Vol. 4, No. 2, June 2026, pp. 272-281
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
POST AXIAL
FUTURISTIC TEACHING AND LEARNING
https://journal.amorfati.id/index.php/postaxial | | ISSN 3025-7549

Managing School-Based Parenting Programs to Support Primary School Students' Reading Literacy: A Qualitative Multiple-Case Study

Yeni Nuraeni [1a*], Deti Rostini [2b]
[1,2] Universitas Islam Nusantara, Indonesia

[a]yeninuraeniyudha71@gmail.com, [b]detirostini@uninus.ac.id

Article History:
Received:
21-08-2026
Revised:
07-09-2026
Accepted:
05-10-2026

Keywords:
Educational management; Family literacy; Parenting program; Primary school; School-family partnership

***Correspondence Address:**
yeninuraeniyudha71@gmail.com

Abstract:
Strengthening primary students' reading literacy requires coordinated support from schools and families. However, many school-based parenting programs focus on one-way information sessions rather than a complete and continuous program cycle. This study examined how two Indonesian public primary schools managed parenting programs to support students' reading literacy. It used a qualitative multiple-case design at SD Negeri Babakan Pacet and SD Negeri 114 Bojongkoneng. Data came from non-participant observations, semi-structured interviews with principals, teachers, school committee members, parents, and students, and an analysis of program documents and literacy portfolios. The data were analyzed through data condensation, data displays, conclusion drawing, and verification. Planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling guided the analysis. Four findings emerged. First, the schools planned their programs around observed reading difficulties and the need for support at home. Second, principals, teachers, and school committees shared responsibility for materials, communication, and literacy resources. Third, the schools used parent workshops, shared reading, reading logs, and online communication. Fourth, teachers monitored progress through classroom observations, communication with parents, reading records, and student portfolios. Evidence across data sources indicated stronger parental engagement, more regular reading, greater confidence in reading, and better understanding of simple texts. Limited parental time and unequal support at home reduced consistency. A connected management cycle helped the schools turn one-off parenting activities into more purposeful family literacy partnerships. This qualitative study does not establish causal effects or statistically measured improvement.

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

Introduction (مقدمة)

Reading literacy helps students understand lessons, evaluate information, and express ideas. Indonesia still faces major literacy challenges. In PISA 2022, approximately 25% of 15-year-old students in Indonesia reached at least Level 2 in reading, compared with an OECD average of 74% (OECD, 2023). These data do not directly represent primary students. However, they show the need to strengthen literacy consistently from the early years of education.

Schools cannot strengthen literacy alone. Families shape the home literacy environment through access to reading materials, models of reading behavior, conversations about texts, shared reading, and expectations for children's learning. Dong et al. (2020) found a moderate positive association between the home literacy environment and reading comprehension. Parental involvement and literacy expectations showed stronger associations than the availability of reading resources alone. An analysis of PIRLS 2021 data also showed that an active reading climate and the number of books at home were associated with Grade 4 students' reading comprehension through pathways involving reading enjoyment, motivation, and frequency (Claes et al., 2024). These findings show that the home literacy environment includes both resources and interaction.

This relationship requires careful interpretation. The home literacy environment does not always directly cause reading development. Children's initial ability, parental language skills, socioeconomic conditions, and school instruction may also contribute. A longitudinal study by Puglisi et al. (2017) showed that existing family characteristics may partly shape the association between the home literacy environment and children's skills. Kim's (2022) second-order meta-analysis also found that the relationship between parental involvement and achievement varied across types of involvement and study characteristics. Parental involvement should therefore not be treated as one uniform activity.

Intervention research still shows that families can support literacy development when activities are well designed. Sénéchal and Young (2008) and van Steensel et al. (2011) found positive effects of family literacy programs, although effect sizes varied by activity and the role given to parents. Fikrat-Wevers et al. (2021) found a moderate immediate effect of family literacy programs for children from low socioeconomic status families, but a much smaller follow-up effect. A recent meta-analysis of school-aged children also found positive effects on code-focused and meaning-focused skills, including vocabulary and reading comprehension (Dahl-Leonard et al., 2025). These results highlight two points. Family programs can help, but their sustainability and fit with family circumstances remain important.

The main challenge concerns not only program content but also implementation quality. de la Rie et al. (2017) distinguished three key elements: program delivery to parents, parents' receipt or engagement, and enactment in daily family life. Many studies record attendance more often than they examine the quality of parent training and the use of strategies at home. A program may appear active at school but fail to become part of family routines. Yearlong collaboration, two-way communication, and opportunities for families to practice strategies can support continuity (Traga Philippakos et al., 2023).

This gap matters for school management. Many studies treat parental involvement as an individual behavior or as a predictor of learning outcomes. That approach does not fully explain the organizational processes that make participation regular and sustainable. A parenting program may remain a one-off seminar if the school does not identify needs, assign responsibilities, support home practice, and use monitoring data to improve activities. This study views parenting as a school-family partnership program. Parents are not only recipients of information. They are partners who apply literacy activities and provide feedback.

The study used the management functions of planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling, known as POAC, as its analytical framework. Planning includes identifying needs,

setting goals, selecting materials, arranging schedules, and allocating resources. Organizing includes assigning roles and coordinating participants. Actuating refers to program implementation and support for participation. Controlling includes monitoring, evaluation, feedback, and follow-up. POAC helps explain how the stages of a program connect. Bronfenbrenner's (1986) ecological perspective complements this framework by locating the family-school relationship within the mesosystem that shapes children's learning experiences. The school, family, and community partnership model also emphasizes shared responsibility for student development (Epstein et al., 2018).

This study took place at SD Negeri Babakan Pacet and SD Negeri 114 Bojongkoneng. The schools operate in different local settings and face different levels of family support. Studying two sites made it possible to identify recurring patterns and contextual variations. Unlike statistical studies of the relationship between parental involvement and reading ability, this study examined how schools managed parenting programs in everyday settings.

The study addressed the following question: How did the schools plan, organize, implement, and monitor parenting programs to strengthen students' reading literacy? It aimed to explain the management cycle, forms of family engagement, observed indications of change, and barriers to implementation. The study offers two contributions. Theoretically, it connects management functions with family literacy partnerships. Practically, it identifies program components that can help schools turn one-off parenting activities into more sustained literacy support.

Method (منهج)

Research design and sites

This study used a qualitative multiple-case design. A case study is suitable for examining complex processes in real-life settings and for using several sources of evidence to understand a defined unit of analysis (Crowe et al., 2011; Yin, 2018). Each school was first treated as a separate case and was then compared with the other case. The study took place at SD Negeri Babakan Pacet and SD Negeri 114 Bojongkoneng. The unit of analysis was the management of school-based parenting programs related to students' reading literacy. The unit of analysis was not parents' personal characteristics or individual literacy scores.

Participants and data sources

Participants were selected purposively according to their formal roles and direct involvement in the parenting programs. The participant groups comprised principals, classroom teachers, school committee members, parents, and students. Principals contributed information on policy and program direction; teachers on literacy facilitation and monitoring; school committee members on coordination between schools and families; parents on literacy practices at home; and students on participation in literacy activities. This role-based selection was intended to capture perspectives from decision making, implementation, coordination, home practice, and student experience.

Documentary data sources included school work plans, parenting materials, activity schedules, lesson plans, reading development records, literacy assessment results, student portfolios, attendance lists, photographs, and activity reports. The documents served as traces of program implementation. They were used not only to support interview data but also to examine the timing, form, and continuity of activities.

Data collection

Data collection combined non-participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. Observations focused on reading routines, forms of support, parental participation, the use of literacy resources, and students' reading behavior in class. Interviews followed a common set of topics covering program planning, division of responsibilities, home literacy support, school-family communication, perceived changes, supporting factors, and

implementation barriers. The semi-structured format kept the main topics comparable across participants while allowing follow-up questions to clarify examples, reasons, and reported changes.

The three data sources were used in a complementary way. Observations documented practice, interviews explained participants' experiences and decisions, and documents provided administrative and developmental traces of implementation. Parenting materials, schedules, reading records, student portfolios, authentic assessment results, and activity documentation were reviewed to check whether reported activities were planned, implemented, and continued. Interview accounts were therefore interpreted alongside observational and documentary evidence rather than as stand-alone claims.

Data analysis

Analysis began during data collection and followed the interactive model developed by Miles et al. (2014). The researcher read the data repeatedly, selected relevant material, assigned codes, grouped related codes, prepared data displays, and drew and verified conclusions. Coding combined deductive and inductive logic. The four POAC functions provided the deductive categories. Inductive codes arose from the data and included literacy activities, patterns of parental participation, observed changes, barriers, and follow-up actions. This combination maintained a clear link to the theoretical framework while allowing contextual findings to emerge.

Analysis occurred in two stages. First, each school was analyzed as a separate case to identify its context, program process, evidence, and implementation barriers. Second, a cross-case matrix compared similarities and variations within each POAC function. The matrix examined shared practices, forms of evidence, implementation problems, and contextual differences between the two sites. Codes and preliminary conclusions were checked against the original data, creating a traceable record of analytical decisions consistent with transparency in qualitative analysis (Nowell et al., 2017).

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was strengthened through source and method triangulation. Source triangulation compared accounts from principals, teachers, school committee members, parents, and students. Method triangulation compared interview accounts with observations and program documents. During analysis, the researcher examined convergence, complementarity, and differences across these sources. Cross-case checking then assessed whether an interpretation appeared in both schools or reflected a contextual variation. Triangulation was therefore used to test and refine interpretations rather than simply count agreement among sources.

The researcher also asked participants to clarify summaries of the findings through member checking. An audit trail recorded data collection, coding, category changes, and the development of conclusions. Together, triangulation, member checking, and the audit trail supported the credibility, rigor, and coherence of the qualitative study (Nowell et al., 2017; Tracy, 2010).

Result (نتائج)

The findings showed that the parenting programs at both schools followed a connected management cycle. Planning defined the program focus, organizing assigned responsibilities, actuating translated plans into practices at school and at home, and controlling generated information for follow-up. Similarities across the schools were stronger than their differences. The main cross-case variations concerned parental access, regularity of support at home, and the use of online communication. These differences affected the consistency of implementation rather than the presence of the four management functions.

Planning began with observed literacy needs

Both schools began by identifying students' needs. Teachers used classroom observations, reading assessment results, development records, and reviews of literacy activities to identify

problems. Three recurring issues emerged: low reading frequency at home, differences in reading ability among students, and limited family support.

The schools then set goals related to reading habits, text comprehension, and cooperation between families and schools. Parenting materials addressed the role of parents in building reading habits, ways to support children without completing tasks for them, managing learning time, selecting reading materials, and creating a simple home literacy environment. The schools used accessible language for parents from different educational backgrounds. Planning also included schedules, facilitators, resources, and communication channels. The schools recognized that parents' work schedules could limit attendance. They therefore did not rely only on face-to-face meetings. They also prepared online materials and communication. Planning went beyond setting an agenda and began to consider family circumstances as part of program design.

Organizing distributed responsibilities between schools and families

The organizing function involved principals, classroom teachers, school committees, and parents. Principals provided policy direction and support. Teachers prepared materials, facilitated activities, guided reading practices at home, and monitored students' development. School committees shared information, connected schools with parents, and encouraged attendance. Parents carried out agreed activities at home and reported children's progress and difficulties.

The division of responsibilities also covered classroom libraries, reading corners, reading materials, reading logs, and communication schedules. This structure prevented the program from becoming the responsibility of one teacher. However, participation remained uneven because families differed in their abilities and available time. Parents with demanding work or household responsibilities found it more difficult to participate regularly. School committees played an important connecting role, but teachers remained the center of technical coordination. This arrangement supported implementation but also created dependence on teachers' initiative. Programs need clearer procedures and regular feedback schedules so that they do not weaken when teachers' workloads increase.

Actuating combined parent education with literacy practice at home

The schools implemented the programs through information sessions, workshops, interactive discussions, learning support, shared reading, and online communication. Materials did more than explain the importance of literacy. Teachers demonstrated activities that families could use, such as reading stories aloud, asking children to retell a text, discussing characters or main ideas, keeping reading logs, and creating simple reading corners.

Interview and document data indicated changes in the practices of some parents. They began to set aside time for shared reading, provide more reading materials, limit screen use unrelated to learning, and use reading records. In the classroom, teachers observed that some students became more confident readers, participated more regularly in literacy activities, and explained simple texts more clearly. Portfolios and reading records supported these indications of development.

Online delivery helped parents who could not attend in person. However, online communication did not produce equal levels of engagement. Some parents received information but did not consistently report or carry out the activities. Access to materials did not automatically lead to active participation. Teachers therefore needed to provide short instructions, concrete examples, and simple feedback channels.

Controlling connected student development with program improvement

Teachers monitored reading activities, reading fluency, understanding of texts, confidence in participation, and regular completion of reading records. The schools also asked parents about home activities, children's difficulties, time constraints, and limited resources.

Student portfolios, authentic assessments, attendance lists, and activity documentation provided additional information.

Monitoring produced two groups of findings. First, the data indicated stronger engagement among some parents, more regular reading, greater interest in reading materials, greater confidence in reading, and better understanding of simple texts. Second, these developments were uneven. Parents' available time and education, access to reading materials, and family routines affected the continuity of practice. The schools responded through more frequent communication, adjusted schedules, repeated messages through online media, and individual guidance from teachers. These actions expanded the program's reach but did not fully address unequal support at home. Controlling therefore served not only to record attendance but also to identify gaps in implementation and adjust strategies.

Cross-case synthesis

Table 1 presents the cross-case synthesis. Both schools showed the same overall POAC structure, but the strength and continuity of enactment varied with family readiness, available time, access to literacy resources, and communication patterns. The comparison therefore suggests that the main difference between the cases was contextual implementation rather than a different management model.

Table 1. Cross-case comparison of findings by management function

Function	Shared pattern across both schools	Main point of variation	Cross-case interpretation
Planning	Needs analysis, goal setting, selection of materials, schedules, and communication channels	Students' needs and family readiness varied	The planning logic was shared, but activities had to be adjusted to family circumstances.
Organizing	Roles were distributed among principals, teachers, school committees, and parents	Technical coordination remained teacher-centered and family capacity varied	Role distribution was similar across cases, but continuity depended on local participation and teacher coordination.
Actuating	Parent sessions, workshops, shared reading, reading logs, and online communication	Attendance, home practice, and reliance on online communication were uneven	Multiple delivery modes widened access, but receipt of information did not always become regular home practice.
Controlling	Monitoring at school and home, portfolio review, feedback, and follow-up	Available time, parental education, and access to reading materials varied	Monitoring served the same purpose in both cases but identified different levels of support needed by families.

Discussion (مناقشة)

POAC formed a common management cycle across both cases

Across the two cases, the strongest pattern was convergence in the management structure. Both schools used needs-based planning, distributed responsibilities among school and family actors, combined parent education with literacy practice at home, and used monitoring for follow-up. Cross-case differences appeared mainly in parental access, the regularity of home

practice, and reliance on online communication. These differences shaped how consistently the cycle operated, but they did not change its basic structure.

This pattern is consistent with research on implementation quality in family literacy programs. de la Rie et al. (2017) distinguished delivery, participant receipt, and enactment at home. In the present cases, planning and organizing supported delivery, actuating created opportunities for parents to receive and practice strategies, and controlling examined whether those strategies became part of family routines. POAC therefore helps explain how separate parenting activities can become a connected program cycle.

The management framework was used at the school-program level rather than to treat families as formal organizations. Parents acted as partners who implemented literacy activities at home, while schools coordinated goals, resources, support, and monitoring. This distinction clarifies the study's contribution: rather than estimating intervention effects, it explains the organizational process that connected school activities with family practice.

Quality of engagement mattered more than attendance alone

The findings showed that parental involvement occurred at different levels. Parents could attend meetings, receive online materials, carry out literacy activities with their children, and provide feedback to teachers. Attendance or receipt of information represented an early level of involvement, whereas changes in home practice represented more substantive engagement.

This interpretation aligns with evidence that different forms of parental involvement do not have uniform relationships with reading outcomes (Graham & Mtsweni, 2025; Kim, 2022). The distinction between delivery, receipt, and enactment is useful here (de la Rie et al., 2017). Meetings and online messages represented delivery; attendance and understanding indicated receipt; and shared reading, text discussion, and reading logs indicated enactment. The main implementation weakness in both cases appeared when receipt did not consistently become home practice.

Family-implemented literacy activities can support reading development, but continuity matters. Dahl-Leonard et al. (2025) reported benefits for code-focused and meaning-focused skills, while Fikrat-Wevers et al. (2021) found that follow-up effects may be smaller than immediate effects. The present findings similarly suggest that shared reading and related practices are more likely to continue when schools provide clear models, feasible activities, and regular feedback.

Cross-case variation reflected family context rather than different management models

Both schools used face-to-face meetings and online communication to reach parents, yet the cross-case analysis showed variation in parental access, regularity of home support, and reliance on online channels. These differences help explain why the same program structure did not produce equally consistent enactment across families. Limited time, low parental confidence, lack of reading materials, and established family routines constrained continuity even when information was available.

Bronfenbrenner's (1986) ecological perspective helps explain this variation. The school-family connection at the mesosystem level becomes meaningful when communication can be translated into workable routines in the home microsystem. The finding also supports partnership approaches that respond to family circumstances (Epstein et al., 2018). Focused activities, sustained collaboration, and flexible forms of participation are therefore important when families differ in resources, experience, and available time (Fikrat-Wevers et al., 2021; Traga Philippakos et al., 2023).

The practical implication is not to standardize every family's participation, but to preserve common literacy goals while allowing manageable routes to enactment. Brief activities, flexible timing, accessible materials, and simple feedback channels can help schools support parents as

learners and partners rather than treating them only as instruments for improving children's outcomes (Clymer et al., 2024).

Interpreting evidence of literacy change

The study found indications of more regular reading, greater confidence, stronger interest in reading materials, and better understanding of simple texts. These indications came from observations, interviews, reading records, authentic assessments, and portfolios. Triangulation strengthened interpretation because interviews described experiences, observations documented practice, and school records provided evidence of activities and development (Carter et al., 2014).

However, the study did not use a comparison group or standardized pretest and posttest measures. It therefore cannot claim that the parenting programs caused literacy improvement or produced statistically significant effects. Classroom instruction, students' initial abilities, peer support, and access to reading materials may also have contributed. The appropriate conclusion is that reading-related developments were observed alongside program implementation.

This caution is consistent with the broader literature. Home literacy environments are associated with reading comprehension, but individual components and indirect pathways differ, and family characteristics may partly account for observed associations (Claes et al., 2024; Dong et al., 2020; Puglisi et al., 2017). Unlike experimental studies and meta-analyses that estimate effects (Dahl-Leonard et al., 2025; Fikrat-Wevers et al., 2021; van Steensel et al., 2011), the present study contributes an explanation of how schools managed activities, how families encountered barriers to enactment, and how follow-up accompanied the observed changes.

Implications for school management

The findings offer five practical implications. First, schools should begin with data on students' needs and family circumstances. Second, they should document responsibilities, communication schedules, and follow-up procedures. Third, teachers should demonstrate short, concrete, age-appropriate literacy activities. Fourth, schools should distinguish indicators of program delivery, receipt, and enactment. Fifth, evaluation should combine indicators of family participation with indicators of student development.

Schools can use reading logs, family activity choices, brief conversations about texts, and portfolios as monitoring tools. These tools should remain simple so that they do not place excessive demands on parents and teachers. Evidence on implementation quality shows that attendance records alone cannot explain how a program works (de la Rie et al., 2017). Schools need to know which activities families use, which barriers they experience, and which forms of support they need.

Schools should also provide additional support to families with limited time, reading materials, or confidence in supporting children. Programs can offer a choice of texts, sample questions, short audio or video guidance, book lending, and flexible activity times. Such adaptations do not lower program standards. They help families work toward the same goals in ways that fit their circumstances.

Limitations and directions for future research

This study was limited to two schools and focused on program management processes. The findings cannot be generalized statistically. The data did not support detailed comparisons by grade level, socioeconomic conditions, parental education, or intensity of participation. In addition, the study inferred literacy development from qualitative evidence and school documents rather than from an impact evaluation design.

Future research could use a mixed-methods design. A qualitative phase could explain processes, while a quantitative phase could measure changes in reading, motivation, and literacy frequency. Studies should also compare program variations across socioeconomic conditions and levels of digital access. A longitudinal design could show whether reading habits continue after the program ends.

Conclusion (خاتمة)

Four management practices characterized both cases: needs-based planning using evidence of students' reading needs and family circumstances; distribution of roles among principals, teachers, school committees, and parents; implementation through parent education and concrete literacy activities at home; and monitoring that connected reading records, portfolios, parent feedback, and follow-up action. Cross-case differences concerned parental access, consistency of home support, and reliance on online communication rather than the overall management structure.

Practically, schools should treat parenting as a continuous management cycle rather than a one-off meeting. They should formalize coordination, provide short and feasible home literacy activities, monitor enactment rather than attendance alone, and offer additional support to families with limited time or resources. Observations, interviews, and documents indicated stronger parental engagement and reading-related development, but the study does not establish causal or statistically measured effects. Its main contribution is showing how a connected POAC cycle can sustain school-family literacy partnerships under differing family conditions.

Bibliography ((مراجع

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*(6), 723–742. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.22.6.723

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The Use of Triangulation in Qualitative Research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *41*(5), 545. https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547

Claes, R., Laga, J., Denies, K., Bleukx, N., Dockx, J., Van Keer, H., & Aesaert, K. (2024). The interplay between students' home literacy environment, reading attitudes and comprehension: A serial mediation analysis using PIRLS 2021-data. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, *12*(1), 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-024-00233-8

Clymer, C., Lee, J., McLean, E. L., & Prins, E. (2024). Parents' learning in family literacy: A mixed-methods evaluation. *Zeitschrift Für Weiterbildungsforschung*, *47*(2), 297–319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40955-024-00286-w

Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *11*(1), 100. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100

Dahl-Leonard, K., Hall, C., Cho, E., Capin, P., Roberts, G. J., Kehoe, K. F., Haring, C., Peacott, D., & Demchak, A. (2025). Examining the Effects of Family-Implemented Literacy Interventions for School-Aged Children: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, *37*(1), 10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-025-09985-3

de la Rie, S., van Steensel, R. c. m., & van Gelderen, A. j. s. (2017). Implementation quality of family literacy programmes: A review of literature. *Review of Education*, *5*(1), 91–118. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3081

Dong, Y., Wu, S. X.-Y., Dong, W.-Y., & Tang, Y. (2020). The Effects of Home Literacy Environment on Children's Reading Comprehension Development: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *20*(2), 63–82.

Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., Van Voorhis, F. L., Martin, C. S., Thomas, B. G., & Greenfeld, M. D. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin press.

Fikrat-Wevers, S., van Steensel, R., & Arends, L. (2021). Effects of Family Literacy Programs on the Emergent Literacy Skills of Children From Low-SES Families: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *91*(4), 577–613. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654321998075

Graham, M. A., & Mtsweni, M. U. (2025). Parental involvement predicts Grade 4 learners' reading literacy: An analysis of PIRLS data for students in Mpumalanga, South Africa. *Educational Review*, *77*(6), 1907–1929. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2024.2379416

Kim, S. (2022). Fifty years of parental involvement and achievement research: A second-order meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, *37*, 100463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100463

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 1609406917733847. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

OECD. (2023). *PISA 2022 Results*. OECD. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2023/11/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_2fca04b9/indonesia_0e09c072/c2e1ae0e-en.pdf

Puglisi, M. L., Hulme, C., Hamilton, L. G., & Snowling, M. J. (2017). The Home Literacy Environment Is a Correlate, but Perhaps Not a Cause, of Variations in Children's Language and Literacy Development. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *21*(6), 498–514. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2017.1346660

Sénéchal, M., & Young, L. (2008). The Effect of Family Literacy Interventions on Children's Acquisition of Reading From Kindergarten to Grade 3: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(4), 880–907. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308320319

Terry, G. R., & Franklin, S. G. (1972). *Principles of management*.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-Tent" Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(10), 837–851. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121

Traga Philippakos, Z. A., Ross, R., & Summers, J. (2023). Promoting Ongoing Partnerships in Family Literacy Through Yearlong Collaborations. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *51*(8), 1499–1510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-022-01404-4

van Steensel, R., McElvany, N., Kurvers, J., & Herppich, S. (2011). How Effective Are Family Literacy Programs?: Results of a Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(1), 69–96. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310388819

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). Sage Thousand Oaks, CA.