive reciprocal interactions between grandparents and grandchildren outlined in this chapter are framed as proximal processes – interactions that “occur on a fairly regular basis over extended periods of time” (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006, p. 797), which contribute to family capital – a form of social capital characterised by access to intergenerational knowledge (Coleman 1988). Family capital is entwined with habitus (Bourdieu 1997), as family stories, traditions and expectations shape a set of dispositions that support particular practices and guide decision-making within families. Decisions related to educational transitions – such as school choice – are influenced by family habitus (Chaps. 6 and 9).

Attention to proximal processes and recognition of the importance of historical time connect life-course theory with bioecological approaches to the study of educational transitions. Bioecological theory (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006) emphasises the importance of social and cultural contexts and the significance of patterns of interaction (proximal processes) among and between those involved in different contexts, over time. The best known element of bioecological theory relates to the identification of nested systems – microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems

and macrosystems – and the temporal element of transitions, reflected in reference to the chronosystem. Alongside these systems, bioecological theory emphasises the role of proximal processes and their interaction with the characteristics of individuals, including their experiences, resources, temperament and motivation, as well as their agency. Taken together, the elements of person (P) characteristics, proximal processes (P), contexts (C) and time (T), combine to form the PPCT model (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006), which provides the theoretical grounding for several chapters in this book: Chap. 3 examines the microsystems of family and schools and the potential mismatch between these as children from refugee and/or immigrant backgrounds make the transition to school; Chap. 11 identifies gender as a demand characteristic of individuals and explores the link between gender and expectations as children start school; Chap. 8 emphasises the contribution of grandparents to proximal processes; and Chap. 16 uses the PPCT model to analyse communication, information sharing and relationship-building between family members and educators across the transition to school.

1.4.3.2 Routines as Processes

Proponents of ecocultural theory have been critical of the broad approach of bioecological theory, arguing that the proposed web of interconnections obscures, rather than clarifies, research investigations and analyses. They advocate the adoption of ecocultural theory, which combines ecological theory and cultural perspectives (Weisner 1984). This approach regards each family as occupying an ecological niche, defined as the ‘larger sociocultural environment surrounding the child and family’ (Bernheimer et al. 1990, p. 223). Ecocultural theory pays particular attention to daily routines as a means of families adjusting to, and changing, their ecological niche. As a framework, ecocultural theory has been used in studies of families with children with special needs to explore the accommodations made in order to build sustainable routines which balance the needs of all family members. Chapter 4 draws on ecocultural theory to explore the ways that families adjust, assimilate and accommodate their daily lives to meet new demands as their children start school.

1.4.3.3 Transformational Processes

Rather than defining transition by the events that mark them, Cowan (1991) has argued for an approach that recognises the qualitative shift in the view of the individual, or family, and the changes of roles and relationships that accompany this, as the essence of transition:

For a life change to be designated as transitional, it must involve a qualitative shift from the inside looking out (how the individual understands and feels about the self and the world) and from the outside looking in (reorganisation of the individual’s or family’s level of personal competence, role arrangements, and relationships with significant others). Passing a life marker (e.g. entering school)...does not in itself signify that a transition has been completed. (p. 5)

The changes associated with life transitions can produce a period of instability, yet, according to Cowan (1991, p. 19), ‘individuals and families do not become unrecognisable’ as a result of transitions. Rather, transitions amplify processes already in motion. In other words, the additional stress that may be associated with times of transition can heighten particular patterns of action and interaction with families (Dockett et al. 2011). This perspective considers both the stress and the coping models of individuals and families as key factors in transition outcomes (Lazarus and Folkman 1984).

The transformation generated by transition also features in the work of Zittoun (2008), who conceptualises transition in terms of the processes that follow a particular rupture, or disruption. According to Zittoun, transition applies to the processes that follow change, rather than to the change itself. These processes generate new ways of being, operating and interacting to meet the changed demands of the new context. In generating this new ‘sense of self’ (Beach 1999, p. 114), Hviid and Zittoun (2008, p. 126) note that

A transition process always requires leaving some old conduct, ways of thinking or of defining oneself. That process of leaving behind things, relations or aspects of oneself, the dying out or loss of interests, goes hand in hand or followed by a process of move towards a new form of acting, defining or sense-meaning.

During the transition to school, children experience changes in identity, status and expectations. So too do parents experience changes, as they position themselves, and are positioned, as parents of school students. Parents and children are required to make sense of the new school contexts and their roles and places within it. It is these sense-making processes – transformational processes – that characterise many of the explorations of transition reported in this book.

1.5 Families: More Than Context

Much transitions research explores these elements of movement, events and processes as children and their families start school. While the roles of families often are recognised, there remains a heightened focus on the individual transition experiences of children. The chapters in this book aim to move beyond consideration of family as context in the transition to school, exploring the dual roles of families as they provide a sense of continuity to support children but, at same time, undergo their own transition. The research reported in the chapters examines the interactions of families and contexts, regarding families as active participants in building the relationships that support children at times of transition, and drawing on their resources and experiences to guide interactions with schools. While each chapter outlines a range of challenges for families, the underlying theme of family strengths prevails. As a consequence, families are not positioned as deficient if their accessible capital does not match that normalised in much research concerning family-school engagement.

In the following section, we explore the research base that connects families and schools, with a particular focus on the transition to school. Much of this literature presents family involvement with schools – and transitions – as a straightforward process, dominated by the role of the family in preparing children for school and promoting the educational agenda of schools in home contexts. The discussion concludes with a second underlying theme of the chapters in this book: the recognition that family roles, responsibilities, expectations and relationships – as well as those of individuals – change at times of educational transition. Key to understanding the dual roles of families is the theoretical base developed by Griebel and Niesel (2009) that derives from studies of family developmental psychology. This framework prompts a nuanced consideration of families and educational transition, recognising the multi-faceted roles and functions of families at this time.

1.6 Families and Transition

The transition to school is a major event in the lives of children and families. As with other transitions, the transition to school occurs within and across social contexts. While a great deal of research attention has been directed towards the experiences of children as they make this transition (Corsaro and Molinari 2008; Dunlop and Fabian 2007; Perry et al. 2014), focus on the transitions experiences of families at this time is relatively sparse (Griebel and Niesel 2009). This is despite many studies investigating what families do *for* children as they start school, particularly in terms of preparing children and promoting children's school readiness (Holliday et al. 2014; Lau et al. 2011; Sheridan et al. 2010; Walker and MacPhee 2011), and evidence that the construct of school readiness involves not only elements related to children, but also derived from family and school contexts (Centre for Community Child Health 2008; Dockett and Perry 2009).

Family involvement in supporting children as they enter and engage with school has been identified as a critical element of educational success – so much so that promoting positive family engagement with schools has been hailed as a means to reduce educational achievement gaps between children from diverse backgrounds in several countries (Bull et al. 2008; Harris and Goodall 2007; Kendall et al. 2008; McWayne et al. 2013). Times of educational transition – such as the transition to school – can be pivotal in the establishment of positive home-school connections.

1.6.1 Home-School Connections

A wide range of research supports the view that family contexts and resources influence children's preparedness for school, notably their school readiness skills (Holliday et al. 2014; Isaacs and Magnuson 2011). This extends throughout the school years as family participation has an impact on educational outcomes (Barnard 2004;

Henderson and Mapp 2002; Jeynes 2012). For example, the resources provided within the home (Kiernan and Mensah 2011), home routines that structure family interactions (Wildenger et al. 2008), home learning environments (Melhuish et al. 2008), language/s spoken within the home (Holliday et al. 2014), family income (Isaacs and Magnuson 2011), parental education (Davis-Kean 2005), and parental expectations (Jeynes 2012), have all been designated as influencing children's school readiness, their engagement in school and long-term educational outcomes.

These studies highlight the context of the family in children's educational experiences. Of particular importance are the resources that families draw upon to support the transition to school – their social, economic and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986). Families have varying levels of access to resources and activate capital in different ways. Families from marginalised groups, or those described as disadvantaged – such as families with low socio-economic resources, who speak a language other than the dominant one, who are migrants or refugees, or who experience a wide range of complex circumstances – generally are positioned as having limited capital, or capital which is not compatible with dominant social contexts, including school. Several of the chapters in this book challenge these positionings, arguing for recognition of the strengths families bring from diverse social and culture backgrounds (Chaps. 2 and 3); affirmation of the family as an educational environment in its own right (Chap. 7); validation of the funds of knowledge accrued by children and families in diverse circumstances (Chap. 12); acknowledgement of the contributions and commitments of families living in complex circumstances (Chaps. 5, 6, 13, and 16); and highlighting some of the possibilities for collaboration among families and educators when such strengths are acknowledged (Chaps. 4, 14 and 15).

Much of the research exploring contextual issues of family participation is concerned with improving educational outcomes by promoting home-school connections (Pomerantz and Moorman 2010). To this end, a number of models of family involvement has been developed. These include: Epstein's (1995, 2011) framework of six types of parent involvement – which range from parenting (helping families establish home environment to support children) through to collaborating with community (integrating community resources into educational programs); Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler's (1997) emphasis on parental sense of efficacy and parent role construction; the enabling and empowering model outlined by Dunst et al. (1992); and the shared responsibility model of Rosenberg et al. (2009). The models of partnership and participation promoted by these different models vary (see Chaps. 5, 14, and 16). However, the consistent aim of such programs is to promote dispositions about the positive value of education (Edwards and Kutaka 2015). Sometimes, this extends to programs of parent education that prioritise the educational agenda of the school. While families may regard the establishment of relationships between home and school as part of their responsibility (Edwards and Kutaka 2015), focus only on what families can do for schools fails to recognise the family as a dynamic unit, itself undergoing changes as family members (parents and children) partake in diverse experiences. This is particularly the case during the transition to school, when adults have opportunities to build and strengthen relationships that support the ongoing educational engagement of children.

Throughout this book, chapter authors recognise the importance of the family contexts and histories and the ways that families shape, and are shaped by, both history and context, including family history. They also acknowledge that – in educational contexts – the predominant view of family involvement privileges the actions of the dominant social group (Lareau 2000). Hence, in the Western world, families who support academic learning through reading to their children, checking homework, having regular interactions with teachers, helping out in the school classroom, and participating in school functions are deemed to be involved in their children’s education (Kimelberg 2014). Such “good parenting” is considered the basis for children’s educational success (Desforges and Abouchaar 2003). The corollary is that those parents who do not engage in these activities may be considered uninvolved, disinterested, or simply not “good” parents (Henderson et al. 2007), unable or unwilling to offer appropriately cognitively stimulating environments for their children (Quiocho and Daoud 2006). Notions of “good” parenting and the provision of supportive home environments are reviewed in explorations of school choice reported in Chaps. 6 and 9, and in discussion of the family as an educational environment (Chap. 7).

Families categorised as uninvolved often include those with economically, socially, culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds (Henderson et al. 2007). When educators perceive families as disinterested, they tend to make few attempts to build relationships, with interactions limited to addressing problems (Zarate 2007), or identify families as the source of problems and seek to provide parenting classes to improve their levels of engagement with schools (Daniel-White 2002).

Throughout the book, questions are asked about the meaning of terms such as parent involvement, parent engagement and parent partnerships, in the light of multiple interpretations and uses of the terms by different participants across a wide range of studies (Edwards and Kutaka 2015; Fan and Williams 2010; Sheridan and Kim 2015). While educational policy around the world emphasises partnerships with parents, what is meant by partnership remains open to interpretations which position parents and educators in different ways. The notion of partnership suggests “equality” of input and interaction, where both parents and educators are involved directly in decision-making and the actions that support this (Edwards and Kutaka 2015). Partnerships reflecting these features are unique – established between specific educators and families for the purpose of supporting specific children – and can be particularly powerful supports for all involved. Yet several examples provided by chapter authors indicate that not all partnerships are valued or positive, supporting existing research noting that such “equal” levels of participation are rarely achieved (Calabrese Barton et al. 2004; Lareau 2000). The notion of collaboration is posited as an alternative (Chaps. 2, 5, 7, 15, and 16), with a focus on meaningful and cooperative relationships between families and schools that reflect specific contexts and the strengths of those involved.

The research reported across the chapters recognises that parental participation – whatever the label – consists of more than *what* parents actually do as their children

start school. *Why* parents become engaged and *how* this occurs are critical elements in understanding what happens within families during times of education transition. In their investigations, researchers note that critical reflection on the intersection of families and children's experiences of educational transition requires movement away from a 'laundry list of things that good parents do for their children's education' (Calabrese Barton et al. 2004, p. 3). In other words, chapter authors problematize the position that the prime role of families at times of educational transition is to prepare children to meet the demands of the educational institution. One of the ways this is achieved is by considering the perspectives of parents during the transition to school.

Regardless of the circumstances experienced, the families who have participated in the studies reported across the chapters demonstrate commitment and willingness to engage with their children's education – not only at times of transition, but throughout their educational journeys. Several studies indicate that educational transitions generate additional demands for families, as they encounter new and different institutional environments (Chap. 3). This is particularly so when children have special education needs (Chap. 4).

1.6.2 Families in Transition

Rather than focusing only what families do and the contexts they provide for children during the transition to school, much of the research reported in this book highlights the dual role of families as they support children and manage transitions in family life. This perspective owes much to the ongoing work of Griebel and Niesel (2009), who highlight the transformational nature of transition for families, as well as the individuals within them (children and parents). They note changes in family life at the individual, interactional and contextual levels. At the individual level, parents adopt the role of "parents of a school student" and negotiate the associated responsibilities and expectations. Family members experience changes at the interactional level as some relationships are lost and others generated, and relationships between family members change. For example, the interactions between children and parents change when expectations of greater independence and autonomy are enacted. Further changes are noted when parents respond to the involvement of other significant adults (teachers) in the lives of their children. At the contextual level, the routines and responsibilities of family members change as the family adapts to integrate home, school and work lives.

Recognition of the transformational nature of transition for families underpins several chapters in the book: Chap. 2 explores the coping mechanisms of parents as they participate in the transition to school; Chap. 15 extends this to consider the impact of collaboration with educators as parents cope with and manage transition; and Chap. 13 emphasises the processes of changing identities, roles and relationships for parents as their children start school. Each of these chapters reminds us

that the transition to school is an emotional – as well as a social, intellectual and physical – experience for parents as well as for children and educators. They confirm the commitments of parents to supporting their children during the transition to school, even when family circumstances present a range of challenges. They also indicate that the considerable attention to children's preparedness for school negatively positions families experiencing vulnerable or disadvantaged circumstances in terms of expectations for children, potential collaboration opportunities, and support for their own transitions.

1.7 In Summary

The chapters in the book make a major contribution to understandings of the impact of families on the transition to school and of transition to school on families. Contributing authors draw on a range of theoretical frameworks and research projects to provide multiple perspectives of family involvement in education, parent-educator partnerships, the nature of collaboration, issues for families in marginalised or complex circumstances as well as the multiple intersections of families and transition processes. The projects reported range from in-depth case studies to the analysis of large-scale data sets.

While the context of the research, participants, foci and analytic frameworks differ, the chapters are united by themes that emphasise the potentially transformational nature of the transition to school, the commitments of parents – regardless of their circumstances – to support their children, the influence of family habitus and capital on the ways such support is activated, and the significance of collaboration between educators and families at this time. This combination of international studies, approaches and perspectives links to, and extends, the extant research base around transition to school.

References

- Ackesjö, H. (2013). Children crossing borders. School visits as initial incorporation rites in transition to preschool class. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 45(3), 387–410.
- Barnard, W. (2004). Parent involvement in elementary school and educational attainment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 26, 39–62.
- Beach, K. (1999). Consequential transitions: A sociocultural expedition beyond transfer in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 101–139.
- Bernheimer, L., Gallimore, R., & Weisner, T. (1990). Ecocultural theory as a context for the individual family service plan. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 14, 219–233. doi:10.1177/105381519001400304.
- Biesta, G. (2006). What's the point of lifelong learning if lifelong learning has no point? On the democratic deficit of policies of lifelong learning. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5, 169–180.

- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (Trans. G. Raymond & M. Adamson). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1997). The forms of capital. In A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Education, culture, economy and society* (pp. 46–58). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, Theoretical models of human development* (Vol. 1, 6th ed., pp. 993–1023). New York: Wiley.
- Bull, A., Brooking, K., & Campbell, R. (2008). *Successful home-school partnerships*. Wellington: Ministry of Education. <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/28415/3> Accessed 23 Mar 2016.
- Calabrese Barton, A., Drake, C., Perez, G., & St. Louis, K. (2004). Ecologies of parental engagement in urban education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(4), 3–12.
- Centre for Community Child Health. (2008). *Rethinking school readiness* (Policy Brief No. 10). http://www.rch.org.au/uploadedFiles/Main/Content/ccch/PB10_SchoolReadiness.pdf Accessed 26 Mar 2016.
- Clancy, S., Simpson, L., & Howard, P. (2001). Mutual trust and respect. In S. Dockett & B. Perry (Eds.), *Beginning school together: Sharing strengths* (pp. 56–61). Watson: AECA.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95–120. doi:10.2307/2780243
- Corsaro, W., & Molinari, L. (2008). Policy and practice in Italian children's transition from pre-school to elementary school. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 3(3), 250–265. doi:10.2304/rcie.2008.3.3.250
- Council of Australian Governments (COAG). (2009). *Investing in the early years – A national early childhood development strategy*. https://www.coag.gov.au/sites/default/files/national_ECD_strategy.pdf Accessed 18 Feb 2016.
- Cowan, P. (1991). Individual and family life transitions: A proposal or a new definition. In P. Cowan & M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family transitions* (pp. 3–30). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Daniel-White, K. (2002). Reassessing parent involvement: Involving language minority parents in school work at home. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 18(1), 29–49.
- Davis-Kean, P. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement: The indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19, 294–304. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.294
- Desforges, C., & Abouchar, A. (2003). *The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment: A literature review, Research Report 433, London Department for Education and Skills*. Nottingham: DfES. http://bgfl.org/bgfl/custom/files_uploaded/uploaded_resources/18617/Desforges.pdf Accessed 14 Mar 2016.
- Dockett, S. (2014). Transition to school: Normative or relative? In B. Perry, S. Dockett, & A. Petriwskyj (Eds.), *Transitions to school – International research, policy and practice* (pp. 187–200). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Dockett, S., & Perry, B. (2009). Readiness for school: A relational construct. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 34(1), 20–26.
- Dockett, S., Perry, B., Kearney, E., Hampshire, A., Mason, J., & Schmied, V. (2011). *Facilitating children's transition to school from families with complex support needs*. Albury-Wodonga: Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education, Charles Sturt University. http://www.csu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/154899/Facilitating-Childrens-Trans-School.pdf Accessed 21 Nov 2016.
- Dunlop, A.-W., & Fabian, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Informing transitions in the early years: Research, policy and practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Dunst, C., Johanson, C., Rounds, T., Trivette, C., & Hamby, D. (1992). Characteristics of parent professional partnerships. In S. Christenson & J. Conoley (Eds.), *Home-school collabora-*

- tion: *Enhancing children's academic and social competence* (pp. 157–174). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Ecclestone, K., Biesta, G., & Hughes, M. (2010). Transitions in the lifecourse. In K. Ecclestone, G. Biesta, & M. Hughes (Eds.), *Transitions and learning through the lifecourse* (pp. 1–15). London: Routledge.
- Educational Transitions and Change (ETC) Research Group. (2011). *Transition to school: Position statement*. Albury-Wodonga: Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education, Charles Sturt University. <https://artsed.csu.edu.au/education/transitions/publications/Position-Statement.pdf>. Accessed 2 May 2017.
- Edwards, C., & Kutaka, T. (2015). Diverse perspectives of parents, diverse concepts of parent involvement and participation: Contrasts between Italy and the United States. In S. Sheridan & E. Kim (Eds.), *Foundational aspects of family-school partnership research* (pp. 35–53). New York: Springer.
- Elder Jr., G. H. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development*, 69, 1–12.
- Epstein, J. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(9), 701–712.
- Epstein, J. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Fan, W., & Williams, C. (2010). The effects of parental involvement on students' academic self-efficacy, engagement and intrinsic motivation. *Educational Psychology*, 30(1), 53–74. doi:10.1080/01443410903353302
- Garpelin, A. (2014). Transition to school: A rite of passage. In B. Perry, S. Dockett, & A. Petriwskyj (Eds.), *Transitions to school – International research, policy and practice* (pp. 105–116). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gessen, M. (2012). The day of knowledge. *New York Times*. http://latitude.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/03/a-summer-cut-short-for-russian-schoolchildren/?_r=0 Accessed 9 Jan 2016.
- Griebel, W., & Niesel, R. (2009). A developmental psychology perspective in Germany: Co-construction of transitions between family and education system by the child, parents and pedagogues. *Early Years*, 29(1), 59–68.
- Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2007). *Engaging parents in raising achievement. Do parents know they matter?* (Research Report DCSF-RW004). University of Warwick, UK. http://wiki.ict-register.net/images/0/0a/July_07_Every_parent_matters.pdf Accessed 14 Feb 2016.
- Henderson, A., & Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Henderson, A., Mapp, K., Johnson, V., & Davies, D. (2007). *Beyond the bake sale: The essential guide to family-school partnerships*. New York: New Press.
- Holliday, M., Cimetta, A., Cutshaw, C., Yaden, D., & Marx, R. (2014). Protective factors for school readiness among children in poverty. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 19(3–4), 125–147. doi:10.1080/10824669.2014.971692
- Hoover-Dempsey, K., & Sandler, H. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? *Review of Educational Research*, 67, 3–42.
- Hughes, M., Greenbough, P., Yee, W., & Andrews, J. (2010). The daily transition between home and school. In K. Ecclestone, G. Biesta, & M. Hughes (Eds.), *Transitions and learning through the lifecourse* (pp. 16–31). London: Routledge.
- Huser, C., Dockett, S., & Perry, B. (2016). Transition to school: Revisiting the bridge metaphor. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 24(3), 439–449. doi:10.1080/1350293X.2015.1102414
- Hviid, P., & Zittoun, T. (2008). Editorial introduction: Transitions in the process of education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 23(3), 121–130.
- Isaacs, J., & Magnuson, K. (2011). *Income and education as predictors of children's school readiness*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

- Jeynes, W. (2012). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of different types of parental involvement programs for urban students. *Urban Education*, 47(4), 706–742. doi:10.1177/0042085912445643
- Jindal-Snape, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Educational transitions: Moving stories from around the world*. New York: Routledge.
- Johansson, I. (2007). Horizontal transitions: What can it mean for children in the early school years? In A.-W. Dunlop & H. Fabian (Eds.), *Informing transitions in the early years: Research, policy and practice* (pp. 33–44). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Kagan, L. S. (1991). Moving from here to there: Rethinking continuity and transitions in early care and education. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho (Eds.), *Issues in early childhood curriculum, Yearbook in early childhood education* (Vol. 2, pp. 132–151). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kendall, S., Straw, S., Jones, M., Springate, I., & Grayson, H. (2008). *Narrowing the gap in outcomes for vulnerable groups: A review of the research evidence*. Berkshire: National Foundation for Education Research. <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/publications/LNG01/LNG01.pdf> Accessed 12 Feb 2016.
- Kiernan, K., & Mensah, F. (2011). Poverty, family resources and children's early educational attainment: The mediating role of parenting. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 317–336.
- Kimelberg, S. (2014). Beyond test scores: Middle-class mothers, cultural capital, and the evaluation of urban public schools. *Sociological Perspectives*, 57(2), 208–228. doi:10.1177/0731121414523398
- Lam, M. S., & Pollard, A. (2006). A conceptual framework for understanding children as agents in the transition from home to kindergarten. *Early Years*, 26(2), 123–141.
- Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education* (2nd ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lau, E. Y., Li, H., & Rao, N. (2011). Parent involvement and children's readiness for school in China. *Educational Research*, 53(1), 95–113.
- Laverick, D., & Jalongo, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Transitions to early care and education: International perspectives on making schools ready for young children*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.
- McWayne, C., Melzi, G., Schick, A., Kennedy, J., & Mundt, K. (2013). Defining family engagement among Latino Head Start parents: A mixed-methods measurement development study. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 28, 593–607. doi:org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2013.03.008 594
- Melhuish, E., Sylva, K., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I., Taggart, B., & Phan, M. (2008). Effects of the home learning environment and preschool centre experience upon literacy and numeracy development in the early primary school. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64, 157–188.
- Nakata, M. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and the cultural interface: Underlying issues at the intersection of knowledge and information systems. *IFLA Journal*, 28, 281–291.
- Perry, B. (2014). Social justice dimensions of starting school. In B. Perry, S. Dockett, & A. Petriwskyj (Eds.), *Transitions to school – International research, policy and practice* (pp. 175–186). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Perry, B., Dockett, S., & Petriwskyj, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Transitions to school – International research, policy and practice*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Peters, S. (2014). Chasms, bridges and borderlands: A transitions research 'across the border' from early childhood education to school in New Zealand. In B. Perry, S. Dockett, & A. Petriwskyj (Eds.), *Transitions to school – International research, policy and practice* (pp. 105–116). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Petriwskyj, A., Thorpe, K., & Tayler, C. (2005). Trends in the construction of transition to school in three western regions, 1990–2004. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 13(1), 55–69.
- Pianta, R., & Cox, M. (1999). *The transition to kindergarten*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Pomerantz, E., & Moorman, E. (2010). Parents' involvement in children's schooling: A context for children's development. In J. Meece & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Handbook of research on schools, schooling, and human development* (pp. 398–417). New York: Routledge.

- Quiocho, A., & Daoud, A. (2006). Dispelling myths about Latino parent participation in schools. *The Educational Forum*, 70(3), 255–267.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenberg, H., Lopez, M., & Westmoreland, H. (2009). *Family engagement: A shared responsibility*. *Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE) newsletter (November)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project. <http://www.hfrp.org/family-involvement/publication-resources/family-engagement-a-shared-responsibility> Accessed 28 Apr 2016.
- Sheridan, S., & Kim, E. (2015). *Foundational aspects of family-school partnership research*. New York: Springer.
- Sheridan, S., Knoche, L., Edwards, C., Bovaird, J., & Kupzyk, K. (2010). Parent engagement and school readiness: Effects of the getting ready intervention on preschool children's social-emotional competencies. *Early Education and Development*, 21(1), 125–156. doi:10.1080/10409280902783517
- Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage* (Trans. B. V. Minika & G.L. Caffee). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Walker, A., & MacPhee, D. (2011). How home gets to school: Parental control strategies predict children's school readiness. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26, 355–364.
- Weisner, T. (1984). Ecocultural niches of middle childhood: A cross-cultural perspective. In W. A. Collins (Ed.), *Development during middle childhood: The years from six to twelve* (pp. 335–369). Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wildenger, L., McIntyre, L., Fiese, B., & Eckert, T. (2008). Children's daily routines during kindergarten transition. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 36, 69–74. doi:10.1007/s10643-008-0255-2
- Zarate, M. (2007). *Understanding Latino parental involvement in education: Perceptions, expectations, and recommendations*. Tomas Rivera Policy Institute. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED502065.pdf>. Accessed 14 Apr 2016.
- Zittoun, T. (2008). Learning through transitions: The role of institutions. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 23(2), 165–181.