International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies

12(*2*), 2022, 473-496

www.ijocis.com

Examination of the Perceptions of Families with Special Needs Children towards Teachers, School Communication, and Cooperation

Elif Ecehan Çuhacı, Cyprus International University, e_ecehan@hotmail.com, 0000-0002-9345-0718

Cahit Nuri, Cyprus International University, cnuri@ciu.edu.tr, 0000-0003-0805-1972

Keywords

Special needs children
Family
Communication
Teacher
Cooperation

Article Info:

Received : 12-11-2021
Accepted : 10-10-2022
Published : 09-12-2022

DOI: 0.31704/ijocis.2022.019

Abstract

This descriptive survey study investigates the perceptions of families with special needs children regarding the teachers, school communication and cooperation in terms of teachers' sex, age, education, professional formation, and experience. 276 parents whose children benefit from special education services in a special education and rehabilitation center in Sarıyer district of Istanbul province participated to the study. Demographic information form and family-teacher communication and cooperation scale were employed to gather data. Findings revealed that the teacher-school communication and expectations of families with special needs children were quite high. Their perception of cooperating with the teacher was also high, while their participation in "communication and cooperation" was found to be at a medium level. In the study, significant differences were obtained in terms of communication, expectations, and collaborations with teachers' age, gender, occupation, and parents' marital status. Moreover, as the parents' education level increased, their perceptions and opinions regarding school-teacher communication and cooperation demonstrated more positive distribution. It was revealed that parents whose monthly household income was 5000 TL and below had higher and positive views towards family-teacher communication. Lastly, significant and positive relationships were found among parents' family-teacher communication, cooperation, expectations, and participation.

To cite this article: Çuhacı, E. E. & Nuri, C. (2022). Investigation of families' perspectives with special needs children towards teacher, school communication and cooperation. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies, 12*(2), 473-496. 10.31704/ijocis.2022.019

Introduction

While defining the educational goals of children with special needs, children cannot be considered alone. Every child is a whole with their family and carries the traces of life provided to them in the family that they grew up in. Family members have extensive knowledge of the child's medical history, daily routines, likes and dislikes, the reasons for their behaviors, and what they need and do not need. Family members are frequently the first to notice the developmental delays and inadequacies of children. The reason is linked to the fact that parents, spend more time with their children than teachers and/or other school staff and observe them more (Smith, 2006). Therefore, it is necessary to consider and care about the thoughts of the families and to establish positive communication in order to make school education beneficial for the child (Cömert & Güleç, 2004). In doing so, families can be integrated into their children's education process. Furthermore, to ensure the continuity of the education implemented in special education, school-family cooperation is vital. Two-way communication should be established and parents and teachers should attempt to comprehend each other's perspectives. No matter how high the quality of the education programs implemented in private education institutions is unless the education is supported by the family, it would not provide permanent behavioral changes in children and achieve the objectives of special education. In this cooperation, it is vital to ensure the participation of both parties (Rodrigez, Blatz, & Elbaum, 2014). Families, school management, and teachers should share the responsibilities required for the healthy development and learning of children (Eliasan & Jenkins, 2003). Effective parent-teacher communication encourages children's learning and helps them to grow and develop through school-family cooperation, which is quite vital (Nuri, 2020). To sum up, teachers who see families as an important stakeholder such as a colleague, cooperate more with parents, which is necessary to ensure effective communication and cooperation (Decker & Decker, 2005; Nuri, Akçamete & Direktör, 2022, Seplocha, 2007).

When the literature is scrutinized, it was noticed that most papers were generally interested in the problems and stress levels of families with children with special needs and their expectations (Haines et al., 2017; Kyzar, Mueller, Grace, & Haines, 2019; Lazerevic & Kopas-Vukašinović, 2014; Mueller & Vick, 2019; Schuh et. al., 2015; Shriberg, 2020). Moreover, it was realized that most of the studies in this field were mainly carried out in Anglo-Saxon countries (Baker, Wise, Kelley & Skiba, 2016; Eichin & Volante, 2018; Garbacz, Herman, Thompson & Reinke, 2017; Garbarcz, Stormshak, E., Lee, L., & Kosti, 2019). However, there are limited studies in Turkey regarding the perspectives of families with special needs children on the teacher, school communication, and cooperation depending on different variables. Hence, in this study, the phenomenon of family-school and family-teacher cooperation in Turkey was investigated through the perspectives of parents of children with special needs, from participatory, holistic, and contextual sides. It is significant to identify the perspectives of these families on the teacher, school communication, and cooperation to raise awareness and inform the school administration, teachers, and other institutions/organizations. Research illustrates that effective private education institutions have high levels of parental and community involvement. This participation can be associated with the learning, development, and behavior of special needs children. Regardless of the family's social or cultural background, family involvement in special education can have a large and multifaceted impact on student learning. For the development

of children, effective communication and cooperation between family and school staff are required. Effective parent-teacher communication helps to support children's learning, positively supports all developmental areas, and helps school-family cooperation grow and improve. Therefore, it is essential to ensure effective communication and cooperation between school and family. One of the most effective ways to make the learning process effective is to integrate families into their children's education (Rodrigez et al., 2014). While family involvement benefits all students, those with special needs often need more parental involvement and support than their peers to get the same level of education as the general student population. Children with special needs often face multifaceted classroom challenges that require the special attention of instructors and the active involvement of their families. Families play a range of supporting roles, including those who can provide educators who may feel under pressure with valuable information about children's special needs. Nonetheless, when families and educators work together, it boosts the probability of children who have special needs have positive and successful learning experiences (Cooc & Bui, 2017). Teachers can realize the education and training program applied at school more easily, reach a healthy result, share responsibilities, reach goals, and increase job satisfaction bythrough the cooperation of school and family (Garbacz, Mcintyre, & Santiago, 2016). Research reveals that parent involvement makes educators more motivated and focused on teaching tasks in class. Moreover, teachers can learn more about students' needs, the ways they can better meet these needs, and the home environment for this purpose by communicating more with parents. Considering this, as the interactions grow, parents of children with special needs often have positive approaches toward teachers, which also boosts the motivation of teachers (Garbacz, et al., 2016; Whyte & Karabon, 2016).

Aforementioned studies conducted in Turkey to reveal their views on parent-school cooperation in formal education (Güleç & Genç, 2010; Güven, 2011; İnal, 2006;). Yet, no study has been found in which parents' opinions towards school-family cooperation in private education institutions with a descriptive approach. It is thought that the findings of the present study will contribute to further school-family cooperation practices in special education. Additionally, focusing on school-family communication and cooperation from a parent perspective will contribute to comprehending the perspectives of parents, who are important stakeholders in teaching/learning processes. Therefore, it is mainly discussed to examine the perceptions of parents of children with special needs towards school-family cooperation in terms of demographic variables and teacher characteristics in the present research. In line with this aim, the following sub-objectives were addressed to obtain answers:

1. What is the level of communication and cooperation perceptions of parents with children with special needs towards teachers?
2. Do the scores obtained from the parent-teacher communication and cooperation scale vary based on the “age, sex, marital status, education level, monthly household income level” and the age of the teacher of the parents of children with special needs?

Method

Research Design

The descriptive survey method, which is under the quantitative research methods, was used to examine the perceptions and thoughts of the parent of children with special needs on

family-teacher communication and cooperation. Descriptive survey research design leads to answers to the questions of "who, what, when, where, and how" relevant to a particular research problem. This research model cannot definitively determine the answers to why questions. The descriptive survey method is utilized for gathering data regarding the present state of a phenomenon and for defining "existing" based on the variables or conditions in a certain situation (Özmen & Karamustafaoğlu, 2019).

Population and Participants

An online data collection procedure through Google Forms was performed on parents with children with special needs who were studying at a special education and rehabilitation center in the Sarıyer district of Istanbul. The convenience sampling method, among purposeful sampling methods, was used in the present study. In this approach, as the name suggests, elements of the research group are selected solely based on suitability in terms of relevance, access, and accessibility, by the purpose of the study. The instance is created quickly without putting any overhead on existing resources. In this approach, in many cases, it is essential to describe the intended information in a versatile and in-depth manner rather than generalizing it to the general population. The aforementioned technique is frequently utilized in preliminary research practice to get a gross estimate of outcomes regardless of incurring the cost or time necessary to randomly choose a population (Özmen & Karamustafaoğlu, 2019). In this regard, the measurement tools of the research were implemented for 274 parents who accepted voluntary participation in the study based on the convenience sampling method. The demographic distribution of the characteristics of children with special needs in the research group is presented in Table 1 in detail.

Table 1. *Distribution of parents by socio-demographic characteristics (N=274)*

	Number (n)	*Percentage (%)*
Age		
20-29	53	19,2
30-39	96	34,78
40-49	97	35,14
50≥	30	10,87
Gender		
Female	219	79,35
Male	57	20,65
Marital Status		
Married	212	76,81
Single	64	23,19
Education		
Primary School	27	9,78
Middle School	30	10,87
High School	106	38,41
Bachelor and above	113	40,94
Monthly Household Income		
3000 TL and below	111	40,22
3001-5000 TL	92	33,33
5001-7000 TL	42	15,22
7001 TL and above	31	11,23

Table 1. (Cont.)

Age of Children's Teacher		
20-29	69	25
30-39	166	60,14
40≥	41	14,86

Table one illustrates that the 19.20% of the parents participating in the study were 20-29 years old, 34.78% were 30-39 years old, 35.14% were 40-49 years old, and 10.87% were 50 years old and over. It was determined that 79.35% were female, 20.35% were male, 76.81% were married and 23.19% were single. It was revealed that 9.78% of the parents had primary school, 10.87% had secondary school, 38.41% had high school and 40.94% had undergraduate or higher education. The monthly household income of 40.22% of the parents included in the research was 3000 TL or less, 33.33% of them were between 3001-5000 TL, 15.22% of them were between 5001-7000 TL and 11.23% of them were 7001 TL and above. When the distribution of parents based on the age of their children's teachers was examined, it was revealed that 25.0% of their children's teachers were between 20-29 years old, 60.14% of them were 30-39 years old, and 14.86% of them were 40 years old and over.

Data Collection Tools

Demographic Information Form

In this part of the measurement tool, questions regarding the distribution of parents based on their socio-demographic characteristics were included. In this context, the questions of gender, age, marital status, educational status, household income and the age of the child's teacher were covered.

Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale

In the present study, the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale", which was developed by Atabey and Tezelşahin (2011), was utilized to measure the perceptions and thoughts of parents who have children with special needs. In light of this, mentioned scale assisted the researchers in further evaluating the interaction and cooperation among parents, schools, and educators. The scale includes 4 sub-dimensions, namely communication, expectation, cooperation, and family involvement, and a total of 62 questions. The questions in both scales are "5-point Likert" type and the options are; "strongly disagree" (1), "disagree" (2), "undecided" (3), "agree" (4), and "strongly agree" (5). This scale consists of Communication (12 items), Expectation (7 items), Cooperation (21 items), and Family Participation (22 items). Atabey and Tezel-Şahin (2011) conducted an analysis to test the construct validity of the scale. The factor and item analyses of the subscale and the whole scale performed on the measurement tool demonstrate that the participants, consisting of parents of children with special needs, have a construct validity suitable for measuring their perceptions of family-teacher communication and cooperation.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was utilized to examine the reliability level of the parent-teacher communication and cooperation scale on parents of children with special needs related to internal consistency. The fact that the alpha coefficient is 0.70 and higher indicates that the reliability of the scale is sufficient (Yurt & Sünbül, 2014). In the study group consisting of

parents of children with special needs, Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" were calculated as 0.92, 0.74, 0.92, and 0.93, respectively. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the whole scale is 0.95. The coefficients obtained showed that the reliability of the scales due to internal consistency was at a high level.

Data Collection

Descriptive statistics were obtained within the scope of the research with arithmetic mean and standard deviation. Normal distribution analyzes were performed with the "Kolmogorov Smirnov Test" on the scores of parents of children with special needs from the "Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale". Kolmogorov Smirnov Test" results revealed that the "Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" scores of parents of children with special needs did not meet the normal distribution assumption. In this case, non-parametric statistical techniques called "Mann Whitney U Test" (gender, marital status) and "Kruskal Wallis Test" (age, education level, monthly household income, age of the child's teacher) were applied. Significance level (p=0.05) was taken and statistical significance p<0.05 level was sought.

Results

In this section, the findings obtained from the research are included.

Table 2. *Scores of Parents from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale (N=276)*

Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale Sub-dimensions	*N*	$\bar{x}$	*SS*	*Min*	*Max*
Communication	276	54,90	7,93	12	60
Expectation	276	31,08	5,53	12	35
Cooperation	276	84,61	18,47	23	105
Family Participation	276	80,47	21,41	22	110
Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale	276	251,06	47,21	73	310

In Table 2, some descriptive statistics are presented regarding the scores of parents included in the study from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale". When Table 2. is considered, an average of 54.90±7.93 points from the communication sub-dimension of the "Parents-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale", an average of 31.08±5.53 points from the expectation sub-dimension, and an average of 84.61±18.47 from the cooperation sub-dimension score and family involvement sub-dimension, they scored an average of 80.47±21.41 points. While the parents included in the study received an average of 251.06±47.21 points from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale", the lowest score they got from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" was 73 and the highest score was 310.

Table 3. *Comparison of Parents' Scores from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale by Age Groups (N=276).*

	Age	*N*	$\bar{x}$	*SS*	*M*	*SO*	χ^2	*p*	*Difference*
Communication	20-29	53	52,42	9,36	55,00	114,72	17,435	0,001*	1-2
	30-39	96	57,20	5,41	60,00	161,77			2-4
	40-49	97	54,35	8,28	60,00	134,70			
	50≥	30	53,70	9,21	56,00	118,33			
Expectation	20-29	53	29,21	6,31	29,00	113,77	27,787	0,000*	1-2
	30-39	96	32,99	3,99	35,00	168,28			2-4
	40-49	97	30,66	5,94	34,00	132,62			
	50>	30	29,63	5,36	30,00	105,90			
Cooperation	20-29	53	80,30	17,66	79,00	118,87	11,889	0,008*	1-2
	30-39	96	89,51	15,97	94,50	158,93			2-4
	40-49	97	83,47	19,88	85,00	135,58			
	50>	30	80,20	19,84	76,00	117,23			
Family Participation	20-29	53	81,72	20,75	83,00	142,70	3,186	0,364	
	30-39	96	82,53	19,55	84,50	144,74			
	40-49	97	79,88	22,47	82,00	137,03			
	50>	30	73,60	24,16	74,00	115,87			
Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale	20-29	53	243,64	47,92	243,00	125,79	8,338	0,040*	1-2
	30-39	96	262,23	39,12	269,00	155,76			2-4
	40-49	97	248,36	50,24	254,00	135,24			
	50>	30	237,13	53,91	225,00	116,27			

*p<0,05

Table 3 illustrates the "Kruskal-Wallis H test" results regarding the contrast of parents' marks through the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" according to their age groups. When Table 3 is considered, it was revealed that the distinction among the marks of families in the scale in general and in the communication, expectation and cooperation sub-dimensions in the scale according to age groups was statistically significant (p<0.05). Points obtained from the parents in the 30-39 age group from the "Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" in general and the communication, expectation, and cooperation sub-dimensions of the scale were noticed to be higher than the parents in the 20-29 age group and 50 and over age group. A statistically significant distinction among parents' points participating in the study from the parent involvement sub-dimension in the "Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" was based on age (p<0.05).

Table 4. *Comparison of Parents' Scores from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale by Gender (N=276)*

	Gender	*n*	$\bar{x}$	*SS*	*M*	*SO*	*Z*	*p*
Communication	Female	219	55,37	8,05	60,00	145,28	-2,980	0,003*
	Male	57	53,11	7,23	55,00	112,46		
Expectation	Female	219	31,42	5,61	35,00	144,79	-2,764	0,006*
	Male	57	29,79	5,05	30,00	114,32		
Cooperation	Female	219	85,95	18,75	91,00	145,12	-2,715	0,007*
	Male	57	79,47	16,49	76,00	113,07		
Family Participation	Female	219	81,62	22,11	85,00	143,87	-2,193	0,028*
	Male	57	76,07	17,97	77,00	117,87		

Table 4. *(Cont.)*

Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale	Female	219	254,34	48,47	267,00	145,84	-2,999	0,003*
	Male	57	238,44	39,92	234,00	110,28		

*p<0,05

Table 4 illustrates outcomes given by the Mann-Whitney U test due to comparing the marks they got from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale based on the parents' gender participating in the research. When Table 4 is examined, results demonstrated that there is a statistically important distinction among the points of the Parent-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale in general and the communication, expectation, cooperation, and family participation sub-dimensions in the scale based on sex (p<0.05). Also, the scores of the female parents in the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale in general and in the communication, expectation, cooperation, and family participation sub-dimensions of the scale were significantly higher than the male parents.

Table 5. *Comparison of Parents' Scores from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale by Marital Status (N=276)*

	Marital Status	*N*	$\bar{x}$	*SS*	*M*	*SO*	*Z*	*p*
Communication	Married	212	55,52	7,77	60,00	145,59	-2,897	0,004*
	Single	64	52,84	8,17	57,50	115,00		
Expectation	Married	212	31,50	5,37	35,00	143,81	-2,164	0,030*
	Single	64	29,69	5,88	33,00	120,92		
Cooperation	Married	212	85,31	18,72	88,50	142,27	-1,437	0,151
	Single	64	82,28	17,56	80,50	126,01		
Family Participation	Married	212	80,04	22,10	83,00	137,33	-0,442	0,659
	Single	64	81,91	19,05	82,00	142,36		
Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale	Married	212	252,37	47,72	261,50	141,20	-1,023	0,306
	Single	64	246,72	45,54	245,00	129,56		

*p<0,05

In Table 5, the scores obtained from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale based on the marital status of families were compared with the Mann-Whitney U test. When Table 5 is examined, outcomes confirmed that there is a statistically important distinction among the marks of the parents in the communication and expectation sub-dimensions of the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale based on the families' marital status (p<0.05). The scores of the married parents in the communication and expectation sub-dimensions in the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale are higher than the singles. As revealed, no statistically significant distinction between the scores of the Parent-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale in general and the cooperation and family participation sub-dimensions in the scale according to the marital status of the parents (p>0.05). Married and single parents got similar scores from the Teacher Communication and Collaboration Scale in general and the cooperation and family involvement sub-dimensions in the scale.

Table 6. *Comparison of Parents' Scores from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale by Education Level (N=276)*

	Education	N	$\bar{x}$	SS	M	SO	χ^2	p	Difference
Communication	Primary School	27	57,11	9,53	60,00	173,33	25,463	0,000*	1-4
	Middle School	30	58,87	2,61	60,00	181,67			2-4
	High School	106	55,03	7,69	60,00	139,99			
	Bachelor and above	113	53,19	8,23	57,00	117,32			
Expectation	Primary School	27	33,85	4,57	35,00	190,06	33,903	0,000*	1-4
	Middle School	30	34,27	1,76	35,00	182,27			2-4
	High School	106	30,82	6,03	35,00	136,91			
	Bachelor and above	113	29,81	5,40	30,00	116,06			
Cooperation	Primary School	27	94,74	16,51	101,00	188,57	17,254	0,001*	1-3
	Middle School	30	90,93	16,18	98,00	164,47			1-4
	High School	106	82,09	19,31	83,00	128,37			2-3
	Bachelor and above	113	82,87	17,67	82,00	129,15			3-4
Family Participation	Primary School	27	90,26	22,54	101,00	179,11	11,593	0,009*	1-3
	Middle School	30	84,33	20,54	88,50	152,22			1-4
	High School	106	76,47	22,16	77,50	123,62			2-3
	Bachelor and above	113	80,86	19,89	83,00	139,11			3-4
Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale	Primary School	27	275,96	48,19	291,00	190,35	18,712	0,000*	1-3
	Middle School	30	268,40	37,25	278,00	166,48			1-4
	High School	106	244,42	49,42	247,00	128,10			2-3
	Bachelor and above	113	246,73	44,64	246,00	128,43			2-4

*$p<0,05$

Table 6 shows the "Kruskal-Wallis H test" outcomes, which are preferred to contrast the parents' points from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" depending on their educational status. Table 6 revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the "Parent-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" in general and the communication, expectation, cooperation, and family participation sub-dimensions in the scale depending on the educational status of the parents ($p<0.05$). The scores of the parents who graduated from secondary school and secondary school in the whole of the scale and the sub-dimensions of communication, expectation, cooperation, and family participation in the scale were significantly lower than the parents who had an undergraduate or higher

education level. Additionally, the scores of the parents who graduated from primary and secondary school in the "Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" in general and in the cooperation and family participation sub-dimensions in the scale were elicited to be lower than the parents who graduated from high school.

Table 7. *Comparison of Parents' Scores from the Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale by Monthly Household Income (N=276)*

	Monthly Household Income	*N*	$\bar{x}$	*SS*	*M*	*SO*	χ^2	*P*	*Diff.*
Communication	3000 TL and below	111	55,91	7,65	60,00	148,41	15,903	0,001*	1-3
	3001-5000 TL	92	55,49	8,14	60,00	150,03			1-4
	5001-7000 TL	42	52,74	7,53	54,00	107,89			2-3
	7001 TL and above	31	52,45	8,07	54,00	110,27			2-4
Expectation	3000 TL and below	111	31,52	5,93	35,00	149,36	14,837	0,002*	1-3
	3001-5000 TL	92	31,76	5,04	35,00	147,99			1-4
	5001-7000 TL	42	29,64	5,19	31,00	106,86			2-3
	7001 TL and above	31	29,42	5,49	30,00	114,31			2-4
Cooperation	3000 TL and below	111	85,48	20,05	91,00	145,52	2,862	0,413	
	3001-5000 TL	92	84,93	18,35	85,50	139,77			
	5001-7000 TL	42	83,57	16,49	83,00	130,00			
	7001 TL and above	31	81,94	15,76	81,00	121,11			
Family Participation	3000 TL and below	111	80,37	22,81	85,00	140,04	1,396	0,706	
	3001-5000 TL	92	82,24	20,07	83,00	143,43			
	5001-7000 TL	42	78,57	23,90	81,00	133,18			
	7001 TL and above	31	78,16	16,49	77,00	125,56			
Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale	3000 TL and below	111	253,28	50,07	267,00	144,63	4,869	0,182	
	3001-5000 TL	92	254,42	45,76	254,50	144,78			
	5001-7000 TL	42	244,52	47,50	232,50	125,18			
	7001 TL and above	31	241,97	40,03	240,00	115,98			

*p<0,05

As shown in Table 7, the scores of the parents from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" according to the monthly household income were compared by utilizing the "Kruskal-Wallis H test". Table 7 proves that there is a statistically important distinction among the scores of the families in the communication and expectation sub-dimensions in the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" according to the monthly household income ($p<0.05$). Parents with a monthly household income of 3000 TL or less and 3001-5000 TL have higher scores from the communication and expectation sub-dimensions in the scale than those with a monthly household income of 5001-7000 TL and 7001 TL and above. Also, it was noticed that no statistically important distinction among the marks of the families from the mentioned scale in general and the cooperation and family participation sub-dimensions in the scale according to the monthly household income ($p>0.05$). Regardless of their monthly household income, the parents included in the study received similar scores from the "Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" in general and the cooperation and family participation sub-dimensions in the scale.

Table 8. *Comparison of Parents' Scores from the Parent-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale according to the Age of the Child's Teacher (N=276)*

	Age of the Child's Teacher	*N*	$\bar{x}$	*SS*	*M*	*SO*	χ^2	*p*	*Diff.*
	20-29	69	54,61	8,57	59,00	132,25	12,573	0,002*	1-3
Communication	30-39	166	55,64	7,41	60,00	149,41			2-3
	40≥	41	52,39	8,48	54,00	104,84			
	20-29	69	30,83	5,74	34,00	133,96	15,158	0,001*	1-3
Expectation	30-39	166	31,80	5,17	35,00	149,87			2-3
	40≥	41	28,59	5,95	30,00	100,10			
	20-29	69	82,14	20,24	82,00	130,58	2,098	0,350	
Cooperation	30-39	166	85,96	18,12	90,00	144,12			
	40≥	41	83,27	16,57	84,00	129,07			
	20-29	69	80,54	23,45	86,00	141,42	0,263	0,877	
Family Participation	30-39	166	80,81	21,21	80,00	138,55			
	40≥	41	78,98	18,92	83,00	133,37			
Parent-Teacher	20-29	69	248,12	51,85	254,00	136,51	2,642	0,267	
Communication and	30-39	166	254,22	46,04	265,00	143,59			
Cooperation Scale	40≥	41	243,22	43,45	242,00	121,23			

*p<0,05

The results of the "Kruskal-Wallis H test", which is used to compare the scores of the parents participating in the research, obtained from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" according to the age of the child's teacher, are demonstrated in Table 8. As observed, no important distinction was obtained among the families' marks in the communication and expectation sub-dimensions of the scale based on the age of their child's teacher ($p<0.05$). Parents whose child's teacher is 40 years of age or older scored lower than other parents in the communication and expectation sub-dimensions of the scale. Furthermore, no statistically significant distinction among the points of families from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" general and the cooperation and family participation scale's sub-dimensions based on the age of their child's teacher ($p>0.05$).

Table 9. *Correlations between Parents' Scores from the Parent-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale (N=276)*

		Communication	*Expectation*	*Cooperation*	*Family Participation*	*Parent-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale*
	r	1	0,845	0,634	0,433	0,680
Communication	p	.	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*
	r		1	0,726	0,499	0,746
Expectation	p		.	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*
	r			1	0,788	0,939
Cooperation	p			.	0,000*	0,000*
	r				1	0,916
Family Participation	p				.	0,000*
Parent-Teacher Communication and	r					1
Cooperation Scale	P					.

As Pearson tests represented in Table 9, which were performed to determine the correlations between the scores of the parents included in the study from the "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation Scale" in general and the communication, expectation, cooperation, and family involvement sub-dimensions of the scale. As table 9 illustrates, there were statistically significant, strong, and positive correlations among parents' marks in the aforementioned scale in general and in the communication, expectation, cooperation, and family participation sub-dimensions in the scale ($p<0.05$). Accordingly, as the families got the scores via the mentioned scale in general and from any of the sub-dimensions of communication, expectation, cooperation, and family participation in the scale increase, the scores obtained from the other dimensions increased.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Implications

Perspectives of families with special needs children on the teacher, school communication, and cooperation were examined in the present study and significant differences were found depending on the variables of gender, age, marital status, education level, monthly household income, and the age of the child's teacher. Research results confirmed that families with special needs children have an increased perception level of teacher-school communication and expectation, a high perception of cooperation with the teacher, and a medium level of participation in school-teacher communication and cooperation. These findings match Heward (2003), and Taub (2006). As Quinn (1998) asserts, parents of children with special needs may perceive their children as more vulnerable to school processes due to their disability. In this regard, this reason keeps their expectations about the school strong and makes their sharing and cooperation dynamically effective. Blum, Resnick, Nelson, and St. Germaine (1991) argued that adolescents with special needs describe their relationship with their parents as good and positive in their education. However, approximately a quarter of the adolescents who participated in the study reported that they perceived their parents to be over-protective in their educational process in ways they found objectionable. Effective two-way communication between families and schools is necessary for students with special needs to achieve the goals of the system and curriculum. Undoubtedly, research confirms that the more parents and teachers share information about a student with each other, the more equipped they will both be to help the student achieve academically (American Federation of Teachers, 2007). When parents are actively involved, their children are more likely to exhibit higher grades and test scores; better attitudes towards school; more positive behavior; regular school attendance; more completed homework; less chance of needing special education services; increased chances of high school graduation; and more likely to attend post-secondary education (Cavkaytar, 2013). Parents who are interested in their child's education set high expectations for success and let them know they believe in their child's abilities create a positive environment for growth and success. When parents and teachers collaborate in the educational process, students become beneficiaries of a strong partnership. The best way to avoid conflicts between private education institutions and parents is to communicate properly with all parents regularly. According to Mulholland and Blecker (2008), successful cooperation requires shared responsibility among all parties involved. Through cooperation between teachers and parents, they can provide an effective educational process on subjects such as individual experiences, positive practices for children with special needs, teaching techniques, and strategies.

To begin with, another problem addressed in the study is to compare family-teacher communication and cooperation based on the age groups of parents. When the perceptions and thoughts of parents towards "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation" based on the age groups were studied, significant differences were found in terms of communication, expectation, and cooperation. Perceptions of parents in the 30-39 age group towards communication, expectation, and cooperation in the overall teacher communication and cooperation scale and the scale were found to be more positive and higher in parents in other age groups. To elaborate, it can be said that with age, the expectations of parents from their children and their goals for their own lives become more realistic. This can be explained by the fact that parents adapt more to parenthood and their own living spaces. Parents may have placed more emphasis on the contribution of communication and cooperation with the teacher. It comes to mind that parents aged 40 and over may experience communication problems since it is thought that their tolerance level towards their children is lower, and these age groups may struggle with different difficulties. Another variable analyzed in the study is the perceptions and thoughts of parents about family-teacher communication and cooperation depending on their gender. Findings revealed that the perceptions and thoughts of parents regarding parent-teacher communication and cooperation differ significantly in terms of gender. According to the averages of the groups, it was noticed that the perceptions and opinions of the female parents on the general family-teacher communication and cooperation scale and the sub-dimensions of communication, expectation, cooperation, and family participation in the scale were significantly higher and more positive than the male parents. These outputs are similar to the findings of the studies conducted by Mahoney, O'Sullivan, and Dennebaum (1990) and Sharabi and Marom-Golan (2018). In the studies conducted by Sharabi and Marom-Golan (2018) on parents of children with special needs, mothers reported higher levels of interaction and participation than fathers. Mahoney, O'Sullivan, and Dennebaum (1990) conducted a scale factor analysis of a national sample of large numbers of mothers with children with special needs in early intervention programs, including system participation, child information, family, school-educational activities, personal family assistance, and resource assistance. Five factors came to the fore. In all these factors, it was observed that mothers, as the child's parents, got high scores.

Considering the findings, another output obtained in the study are as follows. According to the marital status of the parents, it is about the perception and thoughts of family-teacher communication and cooperation. According to the research findings, perceptions and opinions on parent-teacher communication and cooperation differ based on the marital status of the parents. In the study, perceptions and views of married parents towards "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation" are significantly high and positive, especially in the sub-dimensions of communication and expectation. However, it did not provide a significant difference in the dimensions of cooperation and family involvement depending on the parents' marital status. This finding is similar to the results of the study by Salisbury (1987). According to Salisbury (1987), the marital status of the family affects the quality and quantity of the interactions of children with special needs with their school and teachers. Separated, single parents and single parents of children with special needs experience many difficulties in communicating with schools and teachers. This situation creates a very important source of stress for parents. A significant output of this study is that single-parent status is a negative factor in the family-school relationship. In a few studies, teachers reported lower levels of

school attendance for single parents (Epstein, 1995; Kohl, Lengua, & McMahon, 2000; Reynolds, 1992). As the number of single parents increases, this risk factor emerges as an important factor in the context of family-school relations. Single-parent children have more academic and behavioral problems than children from two-parent families (Zill, 1996). Single parents naturally have fewer resources, such as money, social support, and time to invest in their children's education and development. Thus, single parenting status is an indicator of multiple risks that can affect a parent's likelihood of being directly involved in school or the child.

To begin with, another important output was about the perceptions and thoughts of parents regarding family-teacher communication and cooperation based on their educational status. Depending on the education level of the parents, their views and perceptions of "Family-Teacher Communication and Cooperation" differ. There are significant differences in the sub-dimensions of communication, expectation, cooperation, and family involvement in the entire family-teacher communication and cooperation, especially depending on the education level of the parents. In this regard, as observed that parents with a bachelor's degree or higher have a more positive and higher view of family communication and cooperation. As the education level increases, parents' perceptions and views on school-teacher communication and cooperation demonstrate a more positive distribution. These findings are supported by the results of studies conducted in the literature by Bempechat (1998), Coleman (1987), Delgado-Gaitan (1991), Kellaghan, Sloane, Alvarez, and Bloom, (1993), and Ferrel (2012). The growing cultural diversity of the student population and the presence of parents with very low education levels have created various communication difficulties. Parents from different cultural and educational backgrounds may see the purpose of education quite differently from school staff (Bempechat, 1998). Less cultural and educational capital makes it more difficult for parents to encourage their children's learning and navigate the education system, especially at the special education level (Coleman, 1987; Delgado-Gaitan, 1991). In addition, changes in the structure and function of families over the past few decades have raised several concerns. One concern focuses on the family's capacity to provide conditions that support children's school development (Kellaghan, Sloane, Alvarez, & Bloom, 1993). According to Ferrel (2012), although vital to the learning experience of children with special needs, home-school partnerships are still often hindered by the many barriers faced by each person involved, and often parents and educators are encouraged to ensure that it is appropriate and effective to provide an optimal learning experience for their children, stops interacting without knowing how to negotiate their ways. Based on these negative interaction barriers, the fact that parents cannot show the necessary competence in interaction due to their low educational and socio-economic status plays an important role in most cases. According to Melhuish, Sylva, Sammons, Siraj-Blatchford, and Taggart, (2001), higher-quality parenting (strong school-teacher collaboration) was strongly associated with the mother's education level (but not income). To a large extent, the impact of mothers' education also increases the cognitive quality of parent/child interactions in the way they provide opportunities for intellectual skill development at home, namely problem-solving. As the interaction of parents with the school and the teacher gets stronger, the quality of the home learning environment also increases. Pursuing this further, the more educated the parent, the greater their involvement in their child's education. Kohl et al. (2000) argue that the lack of extended personal educational experience has rendered some parents lacking relevant skills or understanding of appropriate "parents as co-educators".

Parents' opinions and perceptions of family-teacher communication and cooperation differ based on their monthly household income. As concluded, parents with a monthly household income of 5000 TL or less have higher and more positive views on "Family-Teacher Communication". However, no significant distinction was obtained in terms of the family monthly income of cooperation and family involvement dimensions. There are many studies on this subject in the literature. Socioeconomic status (SES) is an important factor influencing parent involvement in many countries (Hess & Holloway, 1984). Several studies in the United States confirm that relatively wealthy, college-educated parents are more likely to participate in educational activities at school than lower-SES parents, but some studies show that low-SES parents participate as often as themselves in certain aspects of parental involvement (Lee & Bowen, 2006; Weiss et al., 2003). In his study, Tican-Başaran and Koç (2001) classified the reasons why families could not attend school education as the reasons for not attending the school mostly due to the time of the activities and activities, financial reasons, announcements, and meetings. He stated that the activities held at the school are usually held during the working hours of the families, that money is collected at the schools for various reasons, and that they are worried that money will be collected due to the economic problems of the parents that the announcements are made late or not at all.

Another significant finding regarding the child's perceptions and thoughts on parent-teacher communication and cooperation is based on the age of the teacher. Parents' family-teacher communication and expectations differ based on the age of the child's teacher. However, there is no difference depending on the age of the teacher in terms of "Parent-Teacher Cooperation" and family participation. It is noticed that the studies in the literature focus on the teacher's qualifications and competencies rather than the teacher's age. As Desforges and Abouchaar (2003) posit, the quality of teacher-parent interaction at the basic level is very important to ensure knowledge transfer and to influence mutual support and shared values. The quality and experience of the teacher come to the fore in information about programs, courses, expectations, evaluation processes, and the like. On the other hand, during the time spent in the family, information about the child is very important in terms of the role of the teacher. Home/school communication is an important channel, but with the skills of the teachers, it soon reaches a proficiency level. However, family-school supportive interaction skills can be learned by both parties. As Carlson, Maddocks, and Scardamalia (2019), Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1997), and Macdonald, Livingstone, and Valentine (2017) argue, the degree of parent involvement will be influenced by the school and the teacher itself. If teachers seem to care about the child's well-being, respect parents, and develop effective means of communication with families, parents are more willing and more likely to participate in their child's education. While parents tended to respect teachers' authority and expertise in the past, today they are more motivated to speak out in criticism of the teacher and be involved in shaping classroom practices. In this respect, parents' perceptions about the school are important, especially regarding how much teachers care about children with special needs and teachers' willingness to encourage communication and interaction with parents.

The last finding obtained in the study was about the relationship between the perceptions and thoughts of family-teacher communication and cooperation. Significant and positive relationships were obtained between "Parents-Teacher Communication", "Cooperation", "Expectation" and "Participation of Parents". These results are reported in the literature by Bender, (2008); Leyser and Kirk (2011); It is similar to the findings of the studies conducted by

Geldenhuys and Wevers (2013). Teachers experience as service providers of private education institutions; they provide academic direction, leading, and discipline in the educational context. While both parties regularly experience school, the experience of student parents is more discontinuous and less constructed. Families mostly get involved in educational activities through meetings, volunteer work, events, and school-oriented family associations, and by child's indication regarding the school and related behavior especially between students with special needs. An ideal environment for children includes compassionate staff who communicate with students on a regular basis (i.e., positive learner-educator relations and parent integration) can be linked to lower problematic behavior and improved academic achievement (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Coker & Borders, 2001; Osher et al., 2008). Griffith (2000), Koth, Bradshaw, & Leaf (2008), and Vieno, Perkins, Smith, & Santinello (2005) provided quite useful outputs related to interventions to advance school climate that may be most efficient when constructed to aim "individual-level interplay" (i.e., learner-peer and learner-educator relations, educator-family communication) within schools. The quality of parent-teacher relationship comes to the fore as a measure of the quality of family-school communication. On the other side, in the study of Reynolds and Kamphaus (2004), the correlation between parent and teacher reports on the quality of the parent-teacher relationship is significant, but not high. Given that the shared variance of the quality of the parent-teacher relationship between parent and teacher reports is only 12%, the findings suggest that each participant adds a significant amount of unique information to their assessment of the home-school relationship. Gaining the perspectives of both participants is likely to be beneficial for school psychologists and other clinicians working to support the development of collaborative family-school relationships.

A collaborative family-school relationship requires parents and teachers to engage in collective efforts to develop the competencies of children with special needs and solve their problems at school and home. In this respect, studies can be carried out to develop a cooperative school culture. Parental involvement in the education of children with special needs can be considered in many ways. In addition to communicating with the teacher, parents can participate in activities that support their children cognitively at home. Future research can be conducted by focusing on the relationship and role of parents with the school separately. Interventions can be developed and evaluated to support positive family-school collaboration. When the limitations of this study are examined, although the number of parents in the sample group is considered sufficient, it can be considered as a limitation that the sample group consists only of parents living in provincial centers. The causal perceptions of parents living in rural areas may vary with the factors affecting their lives. In future studies, data can be collected from different sources such as teachers.

References

American Federation of Teachers, (2007). *Building Parent-Teacher Relationships*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers. Retrieved from http://www.ldonline.org/article/19308/.

Atabey, D. & Tezel-Şahin, F. (2011). The scale of communication and cooperation between family and teacher. *Kastamonu Educational Journal, 19*(3), 793-804. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/817391.

Baker, T. L., Wise, J., Kelley, G., & Skiba, R. J. (2016). Identifying barriers: Creating solutions to improve family engagement. *School Community Journal, 26*, 161–184. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1124003.pdf.

Bempechat, J. (1998). *Against the odds: How "at-risk" students EXCEED expectations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bender, W.N. (2008). *Learning Disabilities: Characteristics, identification, and teaching strategies*. Boston: Pearson.

Blum, R. W., Resnick, M. D. , Nelson, R., & St. Germaine, A. S. (1991). Family and peer issues among adolescents with spina bifida and cerebral palsy. *Pediatrics*, *88*, 280–285. Retrieved from https://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/88/2/280.

Bryk, A.S., & Driscoll, M.E. (1988). *The high school as community: Contextual influences and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison, WI: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Carlson, C. I., Maddocks, D. L. S., & Scardamalia, K. M. (2019). *Families and schools.* In B. H. Fiese, M. Celano, K. Deater-Deckard, E. N. Jouriles, & M. A. Whisman (Eds.), APA handbooks in psychology. APA handbook of contemporary family psychology: Applications and broad impact of family psychology (p. 217–233). American Psychological Association.

Cavkaytar, A. (2013). Ailelerle işbirliği. S. Eripek (Ed.), Özel eğitim içinde (ss. 53-65). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Coker, J.K. & Borders, L.D. (2001). An analysis of environmental and social factors affecting adolescent problem drinking. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 79, 200–208. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01961.x

Coleman, J. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher*, 3, 32-38. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X016006032.

Cooc, N., & Bui, O.T. (2017). Characteristics of parent center assistance from the federation for children with special needs. *The Journal of Special Education*, *51*(3), 138-149. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466917696285.

Cömert, D., & Güleç, H. (2004). Okulöncesi eğitim kurumlarında aile katılımının önemi: öğretmen-aile-çocuk ve kurum. *Social Sciences Journal*, 132. Retrieved from http://acikerisim.aku.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/11630/3302.

Decker, C. A., & Decker, J. R. (2005). *Planning and administering early childhood programs*. Prentice Hall.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1991). Involving parents in the schools: A process of empowerment. *American Journal of Education*, *100*(1), 20-46. Retrieved from https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/444003.

Desforges, C., & Abouchaar, A. (2003). *The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment: A literature review* (Vol. 433). London: DfES.

Eichin, N. R., & Beach, P. V. (2018). Leading school, family and community partnerships: A critical review. *Revista Complutense de Educacion*, *29*(2), 595+. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A539647862/IFME?u=anon~17b13763&sid=googleScholar&xid=fb4f4127

Eliasan, C. & Jenkins, L. (2003). *A practical guide to early childhood curriculum* (7th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill

Epstein, J.L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1, 701–712. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200326.

Ferrel, J. (2012). Family engagement and children with disabilities: A resource guide for educators and parents. *Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education*, 1, 3-31.

Garbacz, S. A., Herman, K. C., Thompson, A. M., & Reinke, W. M. (2017). Family engagement in education and intervention: implementation and evaluation to maximize family, school, and student outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology, 62*, 1–10. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-28505-002

Garbacz, S. A., McIntyre, L. L., & Santiago, R. T. (2016). Family involvement and parent-teacher relationships for students with autism spectrum disorders. School psychology quarterly: the official journal of the Division of School Psychology. *American Psychological Association*, *31*(4), 478–490. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000157.

Garbarcz, S. A., Stormshak, E., Lee, L., & Kosti, D. (2019). Examining family-school engagement in a randomized controlled trial o the family check-up. *School Psychology*, *34*, 433–443. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000284.

Geldenhuys, J.L. & Wevers, N.E.J. (2013). Ecological aspects influencing the implementation of inclusive education in mainstream primary schools in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, *33*(3): 1-18. https://doi.org/10.15700/201503070804

Griffith, J. (2000). School climate as group evaluation and group consensus: Student and parent perceptions of the elementary school environment. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101, 35–61. Retrieved from https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/499658.

Güleç, Ç. H., & Genç, Z. S. (2010). An evaluation of the intervention between teacher and parent about school and family cooperation in preschool educational institution. *Education and Science*, *35*(155), 158-71. https://search.trdizin.gov.tr/yayin/detay/94945/

Güven, G. (2011). *Farklı eğitim modelleri kullanılarak uygulanan aile eğitim ve aile katılım programlarının okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin uygulamalarına ve ebeveynlerin görüşlerine etkisinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis),Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

Haines, S. J., Francis, G., Mueller, T.G., Chiu, C., Burke, M., Kyzar, K., & Turnbull, A. (2017). Reconceptualizing family-professional partnership for inclusive schools: A call to action. *Inclusion*, *5*(4), 234–247. https://doi.org/10.1352/2326-6988-5.4.234

Hess, R. D., & Holloway, S. D. (1984). Family and school as educational institutions. In Ross Parke (Ed.), *Review of child development research* (pp. 179-222). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heward, W. L. (2003). *Exceptional children: An introduction to special education* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Hoover-Dempsey, Kathleen, V. & Sandler, Howard M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education?, *Review of Educational Research, 67*(1), 3-42. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067001003.

Inal, G. (2011). Okul öncesi eğitim programında aile katılım çalışmaları. F. Alisinanoğlu (Ed.) *Okul öncesi eğitimde özel öğretim yöntemleri* içinde (ss. 182- 189). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Kellaghan, T., Sloane, K., Alvarez, B., & Bloom, B.S. (1993). *The home environment and school learning: Promoting parental involvement in the education of children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kohl, G.O., Lengua, L.J., & McMahon, R.J. (2000). Parent involvement in school: Conceptualizing multiple dimensions and their relations with family and demographic risk factors. *Journal of School Psychology*, *38*(6), 501-523. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(00)00050-9.

Koth, C.W., Bradshaw, C.P., & Leaf, P.J. (2008). A multilevel study of predictors of student perceptions of school climate: The effect of classroom-level factors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100, 96–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.1.96

Kyzar, K., Mueller, T. G., Grace, F., & Haines, S. (2019). Special education teacher preparation for family-professional partnership results from a national survey of teacher educators. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *42*(4), 320–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406419839123.

Lazarević, E., & Kopas-Vukašinović, E. (2014). The role and place of parents of children with disabilities in ınclusive education in Serbia. *International Journal About Parents in Education*, *7*(2), 69-78.

Lee, J. S., & Bowen, N. K. (2006). Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary school children. *American Educational Research Journal*, *43*(2), 193-218. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043002193

Leyser, Y., & Kirk, R. (2011). Parents' perspective on inclusion and schooling of students with Angelman syndrome: Suggestions for educators. *International Journal of Special Education*, *26*(2), 79-91. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ937177.pdf

Macdonald, G., Livingstone, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2017). Families and Schools Together (FAST) for improving outcomes for children and their families. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, *8*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012760.pub2

Mahoney, G., O'Sullivan, P., & Dennebaum, J. (1990). Maternal perceptions of early intervention services: A scale for assessing family-focused intervention. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, *10*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1177/027112149001000102.

Melhuish, E., Sylva, C., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Taggart, B. (2001). *Social behavioural and cognitive development at 3-4 years in relation to family background*. The effective provision of pre-school education, EPPE project (Technical paper 7). London: The Institute of Education.

Mueller, T. G., & Vick, A. M. (2019). Rebuilding the family-professional partnership through facilitated individualized education program meetings. *Journal of Educational Psychological Consultation*, *29*(2), 99–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2018.1470934

Mulholland, R., & Blecker, N. (2008). Parents and Special Educators: Pre-Service Teachers' Discussion Points. *International Journal of Special Education,* 23(1), 48-53. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ814374.pdf

Nuri, C. (2020). DEHB'nin çocukların okul başarısı, sosyal ve duygusal yönleri üzerindeki etkileri. Kurnaz, A. & Şengün, G. (Ed.). D*ikkat Eksikliği ve Hiperaktivite Bozukluğu* içinde (ss. 147-161. ss.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Nuri, C., Akçamete, G., & Direktör, C. (2022). The trial support program for empowerment of parents of children with ADHD. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, *27*(3), 676-685. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2021.1975786

Osher, D., Sprague, J., Weissberg, R.P., Axelrod, J., Keenan, S., Kendziora, K., & Zins, J.E. (2008). A comprehensive approach to promoting social, emotional, and academic growth in contemporary schools. In: Thomas A, Grimes J, (Ed.). *Best practices in school psychology*, (pp. 162-230). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Özmen, H., & Karamustafaoğlu, O. (2019). *Eğitimde araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Tican-Başaran, S., & Koç, F. (2001). *Ailenin Çocuğun Okuldaki Eğitimine Katılım Sorunları ve Katılımın Sağlanması için Alternatif Bir Model*. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Eğitimi Araştırma ve Geliştirme Dairesi Bankanlığı, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Quinn, P. (1998). *Understanding disability: A lifespan approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reynolds C.R., & Kamphaus, R.W. (2004). *BASC-2: Behavior assessment system for children*. New York: AGS Publishing.

Reynolds, A.J. (1992). Comparing measures of parent involvement and their effects on academic achievement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*. *7*, 441–462. https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2006(92)90031-S

Rodriguez, R.J., Blatz, E.T., & Elbaum, B. (2014). Parents' views of schools' involvement efforts. *Exceptional Children*, *81*, 79–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402914532232

Salisbury, C.L. (1987). Stressors of parents with young handicapped and nonhandicapped children. *Journal of the Division for Early Childhood*, *1*(2), 154-160. https://doi.org/10.1177/105381518701100207

Schuh, Ml., Hagner, D., Dillon, A., & Dixon, B. (2015). The outcomes of family and consumer leadership education: creating positive change in disability policy and practice. *Health Psychology Report*, *3*(2), 11-122. https://dx.doi.org/10.5114/hpr.2015.50173

Seplocha, H., (2007). Partnerships for learning: Conferencing with families. In D. Koralek (Ed.), *Spotlight in young children and families* (pp. 12–15). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Sharabi, A., & Marom-Golan, D. (2018). Social support, education levels, and parents' ınvolvement: a comparison between mothers and fathers of young children with autism spectrum disorder. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, *38*(1), 54-64. https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121418762511

Shriberg, D. (2020). The present and future of consultation scholarship: reflections on seven years as editor of journal of educational and psychological consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *30*(4), 395-401. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2020.1818571

Smith, T. E. (2006). *Families and children with special needs: Professional and family partnerships*. Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Taub, D.J. (2006). Understanding the concerns of parents of students with disabilities: challenges and roles for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling Journal*, *10*(1), 52-57. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X0601001S07

Vieno, A., Perkins, D.D., Smith, T.M., & Santinello, M. (2005). Democratic school climate and sense of community in school: A multilevel analysis. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *36*, 327–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-005-8629-8

Weiss, H.B., Mayer, E., Kreider, H., Vaughan, M., Dearing, E., Hencke, R., & Pinto, K. (2003). Making it work: Low-income working mothers' involvement in their children's education. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(4), 879-901. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312040004879

Whyte, K., & Karabon, A. E. (2016). Transforming teacher-family relationships: Shifting roles and perceptions of home visits through the Funds of Knowledge approach. *Teacher Education Faculty Publications,* 95, 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2016.1139546

Yurt, E., & Sünbül, A. M. (2014). The adaptation of the sources of mathematics self-efficacy scale for Turkish context. *Education and Science, 39*(176), 145-157. http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2014.3442

Zill, N. (1996). Family change and student achievement: What we have learned, what it means for schools. In: Booth A, Dunn JF, (Ed.). *Family school links: How do they affect educational outcomes*? (pp. 139–174). NJ: Erlbaum- Mahwah.

Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi
12(2), 2022, 473-496
www.ijocis.com

TÜRKÇE GENİŞ ÖZET

Özel Gereksinimli Çocuğu Olan Ailelerin Öğretmen, Okul İletişim Ve İşbirliğine Bakış Açılarının Farklı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi

Giriş

Özel eğitim alanında verilen eğitimin devamlılığının oluşturulabilmesi için okul aile işbirliğinin sağlanması gerekmektedir. Karşılıklı iletişim kurulmalı, aileler ve öğretmenler birbirlerinin bakış açılarını anlamaya çalışmalıdırlar. Aileleri birer iş arkadaşı olarak gören öğretmenler ailelerle daha çok işbirliği yapmaktadırlar (Rodrigez, Blatz, & Elbaum, 2014). Çocukların sağlıklı gelişimi ve öğrenimi için gerekli olan sorumlulukları aileler, okul yönetimi ve öğretmenler kendi aralarında paylaşmalıdırlar (Eliasan & Jenkins, 2003). Nitekim aileleri birer takım arkadaşı gibi önemli bir paydaş olarak gören öğretmenler ailelerle daha çok iş birliği yapmaktadırlar. Bilinmektedir ki, etkili aile öğretmen iletişimi çocukların öğrenmelerini desteklemeye ve çok önemli olan okul aile işbirliğinin büyüyerek gelişmesine yardım etmektedir. İşte bu nedenle okul aile arasında etkili bir iletişim ve işbirliğinin sağlanması önem taşımaktadır (Decker & Decker, 2005; Seplocha, 2007).

Okul aile işbirliği ile öğretmenler, okulda uygulanan eğitim ve öğretim programını daha kolay gerçekleştirebilirler, sağlıklı bir sonuca ulaşabilirler, sorumlulukları paylaşabilirler, hedeflere ulaşabilirler, iş tatminindeki artışı sağlayabilirler (Garbacz, Mcintyre, & Santiago, 2016). Araştırmalar, ebeveynlerin sürece katılımının öğretmenleri çocuklara öğretme görevine daha fazla odaklanmaya yönlendirdiğini göstermektedir. Ayrıca, ebeveynlerle daha fazla iletişim kurarak, öğretmenler öğrencilerin ihtiyaçları, bu ihtiyaçları daha iyi karşılamak için uygulayabilecekleri yöntemler ve bu amaçla ev ortamı hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinebilir. Etkileşim arttıkça özel gereksinimli çocukların ebeveynleri öğretmenler hakkında daha olumlu bir görüşe sahip olma eğilimindedir, Bu durumda da öğretmenlerin moral ve motivasyonun artmasına neden olur (Garbacz, Mcintyre, & Santiago, 2016; Whyte & Karabon, 2016).

Türkiye'de örgün eğitimde ebeveyn-okul işbirliğine yönelik görüşlerini belirlemek amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiş çalışmalar bulunmaktadır (Güleç & Genç, 2010; Güven, 2011; İnal, 2006). Bununla birlikte özel eğitim kurumlarında okul aile işbirliğine yönelik ebeveyn görüşlerinin betimsel bir yaklaşımla ele alındığı çalışmaya rastlanmamıştır. Bu çalışmanın bulgularının özel eğitimde ileriki dönemlerde gerçekleştirilecek okul-aile işbirliği uygulamalarına katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir. Ayrıca ebeveyn perspektifi açısından okul-aile iletişim ve işbirliğine odaklanmak sürecin önemli paydaşı olan velilerin bakış açılarının anlaşılmasına katkı sağlayacaktır. Bu nedenle çalışmada özel gereksinimli çocukların ebeveynlerinin okul aile işbirliğine yönelik algılarının demografik değişkenler ve öğretmen özellikleri açısından

incelenmesi öncelikli olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda aşağıdaki alt amaçlara cevap aranmıştır.

1. Özel gereksinimli çocuğu olan ebeveynlerin öğretmenlere yönelik iletişim ve işbirliği algıları ne düzeydedir?

2. Özel gereksinimli çocuğu olan ebeveynlerin yaşı, cinsiyeti, medeni durumu, eğitim durumu, aylık hane gelir düzeyi ve çocuğun öğretmenin yaşına göre aile-öğretmen iletişim ve işbirliği ölçeğinden aldıkları puanlar farklılık göstermekte midir?

Yöntem

Araştırmanın Modeli

Bu çalışmada özel eğitim gerektiren çocuğa sahip ailelerin aile-öğretmen iletişim ve işbirliği konusundaki algı ve düşüncelerini incelemek amacıyla nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden betimsel tarama yöntemi kullanılmıştır.

Evren ve Örneklem

Bu çalışma İstanbul ilinin Sarıyer ilçesinde bulunan özel eğitim ve rehabilitasyon merkezinde eğitim gören özel gereksinimli çocuğu olan ebeveynler üzerinde online olarak (Google Formlar) yürütülmüştür. Çalışmada amaçlı örnekleme yöntemlerinden kolayda örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Bu kapsamda kolayda örnekleme yöntemine dayalı olarak çalışmaya gönüllü katılımı kabul eden 274 ebeveyne araştırmanın ölçme araçları uygulanmıştır.

Veri Toplama Araçları

Araştırma kapsamında özel gereksinimli çocukların ebeveynlerinden oluşan katılımcıların aile-öğretmen iletişim ve işbirliği konusundaki algı ve düşüncelerini ölçmek için Atabey ve Tezel-Şahin (2011) tarafından geliştirilen "Aile-Öğretmen İletişim ve İşbirliği Ölçeği" ve "Aile Bilgi Formu" kullanılmıştır. Özel gereksinimli çocukların ebeveynlerinden oluşan çalışma grubunda Aile-Öğretmen İletişim ve İşbirliği ölçeği için Cronbach alfa katsayıları sırasıyla 0,92, 0.74, 0,92 ve 0,93 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Ölçeğin bütününe ilişkin Cronbach alfa katsayısı 0,95'tir. Elde edilen katsayılar ölçeklerin iç tutarlılığa bağlı güvenirliğinin yüksek düzeyde olduğunu göstermiştir.

Verilerin Analizi

Araştırma kapsamında betimsel istatistikler, aritmetik ortalama ve standart sapma ile analiz edilmiştir. Özel gereksinimli çocukların ebeveynlerinin Öğretmen İletişim ve İşbirliği ölçeğinden aldıkları puanlar üzerinde Komogrov Smirnov Testi ile normal dağılım analizleri yapılmıştır. Komogrov Smirnov Testi sonuçları özel gereksinimli çocukların ebeveynlerine ait Öğretmen İletişim ve İşbirliği ölçeği puanlarının normal dağılım varsayımlarını karşılamadığı görülmüştür. Bu durumda non-parametrik istatistik tekniklerinden Mann Whitney U Testi (cinsiyet, medeni durum) ve Kruskal Wallis Testi (yaş, eğitim durumu, aylık hane geliri, çocuğun öğretmeninin yaşı) uygulanmıştır.

Bulgular

Özel gereksinimli çocuğu olan ailelerin öğretmen, okul iletişim ve iş birliğine bakış açılarının incelendiği bu çalışmada ailelerin cinsiyet, yaş, medeni durum, eğitim durumu, aylık hane geliri

ve çocuğun öğretmeninin yaşı değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Araştırma bulgularına göre özel gereksinimli çocuğu olan ailelerin öğretmen- okul iletişim ve beklenti algılarının çok yüksek, öğretmenle işbirliğine yönelik algılarının yüksek bununla birlikte okul-öğretmen iletişim ve işbirliğine katılımlarının ise orta düzeyde olduğu bulunmuştur. Ebeveynlerin yaş gruplarına göre Aile-Öğretmen İletişim ve İşbirliğine yönelik algı ve düşünceleri incelendiğinde iletişim, beklenti ve işbirliği açısından anlamlı farklar bulunmuştur. 30-39 yaş grubundaki ebeveynlerin öğretmen iletişim ve işbirliği ölçeği genelinden ve ölçekte yer alan iletişim, beklenti ve işbirliğine yönelik algıları diğer yaş gruplarındaki ebeveynlerde daha olumlu ve yüksek düzeyde bulunmuştur. Araştırmada analiz edilen değişkenlerden bir diğeri ise ebeveynlerin cinsiyetine göre aile-öğretmen iletişim ve işbirliğine yönelik algı ve düşünceleridir. Çalışmanın bulgularına göre ebeveynlerin cinsiyetleri açısından aile-öğretmen iletişim ve işbirliğine yönelik algı ve düşünceleri anlamlı düzeyde farklılık göstermektedir.

Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler

Ebeveynlerin Aile-Öğretmen İletişim, İşbirliği, beklenti ve katılımları arasında anlamlı ve pozitif ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Bu sonuçlar literatürde Bender, (2008), Geldenhuys ve Wevers (2013), Leyser ve Kirk'ün (2011); gerçekleştirdiği araştırmaların bulgularıyla benzerlik göstermektedir. Öğretmenler özel eğitim kurumlarının hizmet sağlayıcıları olarak deneyimler; rolleri, sınıflarında ve okullarında akademik eğitim, rehberlik ve disiplin vermektir. Öğrenciler ve öğretmenler okul ortamlarını düzenli olarak deneyimlerken, öğrenci ebeveynlerinin deneyimi daha aralıklı ve daha az yapılandırılmıştır. Griffith (2000), Koth ve diğ. (2008), Vieno ve diğ. (2005) göre okul iklimini iyileştirmeye yönelik müdahalelerin, okullar içindeki bireysel düzeydeki etkileşimleri (yani öğrenci-akran ve öğrenci-öğretmen ilişkileri, öğretmen-veli iletişimi) hedeflemek üzere tasarlandıklarında en etkili olabileceğine dair önemli kanıtlar ortaya koymuştur. Ebeveyn-Öğretmen İlişkisinin kalitesi, aile-okul iletişiminin kalitesinin bir ölçüsü olarak önemli ölçüde ön plana çıkmaktadır.

İşbirliğine dayalı bir aile-okul ilişkisi, ebeveynlerin ve öğretmenlerin özel gereksinimli çocukların yetkinliklerini geliştirmek ve sorunlarını okulda ve evde çözmek için kolektif çabalara girmelerini gerektirir. Bu kapsamda işbirlikli öğrenme anlayışına dayalı bir okul kültürünün geliştirilmesine yönelik çalışmalar yapılabilir. Özel gereksinimli çocukların eğitiminde ebeveyn katılımı çok yönlü olarak ele alınabilir. Ebeveynlerin öğretmenle iletişim kurmalarına ilaveten evde çocuklarını bilişsel olarak destekleyici faaliyetlere katılımları sağlanabilir. Gelecekteki araştırmalar anne ve babaların ayrı ayrı okulla ilişkilerine ve rolüne odaklanarak yürütülebilir. Olumlu aile-okul işbirliğini desteklemek için müdahalelerin geliştirilmesi ve değerlendirilmesi sağlanabilir.