Analysis of Parental Engagement in Inclusive Classroom from Teachers' Lenses

Zhana Goginashvili[1]

Abstract

This study deals with the understanding and experience of teachers in urban primary schools in Georgia and England regarding the parental engagement in the inclusive education of students with Special Educational Needs (SEN). The research is based on semi-structured interviews with ten teachers who are in two different national contexts and uses a qualitative, cross-national case study design and reflexive thematic analysis to find the similarities, differences, and common issues of the two countries. According to the results, both teachers in Georgia and those in England find parental involvement not only important but also a necessary condition for including all students in the classroom effectively. The most prevalent challenges of the parental capacity remain the parental stigma, a lack of special educational needs awareness in Georgia, emotional burnout, and bureaucratic complexity in England. The collaborative work is also affected by system-level barriers, which are of various types, such as the lack of specialist support and unclear procedures in Georgia, long assessment waiting lists, and SENCos who are overloaded with work in England. However, despite these, both sets of environments indicate constant contradiction between what the policies say should be done and what is actually done. According to the research findings, effective participation of parents in the education of their children comes with the need for long-term commitment and systemic investment, which entails things such as more provision of specialists, targeted parent education, clearer communication structures, and reforms that would ease the burden of work on teachers. These findings stress the importance of context-tailored strategies to promote the synergy between home and school and the enrichment of learning experiences in the case of SEN students.

Keywords: parental engagement, inclusive education, special educational needs (SEN), teacher perspectives, cross-national case study

1. Introduction

Parental engagement has become one of the central topics in discussions about inclusive education, especially for children with Special Educational Needs (SEN). While policies across many countries emphasise partnership, collaboration, and shared responsibility, what this looks like in everyday school life is often far more complex. Besides, teachers are the ones who form the centre of this cooperation, who talk to parents, adjust, are the first to notice, and help the child between policy expectations and classroom real life. Yet their perspectives are often overlooked in research, even though their experiences can reveal much about how inclusion operates in practice. The current study examines how teachers from two countries, Georgia and England, understand and engage in parental involvement in the education of SEN pupils. Despite both countries having made significant commitments to inclusive education, they have different historical, cultural, and structural starting points. England has a long-standing and established statutory framework that places parents as co-producers in the SEN process. On the other hand, even though Georgia has been rapidly developing its inclusive system, it is notable that in this period, there have been problems related to service provision, supervision, and understanding of disability issues. Listening to teachers' voices across these two settings offers a unique opportunity to see not only where systems diverge but also where they converge. Despite the contextual differences, teachers in both countries repeatedly emphasise the same message: meaningful inclusion is impossible without the active participation of families. At the same time, they acknowledge the practical barriers, such as time pressures, bureaucratic

[1] MA in Education (Autism), PhD Candidate in Education Science, ORCID number (0009-0007-7216-0512), Education Science, Georgia. Email: 23300416@ibsu.edu.ge

demands, emotional strain, cultural expectations, and system capacity, that make the ideal of partnership difficult to realise in daily practice. Through conversations with teachers in both countries, this study seeks to understand how they actually experience parental engagement, how they reach out to families, how they use parents' insights when planning support, and which parts of the system help or make things harder. A qualitative, cross-national design allowed these experiences to be understood within the realities of two different educational landscapes. Using reflexive thematic analysis, the study uncovers the themes and contrasts that run through their accounts: the distance between policy expectations and everyday practice, the ways that culture and socio-economic factors shape communication, and the need for practical, supportive structures that genuinely allow parents to be active partners in their child's education. Ultimately, this research seeks to humanise the conversation about parental engagement. Rather than treating it as a checklist of expectations, it views engagement as a relational, evolving partnership shaped by trust and transparent communication. The research focuses on the real experiences of the teachers, not only to help us understand what works and what does not work, but also what changes are needed for schools and families to effectively collaborate in the process of assisting children with SEN.

2. Literature Review

Parental engagement is conceptualised more and more as a learning-centred partnership between home and school, instead of being just a set of school-facing tasks like attending events, signing planners, and it is therefore, very much linked to the children's outcomes (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997; Goodall & Vorhaus, 2011). Furthermore, Goodall and Montgomery (2014) describe a continuum from "involvement" in school routines toward "engagement" with learning, arguing that the greatest gains emerge when families are supported to shape everyday learning practices at home. The interpretation of how teachers relate to and implement the engagement could be facilitated by using two classic models: Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory places the relationship between home and school into a nested context and emphasizes the importance of mesosystem links as developmental levers; Epstein's (1995, 2011) school-family-community partnership model differentiates six types of connections such as parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community. This gives teachers a shared vocabulary and a menu of practical strategies. Across the literature, the viewpoints of the teachers are of great importance because their attitudes and self-efficacy related to working with families are the predictors of quality communication, the probability of joint planning, and the implementation of inclusion in classrooms daily (Florian, 2014, 2015) meta-analyses suggest that family engagement relates positively, albeit modestly, to achievement, with the strongest effects associated with parental expectations and academic socialisation rather than homework help alone (Jeynes, 2007; Erdem & Kaya, 2020). Nonetheless, there are still some misalignments. In some cases, teachers are inclined to relate involvement to presence and behaviour control, but parents see it as a more synonymous element with emotional support and good learning habits. The different perceptions can trigger tension and, thus, undermine the development of an equitable partnership (Harris & Goodall, 2008).

Current inclusion research has transformed the concept of difference into a fundamental aspect of teaching and learning. Instead of moving the "problems" to the students or their families, teachers are encouraged to redesign participation and pedagogy in a way that all students can learn and make progress. This view is reflected in the Inclusive Pedagogical Approach in Action (IPAA) (Ainscow & Miles, 2008; Florian, 2014, 2015). Within this stance, parents are seen as specialists in their children, and their views are considered crucial for making adjustments and reasonable accommodations. Family involvement with the teacher is consequently integral to inclusive pedagogy, rather than simply an additional measure.

The Children and families Act 2014 in the UK, along with the SEND Code of Practice (0-25) that was associated with it, required the initiation and implementation of parental co-production particularly through the Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), besides which other activities such as rights to participation and joint decision-making were also underscored (Department for

Education [DfE], 2015). The SEND and Alternative Provision Improvement Plan (DfE, 2023) respond to rising demand and variability by prioritising early intervention, consistent national standards and clearer accountability across education and health. In parallel, inspection and governance mechanisms (e.g., Ofsted's Parent View) formalise parent feedback in school improvement. However, the system pressures tend to create difficulties in classroom realities reported by the teachers. The National Audit Office (2024) draws attention to the unsustainable spending trajectories, the explosion in the number of EHCPs since 2015, and local budget deficits, all of which eliminate teacher time, specialist access, and the possibility of partnership work. Evidence syntheses commissioned by the government (Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003; Goodall & Vorhaus, 2011) and the trials briefly reported by the Education Endowment Foundation suggest focusing on easy, regular, low-cost methods like the text prompts that cue at-home learning routines instead of massive resource workshops that are hard to maintain and mostly inaccessible to disadvantaged families.

In the last 15 years, Georgia has been able to grow inclusive education fast, and it is now a very well-established practice. The introduction of inclusive education into the legislation and regulation (e.g., the Law on General Education; the "Rules for the introduction, development and monitoring of inclusive education") as a regular feature in Georgian law shows the acceptance of this mode of education as a normal way to operate in the country. The endorsement of the UNCRPD by Georgia in 2014 further affirms the country's commitment to a rights-based approach to inclusive education in mainstream schools. UNICEF and the World Bank strategic documents and programs underscore the importance of workforce development, better identification and parent participation structures. Teacher accounts and monitoring reports still clearly show that the implementation problems, such as lack of specialists, inconsistent quality of individualised curricula, and restricted or unequal parental participation, mainly in rural, minority, and economically disadvantaged communities, are the issues reported (UNICEF Georgia, 2020, 2024; World Bank, 2019, 2024; UNESCO-GEM, 2021). Earlier qualitative work identified minimal parental engagement and uncertain role construction for teachers, while regional studies stress that systematic teacher–parent collaboration in planning and monitoring individual education programs is the basis for effective inclusion (Kavelashvili, 2017).

Across both systems, teachers often share their perspective of the successful engagement proposed as family collaborations that include co-setting goals and adjustments, choosing a small number of high-impact home routines (e.g., talking, shared reading, organisation, sleep), using user-friendly, multilingual, and asynchronous channels, and providing specific data along with next steps rather than general updates. Evidence from England suggests that one-off workshops do not work as well for engaging parents. Instead, gentle and regular prompts, such as structured text messages, tend to be more effective in keeping parents involved and supporting children's learning (Education Endowment Foundation, 2016). In parallel, Georgian case reports emphasise the importance of parents' involvement in the IEP process, as well as the role of school-based specialists in conducting joint meetings and handing over information between teachers and families (UNICEF Georgia, 2020, 2024; World Bank, 2019, 2024). Scaffolding techniques applied by the teachers in both countries are usually the conditions required to elevate and sustain these practices. At the same time, the teachers are required to navigate the class and culture-based expectations of the "well" parenting, which may quietly privilege some of the households. Lareau (2003) suggests that the middle-class "concerted cultivation" and the school's wishes are in accordance, while the families who implement the "accomplishment of natural growth" may consider learning differently; for instance, without a funds-of-knowledge orientation (Moll et al., 1992), teachers can misinterpret commitment as disengagement. The engagement conditions are reframed by migration further: In the case of Georgia, the experiences of teachers reflect how parental out-migration affects the education of children who are "left behind" and reveals the need for the communication channels to be extended and the partnership with the involved long-term caregivers (Antia et al., 2022). In England, widening SEND demand intersects with poverty and youth mental health, reinforcing the need for trauma-informed, flexible outreach.

When discussing convergence, of course, it is evident that teachers in Georgia and England are on the same page regarding the fact that they value parents' insights for tailoring adjustments, and they consider trust-building to be the primary step for inclusion. They also report the same obstacles, such as time pressure, limited training, reaching parents living in poverty, language, or work barriers, and being confused about the purpose of engagement (Harris & Goodall, 2008; Goodall & Montgomery, 2014). The differences, in fact, are mostly structural. Teachers' routines for engagement are influenced by England's long-term statutory framework for co-production (EHCP processes, inspection, and extensive guidance) compared to Georgia. However, fiscal strain and capacity problems limit the outreach that teachers can do day-to-day (DfE, 2023; NAO, 2024). Georgia has a newer, reformatory path. Teachers frequently find themselves in the situation of new regulations being implemented, not having enough specialists, and a lack of professional development opportunities. Besides the fact that both the school management and NGO/UN support are the main factors influencing the quality of the students' engagement (UNICEF Georgia, 2020, 2024; World Bank, 2019, 2024). Implications across contexts are consistent with the literature. Teacher education and CPD should explicitly teach partnership frameworks (Epstein, 2011; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997) alongside inclusive pedagogy (Florian, 2014), coach teachers to elicit and use families' funds of knowledge, develop low-burden communications focused on learning, and scaffold co-planning meetings (IEPs/EHCP reviews) to be accessible, dialogic, and data-rich. Priority research gaps include longitudinal studies of teacher engagement practices in Georgian mainstream schools; causal evaluations of low-cost, scalable engagement nudges in inclusive settings; and comparative analyses of how funding and specialist availability mediate teachers' engagement under different governance regimes.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

The study utilised a qualitative, multiple-case study design in the cross-national context and was focused on two urban mainstream primary schools: one in Tbilisi, Georgia, and the other in London, England. The intention was to examine how teachers in both situations grasp and perform the parental engagement within the inclusive mode of education, particularly for pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN).

The choice of qualitative design was made since parental engagement is a socially constructed, relational, and context-dependent process (Goodall & Montgomery, 2014; Hornby, 2011). The semi-structured interviews gave participants an opportunity to express their feelings about their story that involved getting deep insight into the practices, expectations, and systemic factors of two different educational systems. Cross-national designs like this one are particularly useful in finding out how the large-scale cultural and policy environments form inclusion (Ainscow, Dyson, & Weiner, 2013; Mitchell, 2022).

3.2 Participants

The study included 20 teachers in total from both countries**,** recruited purposively:

Georgia: 10 teachers from one urban public primary school in Tbilisi

England: 10 teachers from one urban mainstream primary school in London

Teachers were required to have at least two years of experience **i**n inclusive classrooms and direct experience supporting students with SEN and communicating with their families.

Purposive sampling ensured representation of teachers who are regularly engaged with SEN processes (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Participation was voluntary, and pseudonyms were assigned to protect confidentiality.

3.3 Ethical Considerations

Before initiating data collection, ethical approval was secured. The subjects were administered:

- an information sheet
- a consent form
- details about confidentiality and voluntary participation, and
- assurances regarding withdrawal at any stage.

The information was anonymised and securely stored according to GDPR and institutional policy.

3.4 Data collection

Semi-structured interviews, which lasted for 35-55 minutes, were the medium through which the data were obtained. The format struck a balance between replicability and flexibility, which made it possible to map general themes while at the same time conducting in-depth studies of specific contexts (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015).

An interview guide was developed based on:

- The parental engagement literature (Goodall & Vorhaus, 2011; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997),
- The SEND Code of Practice (DfE & DoH, 2015), and
- Georgian inclusive education policies and practices.

Key questions addressed in the research were the following:

1. How do teachers conceptualise parental engagement compared to parental involvement?
2. How do teachers communicate and collaborate with parents of students with SEN?
3. In what ways has parental input influenced your teaching strategies or classroom decisions?
4. What barriers do you experience that hinder effective engagement with parents?
5. What systemic or school-level improvements would you like to see to strengthen parental engagement?

Interviews were conducted in Georgian or English, then professionally transcribed and translated.

3.5 Data analysis

The data were evaluated using the reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2021). This approach made it possible to identify patterned meanings in both national contexts and still be sensitive to the cultural specificity.

The analysis followed six phases:

1. The process of familiarisation with all transcripts consists of repeatedly reading all of them.
2. Initial coding is carried out in an inductive way to find meaningful data units.
3. Generating candidate themes is the process of classifying codes and creating wider conceptual categories.
4. Reviewing and refining themes, through which one can make sure that they are coherent and have clear distinctions.
5. Defining and naming themes are done by considering and clearly stating the contrasts that exist between the two cultures.
6. The final narrative of the research that includes the integration of literature and policy context is drafted after this stage.

3.6 Cross-National comparisons

The researcher engaged in the primary analysis with a view to exploring the themes based on the comparative view (Alexander, 2000) that indicates the similarities and differences of Georgian and English respondents. This allowed identification of

- shared challenges (e.g., parental time constraints),
- culturally influenced expectations,
- system-level factors shaped by legislation and available specialist services.

3.7 Researcher reflexivity

Reflexivity was a prominent factor in shaping every phase of this study, as recommended by the contemporary qualitative methodologies (Berger, 2015; Tracy, 2010). The researcher kept a journal that recorded his/her own assumptions, positionality, and interpretative decisions made throughout the study, especially considering that it was a cross-national study and involved translation processes. This was the way of ensuring both transparency and analytic rigour.

4. Findings

Thematic findings from semi-structured interviews conducted with 20 teachers, out of which 10 were from an urban primary school in Tbilisi, Georgia, and 10 from an urban mainstream primary school in London, England, are presented in this chapter. Reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2021) was used to arrive at five dominant themes:

1. Parental engagement vs parental involvement
2. Communication practices between schools and families
3. Impact of parental insights on classroom practice
4. Systemic and cultural barriers to engagement
5. Teachers' desired supports and systemic improvements

Each theme is explored with cross-national comparisons.

4.1 Theme 1: Parental engagement vs parental involvement

Both in Georgia and England, teachers mentioned the difference between involvement and engagement. Involvement is simply the way of participating, like signing documents, while engagement is the actual way of collaborating and decision-making. Teachers stated that parents in Georgia were mainly engaged formally and minimally. Usually, parents would sign the IEPs without understanding the main reasons for them or being able to contribute. One of the teachers stated that: "Generally, the parents are signing the documents, but they are not quite aware of what the plan contains." This was recognised as a cultural norm that the education system and not the parents are mainly responsible for the process, and hence, it poses a barrier to them being actively involved.

In England, teachers seemed to have a firmer grasp of what genuine engagement looks like, largely because the SEND Code of Practice puts a strong focus on working together with families. Most teachers spoke about parents as partners, but they also admitted that this ideal is often hard to live out day to day. Limited time, busy schedules, and parents feeling overwhelmed all get in the way. As one teacher put it, "We're expected to work in partnership with parents…but it doesn't always happen."

In the end, both countries are grappling with the same underlying problem: what policy promises and what schools can realistically deliver do not always line up. England has clearer policies that encourage collaboration, but the capacity to put those expectations

into practice is not always there. Georgia, by contrast, is still developing the basic structures needed for partnership, which makes consistent collaboration even more difficult to achieve.

4.2 Theme 2: Communication approaches and their effectiveness

Communication looked quite different across the two settings, yet it remained central to how teachers understood parental engagement. Georgian teachers characterised communication as sporadic and mainly reactive rather than being a steady, constant process that runs the course of time. They were typically the ones to initiate the connection, usually through a brief and informal conversation at school. "They don't have time to come to the meeting if they don't have any serious issues to share," admitted one teacher. Nevertheless, the stigma and doubt associated with SEN made these relationships difficult to foster.

Conversely, in England, the mode of communication was more rigid, where teachers depended on emails, scheduled meetings, IEP reviews, and discussions led by SENCo to be in contact with families. Despite having these measures, it was very hard for many people to manage them along with their already very high workloads. In the words of one teacher, "It is really hard to keep up with all the communication along with all the other things." In fact, SENCos were frequently the most important connectors handling the expectations, explaining the information, and assisting in keeping everyone on track.

By observing the two settings together, one can clearly see the pattern: Georgia has little formal communication plan. On the contrary, England is equipped with a more formal communication structure than it can handle. The essentials for good communication, such as time, frequent contact and common ground, can be very much absent in both contexts.

4.3 Theme 3: Influence of Parental Insights on Practice

In both nations, teachers were aware of the importance of parents' insights in structuring really effective support for SEN, but these contributions appeared in very different ways across the two contexts.

In Georgia, teachers claimed that the parents' observations, while being substantially helpful, were reported only on rare occasions. When families really shared their child's routines, sensitivities, or triggers, which are normally hidden, their information had a positive impact on the classroom practice, but these kinds of statements were rare. One of the teachers said, "It's extremely helpful… but it happens maybe once a year," which conveys the reality of how their communication was limited.

In the United Kingdom, educators expressed the opinion that the parents were more eager to provide their own thoughts, and such suggestions meant changes in the classroom. They told stories of how a parent who was concerned about emotional triggers or sensory overload would be the reason for them to structure the day differently. As one teacher said, "A parent told me that their kid has difficult mornings, therefore I started a soft-start routine, which made all the difference."

When compared with the two contexts, the sharing of information by Georgian parents was often less, and this was due to the stigma or the lack of knowledge about SEN. On the contrary, the English parents were consistently more open to giving suggestions, but they were also troubled emotionally by the system. The teachers from the two countries were on the same wavelength regarding one issue: the parents' provision of such details made a big difference in picturing the whole picture and adjusting support accordingly.

4.4 Theme 4: Systemic, cultural and socio-economic barriers

Across both countries, teachers pointed to a combination of systemic and cultural barriers that make it hard to build meaningful parental engagement. The pressures look different in Georgia and England, yet teachers in both places felt that their systems—

whether still developing or stretched to their limits—create a gap between what policy expects and what they can reasonably deliver. Teachers in Georgia often mentioned the continued stigma attached to Special Educational Needs. Some parents tend to keep their child's disabilities a secret for fear of being judged. Consequently, delaying the support leads to communication complexities. The problem of insufficient professional staff is the most important among the hurdles that culture presents. Most of the psychologists, therapists, and resource teachers are unavailable due to the lack of adequate specialisation. This has left classroom teachers with the task of handling student identification, interventions, and family communication almost single-handedly. Parents' ignorance of SEN, which, in turn, decreases their self-confidence and makes it more difficult for them to get involved. In the UK, teachers pointed out a different type of problem that they had to deal with: bureaucracy and the limited capacity of the system. They mentioned that many individual assessment and referral waiting lists can be for over a year, therefore, leaving the families without any immediate support and inflicting them with considerable emotional strain. Teachers also pointed out that SENCos are often overwhelmed by large caseloads and paperwork, leaving little room for deeper engagement. Even comparatively well-resourced schools find it hard to deliver the kind of parental involvement that policy assumes.

Overall, the two countries are experiencing the same problem in different ways. Georgia does not have the necessary professionals who can support students with disabilities, while in England, there are structures to support, but insufficient human resources to manage them effectively. In both instances, the constraints that are present make it hard for parents and teachers to collaborate meaningfully.

4.5 Theme 5: Desired supports and systemic improvements

Both countries' educators provided original and feasible ideas on the ways to enhance parental involvement in inclusive education. Even if their proposals were coloured by the stress that their systems faced, one of the main ideas was communicated by all of them: communication must be more explicit, the partnership between home and school should be tough, and the overall system has to offer extra support.

Georgia's educators were persistent in helping parents build a clearer understanding of SEN. The teachers explained that many families are not familiar with the basic terms and are in a state of confusion concerning the objectives of IEPs. Additionally, most are doubtful about the ways they can effectively help their child's learning. The teachers believed that continuous workshops, information meetings, and transparent manuals would help the parents to be more confident and at ease. Moreover, they are of the view that the insufficient expert staff - namely psychologists, resource teachers, and therapists - represents a substantial barrier to this goal.

Besides additional specialist support, parents and teachers would be able to acquire better knowledge of the processes involved in the SEN Code of Practice, thus becoming more efficient. Teachers also noted the importance of establishing straightforward and universal procedures that would allow parents to get involved in the process of IEP development and review, thus making their engagement an integral part of practice and not just a sporadic occurrence.

The educators in both nations shared the most constructive thoughts on how to boost parental involvement, especially in the inclusive education field. Despite the recommendations given, having their respective system-specific stresses, the one common thread was: better communication is needed, stronger partnerships between home and school need to be better, and the larger system should provide more support.

In Georgia, the teachers pointed out the significance of their role in helping parents with the knowledge of special educational needs. They shared that most families are not familiar with key SEN terminology, are not aware of the use of IEPs, and are very

often unclear about the way to practically support their child's study. Teachers argued the case that such activities as periodic workshops, informative sessions, and practical, accessible guidance would be the best means of developing parents' confidence and skills. They also mentioned the lack of specialists such as psychologists, resource teachers, and therapists as a huge obstacle that schools are facing.

Besides additional specialist support, parents and teachers would be able to acquire better knowledge of the processes involved in the SEN Code of Practice, thus becoming more efficient. Teachers also noted the importance of establishing straightforward and universal procedures that would allow parents to get involved in the process of IEP development and review, thus making their engagement an integral part of practice and not just a sporadic occurrence.

Table 1. Side-by-Side comparative table (Georgia vs England)

Theme	Georgia	England
Understanding of Parental Engagement	Seen as formal, minimal, largely school-driven	Understood as co-production; policy-driven but inconsistently implemented
Communication Methods	Reactive, ad-hoc, teacher-led	Structured (emails, SENCos, reviews), but time-intensive
Influence of Parents on Practice	Rare but impactful	Common and often shapes adjustments
Barriers	Stigma, lack of specialists, limited parental SEN knowledge	Long waiting lists, bureaucracy, parental overwhelm
Teacher Needs	Parent workshops, SEN awareness, more specialists	Time, family liaison roles, reduced caseloads, joint training
Policy Context	Inclusive policies emerging, inconsistent implementation	Strong legal framework (SEND Code 2015) but under-resourced

5. Summary of cross-national findings

Even though Georgia and England are quite different in their educational pasts, political environments, and general system maturity, the conclusions are very similar in both regards. Teachers from both countries were very positive about their professionalism and morals in supporting students with Special Educational Needs. They all mentioned that equal and genuine involvement of parents is a must for meaningful inclusion to occur. They considered inclusion not in the way it only exists at school; instead, it is a teamwork of families and teachers collaborating.

Despite this shared commitment, teachers described constraints that limit parents' ability to participate fully. These factors may be pictured in various ways in different environments, but they often come to the same result: parents not being able to realise the image of positive and active participation in policy as they wish to do. In the case of Georgia, parents' involvement is limited due to social stigma, lack of knowledge on SEN, and lack of clarity on what the support involves. In the instance of England, parents feel the physical and emotional toll of often being unsure of procedural complexities befitting a bureaucratic SEND system. Be it through the lens of cultural perspectives or procedural burdens, both parent groups endure hurdles that restrict their capacity at times for sustained engagement.

Genuine collaboration is often difficult due to the presence of systemic barriers. During their stay in Georgia, teachers narrated the ordeal of being the sole support staff due to the lack of specialist support. They must bear the burden of responsibility for identifying needs, planning interventions, and communicating with families—often in the absence of resources and without guidelines to involve the parents. While in England, the system is more developed in the formal sense, teachers still felt it was a barrier because of long waiting lists, overworked SENCos, and very detailed paperwork that affects support and adds more stress on families. A lot of the time, England's model presents itself as somewhat powerful, but the daily routine is very much congested due to the lack of capacity.

In both countries, teachers observed a gap between what is policy and what is possible at a school level. Even if both the policies highlight cooperation and the partnership between a family and school, the parents have to be at the edge of the solutions, the communication is usually done after problems arise, and the teacher's schedule is completely booked, thus the problems are given only superficial solutions. These implications are due to the existing socioeconomic and cultural conditions and not to the educators' lack of engagement.

The evidence points to a clear message: the two countries need long-lasting investments in order for the sustained and meaningful parental engagement to be a reality. In Georgia, the major prerequisites should be put in place, these include insufficient support for parents to comprehend SEN better, and a lack of a clear-cut, equitable process that tell family what to do. more specialist staff, better support to help parents understand SEN, and clearer, more consistent processes that improve families' involvement. In England, the problem is one of capacity: it is essential to cut the heavy caseload, speed up the assessments, and fortify the coordination that helps maintain the communication between home and school. In both countries, genuine collaboration will only develop if policymakers and school leaders commit to long-term, sustained investment.

6. Conclusion

The research focuses on the teachers' perceptions of parental involvement in students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) in urban primary schools of Georgia and England. The data were generated through semi-structured interviews with twenty teachers which revealed that the combination of common interests and local-specific obstacles is the determinant of home-school interaction. Both UK and Georgian teachers confirmed that they are very devoted to the integration of SEN children and constantly reiterated their belief that real inclusion is only possible with the active and continuous collaboration with families. Although being in very different arrangements, they still agreed that the partnership with parents is the main tool in aiding children to flourish.

The study also revealed barriers that prevent parents from engaging as fully as they might. In Georgia, social stigma, low awareness of SEN, and limited guidance restrict families' involvement. In England, even well-informed parents often become worn down by the emotional and bureaucratic demands of the SEND system. In both instances, whether they are cultural or procedural, these pressures act as obstacles for the parents to take the confident, active part that is normally expected of them in the inclusive education process.

Systemic constraints often lead to dysfunctional teachers and parental collaboration. A few teachers in Georgia reported that they do not have any access to the specialist staff and lack of time to support the SEN children on their own. In England, the problem is the painfully bureaucratised system where the system is more structured, but waiting lists are still a problem, overwhelmed SENCos, and heavy documentation demands. Both countries face deficiencies in resources have made it impossible to fulfil the proposed timely support to SEN who could benefit from it.

In this way, the evidence presented aids in demonstrating the dissimilarity of the policies intended by the management and the real-life situations prevailing in the classrooms. In addition, the systems, while both traditionally making parental involvement a priority, were lacking the main components pertaining to real collaboration, such as dependable time, access to specialist guidance, and strong, trusting relationships. The infrastructure support is the missing component that teachers will not be able to provide, which is necessary to make a true partnership possible.

Georgia is in dire need of investment in essential sectors; recruiting more specialist professionals, ensuring that the procedures for the active participation of parents are clearer and more consistent. So that the families can feel that they have the required knowledge and, thus, gain their confidence. In contrast, England also needs the additional system capacity which is lighter

caseloads, quicker access to assessments, and stronger roles that will be directly dedicated to communication and coordination between homes and schools.

Although the pathways are not the same, there is a deep common aim: to create conditions that will allow parents to become partners in their children's inclusion as knowledgeable and empowered. Reaching such a goal requires a long-term, context-sensitive focus from policymakers and school chiefs, thus ensuring that collaboration is not merely promoted in theory but is indeed facilitated in practice.

References

Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2008). Making education for all inclusive: Where next? *Prospects, 38*(1), 15–34.

Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., & Weiner, S. (2013). From exclusion to inclusion: A review of international literature on ways of responding to students with special educational needs in schools. CfBT Education Trust.

Alexander, R. (2000). *Culture and pedagogy: International comparisons in primary education*. Blackwell.

Antia, K., Boucsein, J., & Gassmann, F. (2022). Parental migration and left-behind children in Georgia: Schoolteachers' perspectives. *International Journal of Population Research*, *22*(1), –11.

Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 15*(2), 219–234.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18*(3), 328–352.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Harvard University Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Department for Education. (2023). *Special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and alternative provision improvement plan: Right support, right place, right time*.

Department for Education, & Department of Health. (2015). *Special educational needs and disability (SEND) code of practice: 0 to 25 years*.

Desforges, C., & Abouchaar, A. (2003). *The impact of parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment* (DfES Research Report 433). Department for Education and Skills.

Education Endowment Foundation. (2016). *Parental engagement (Teaching and Learning Toolkit)*.

Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(9), 701–712.

Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Westview Press.

Erdem, C., & Kaya, M. F. (2020). A meta-analysis of the effect of parental involvement on students' academic achievement. *International Education Studies, 13*(10), 8–23.

Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 29*(3), 286–294.

Florian, L. (2015). Conceptualising inclusive pedagogy: The inclusive pedagogical approach in action. In J. M. Deppeler, T. Loreman, R. Smith, & L. Florian (Eds.), *Inclusive pedagogy across the curriculum* (pp. 11–24). Emerald.

Goodall, J., & Montgomery, C. (2014). Parental involvement to parental engagement: A continuum. *Educational Review, 66*(4), 399–410.

Goodall, J., & Vorhaus, J. (2011). *Review of best practice in parental engagement* (DfE Research Report 156). Department for Education.

Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2008). Do parents know they matter? Engaging all parents in learning. *Educational Research, 50*(3), 277–289.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? *Review of Educational Research, 67*(1), 3–42.

Hornby, G. (2011). *Parental involvement in childhood education: Building effective school-family partnerships*. Springer.

Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Urban Education, 42*(1), 82–110.

Kavelashvili, N. (2017). Inclusive education in Georgia: Challenges and perspectives. *Izzivi prihodnosti/Challenges of the Future, 2*(1), 17–27.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. University of California Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia. (n.d.). *Inclusive education programmes*.

Mitchell, D. (2022). *What really works in special and inclusive education* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.

National Audit Office. (2024). *Support for children and young people with special educational needs* (HC 299).

Ofsted. (2022). *Parent View: Toolkit for schools*.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(10), 837–851.

UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. (2014). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Status—Georgia*.

UNESCO Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Education Profiles. (2021). *Georgia—Inclusion profile*.

UNICEF Georgia. (2020). *Early childhood development and education in Georgia*.

UNICEF Georgia. (2024). *Results in 2024*.

World Bank. (2019). *Georgia—Innovation, Inclusion and Quality Project (Project Appraisal Document)*.

World Bank. (2024). *Implementation status and results report: Georgia I2Q*.