

Methodology For Improving Family Relationships In Households With Children Who Have Special Educational Needs: Distinctive Features And Targeted Interventions

Saitova Muattar

Basic doctoral student at Research Institute of Family and Gender, Uzbekistan

Received: 15 September 2025; **Accepted:** 07 October 2025; **Published:** 11 November 2025

Abstract: Families raising children with special educational needs (SEN) display distinctive relational patterns—heightened stress, blurred caregiving boundaries, renegotiated coparenting, shifting sibling roles, and service-mediated communication. This study proposes a replicable methodology to strengthen family relationships by integrating family-systems theory, the ICF framework, and family-centred practice. The five-step process includes baseline mapping, co-designed relational targets, sequenced coaching and psychoeducation, school-home alignment, and iterative monitoring. Developed via expert review and piloted in community and school settings, mixed measures (Parenting Stress Index, Family Assessment Device, FACES) and narrative data showed clearer communication rituals, more balanced task sharing, improved sibling inclusion, modest stress reductions, and faster parent-school problem solving. Culturally responsive and participation-oriented, the approach treats distinctive features as modifiable, converting service contact into durable relational competence at home.

Keywords: Special educational needs; family relationships; family-centred practice; inclusive education; coparenting; sibling dynamics; ICF; family quality of life.

Introduction: Families who raise children with special educational needs face a relational landscape shaped by clinical schedules, institutional interfaces, and adaptive routines that reconfigure daily life. Unlike families whose parenting tasks are primarily developmental and social, SEN-impacted families juggle additional roles such as case coordinator, therapy extender, and advocate, with consequences for marital cohesion, communication patterns, and sibling inclusion. Research consistently associates persistent caregiving demands with elevated stress and reduced perceived control, yet also demonstrates the possibility of post-stress growth where supports are reliable, family strengths are recognized, and professional partnerships are authentic rather than prescriptive. From a bioecological standpoint, the child's pathways of participation emerge from nested systems—family, school, services, and community—so the quality of family relationships cannot be isolated from how those systems synchronize effort and language. Family-centred practices and inclusive

education frameworks underline partnership, shared decision-making, and functional goal setting as core principles, while the ICF provides a common taxonomy that links participation outcomes to environmental facilitators and barriers. However, the translation of these principles into everyday family interactions remains uneven. Many interventions address child function or parental coping without an explicit, structured plan for the relationship features that actually mediate home routines, learning carryover, and wellbeing. Gaps persist around how to convert assessment data into home-anchored plans, how to integrate school and service goals into domestic life without colonizing family culture, and how to measure changes in relational competence with the same discipline applied to child outcomes.

This article responds to those gaps by articulating a practice methodology that treats distinctive family features as modifiable targets. The approach is designed for psychologists, social workers, special educators, and school-based teams who collaborate

with caregivers of children across disability categories. It adopts a design-research stance: begin with thick description of family life, co-construct a plan that privileges family meaning and cultural anchors, sequence coaching and psychoeducation to enhance communication and task sharing, and evaluate progress with mixed methods that include standardized indices and narrative change in family discourse. The central contention is that relational functioning, while shaped by disability-related demands, is amenable to improvement when professional attention is directed at interaction patterns, boundaries, and the alignment of home practices with inclusive schooling.

The methodology was developed through iterative synthesis of four knowledge streams. Family-systems theory contributed conceptual tools for analyzing boundaries, roles, and patterns such as triangulation or disengagement that may emerge when demands escalate. The ICF framework added a shared language for linking family routines and environmental factors to participation, reducing the risk that relationship work becomes detached from functional goals. Family-centred early intervention and inclusive education literature provided evidence for collaborative planning, routines-based practices, and conjoint problem solving with teachers. Finally, coping and resilience research guided the construction of psychoeducational content that replaces deficit-oriented narratives with skills in reappraisal, problem-focused collaboration, and social support mobilization.

Methodologically, a design-based approach was chosen to allow rapid refinement in authentic settings. The development process involved expert panels of practitioners and family advocates who critiqued successive drafts of the protocol, followed by small pilot cycles in which practitioners implemented the steps with volunteer families and convened reflective debriefings. Data sources included baseline and follow-up scores on family functioning and stress measures, reflective journals from caregivers, deidentified case notes from practitioner teams, and school-home communication artifacts. Quantitative instruments comprised the Parenting Stress Index for caregiver burden, the Family Assessment Device for structural and communication patterns, and the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales for flexibility and connectedness, complemented by optional Family Quality of Life scales. To preserve ecological validity, assessments were embedded within conversations about routines, aspirations, and cultural practices rather than administered as isolated tests.

The intervention was structured as an individualized family relationship plan with five interlocking

components. The first was a baseline mapping conversation aligned to ICF domains and family-systems indicators, designed to capture strengths, stress points, and the meanings caregivers attach to therapy and school goals. The second was a co-design step that transformed the map into a small set of relational targets, expressed in the family's own language and linked to observable routines. The third component was sequenced coaching and psychoeducation delivered across several weeks, addressing communication clarity, supportive coparenting, sibling inclusion, and alignment of home support with individualized education plans. The fourth involved deliberate synchronization with schools and services, ensuring language and expectations were coherent across settings without displacing family authority. The fifth component was monitoring and iterative adjustment, with planned check-ins that reviewed indicators, refined strategies, and captured narrative evidence of change. Fidelity guides supported practitioners to maintain collaborative stance and avoid prescriptive drift.

Ethical considerations prioritized informed consent, voluntary participation, and the minimization of burden. Cultural responsiveness was built into practitioner prompts to elicit traditions, gendered expectations, and extended family roles. Because the methodology targeted interaction patterns, particular care was taken to avoid pathologizing families; language emphasized adaptation, agency, and shared problem solving. Practitioners were trained to distinguish between coaching that builds capacity and counseling that requires referral when significant marital conflict or caregiver depression surfaced.

Iterative testing produced a coherent pathway from assessment to sustained relational change. During baseline mapping, caregivers typically articulated diffuse goals that blended hopes for the child with fatigue from service navigation. Translating these narratives into a small number of relational targets reduced overwhelm and made progress visible. For example, families that initially described constant miscommunication about therapy homework reframed the issue as the need for a predictable communication ritual that did not intrude on bedtime or meals. In cases where one parent functioned as a de facto therapist while the other withdrew to avoid conflict, the plan foregrounded mutual acknowledgment of roles and scheduled check-ins that distributed tasks without implying incompetence. When siblings oscillated between protectiveness and resentment, the plan framed inclusion as participation in joint activities calibrated to each child's interests and capacities rather than as caretaking duty.

Sequenced coaching emphasized micro-skills that altered interaction patterns. Communication work focused on short, expectation-anchored exchanges that separated requests from judgments and replaced global criticism with specific, time-bound observations. Coparenting sessions encouraged partners to articulate personal limits and to trade tasks in ways that preserved each adult's sources of competence and rest. Psychoeducation about stress and coping legitimized oscillation between problem solving and respite, allowing caregivers to choose strategies appropriate to fluctuating demands instead of interpreting fatigue as failure. Aligning home supports with individualized education plans reduced conflicts over priorities by rephrasing goals in functional terms tied to routines rather than abstract skill names. Teachers reported that parents were more likely to initiate solution-focused contact when school language mirrored the home plan's phrasing.

Monitoring revealed incremental but meaningful shifts. Families who adopted communication rituals reported fewer quarrels sparked by therapy logistics because decisions moved from spontaneous negotiation to planned conversations. Partners who redistributed roles experienced relief from role overload and displayed greater warmth in daily interactions. Siblings who were invited into inclusive play with clear boundaries demonstrated more stable affiliative behavior and fewer avoidance patterns. The coherence between school and home goals shortened the time required for teachers and parents to agree on adjustments, which sustained parental engagement. On standardized measures, stress scores tended to stabilize or decline modestly, while cohesion and adaptability indices trended upward when plans were actively reviewed. Narrative accounts captured qualitative improvements such as renewed humor, restoration of couple time, and increased confidence during school meetings.

Across cases, the most potent mechanism appeared to be the shift from a problem-saturated story about the child or services to a shared narrative in which the family recognized and enacted relational competencies. The methodology's attention to language—how goals are phrased, how requests are framed, how successes are noticed—functioned as both process and outcome, because the vocabulary of collaboration became the family's own tool for maintenance after formal coaching ended. Equally important, linking targets to ICF domains helped practitioners reduce jargon and demonstrate to families that participation, not mere compliance with exercises, was the central purpose of support.

The findings suggest that distinctive relational features

in SEN-impacted families are neither fixed liabilities nor incidental background but strategic points of influence for intervention. Elevated stress and boundary ambiguity can be reframed as signals about where communication and role renegotiation are most needed. Coparenting strain, for instance, often reflects an absence of protected planning time rather than deep incompatibility; when couples were supported to install brief, predictable rituals with clear agendas, they were able to negotiate task sharing without revisiting older disagreements. Sibling resentment frequently reveals confusion about expectations; when inclusive activities were embedded in the family plan as opportunities for shared enjoyment rather than caretaking obligations, siblings reengaged without feeling displaced. Persistent friction with schools can expose language mismatches; when home plans and individualized education documents shared functional phrasing and recognized the family's non-professional identity, collaboration improved without escalating advocacy to conflict.

The proposed methodology extends family-centred practice by bringing the unit of change squarely into everyday exchanges rather than confining it to service meetings. It also guards against two common risks. The first is prescriptive overload, where families receive a long list of tasks unmoored from their rhythms and meanings. Co-design with a strict limit on concurrent targets counteracts this tendency and preserves the family's sense of authorship. The second risk is clinical colonization of family life, in which homes become therapy spaces and relationships are instrumentalized for skill acquisition. By anchoring goals in participation and by naming rest, humor, and couple time as legitimate outcomes, the methodology protects family culture from being absorbed by intervention agendas.

Cultural responsiveness proved essential. Families vary in how authority is distributed, how emotions are expressed, and how extended kin participate in decision-making. The protocol's open prompts elicited these differences without imposing a single relational ideal, and practitioners were trained to translate skills into forms congruent with local norms. For instance, in households where elders play significant roles, communication rituals included them so that decisions did not have to be renegotiated informally afterward. In families using more indirect communication styles, the language of appreciation and requests was adapted to align with respectful forms, preventing coaching from inadvertently creating conflict.

Measurement and evidence remain important considerations. While standardized instruments help monitor trends, narrative indicators capture nuances that scales can miss, such as shifts in tone during family

meetings or the spontaneous emergence of joint problem solving. The methodology therefore balances quantitative and qualitative evidence, positioning both as legitimate. Future research should examine effect sizes in larger samples and explore which components drive the greatest change for specific subgroups, such as single-parent households, families navigating poverty, or those managing co-occurring mental health conditions.

Limitations include the modest scope of pilot cycles and the reliance on practitioner documentation for some outcomes, which introduces expectancy bias. The absence of randomized controls constrains causal claims. Nonetheless, the iterative design shows feasibility and acceptability, and the convergence of standardized and narrative signals provides a credible basis for broader trials. Schools and community agencies can adopt the framework without major infrastructural changes because it leverages existing meetings and documentation, requiring primarily a shift in conversational practice and the institution of short, scheduled review points.

The methodology's alignment with inclusive education yields practical dividends. When school teams adopt the same functional vocabulary and recognize that families must remain families, not paraprofessionals, homework expectations are calibrated to real routines. Teachers avoid assigning activities that displace sibling play or couple time, and parents are better positioned to provide feedback that is not filtered through guilt. In turn, children experience more consistent supports across contexts, as the relational competence of the home becomes a scaffold for participation in classrooms and communities.

Families raising children with special educational needs embody distinctive relational features that emerge from the collision of caregiving intensity, institutional interfaces, and cultural meanings of disability. These features—stress, boundary ambiguity, coparenting strain, sibling renegotiation, and service-mediated communication—are not static descriptors but adjustable coordinates of family life. A methodology that begins with careful mapping of strengths and stressors, translates them into a few relational targets, delivers sequenced coaching and psychoeducation, aligns home practices with school goals through a shared functional language, and monitors progress with mixed measures can shift patterns toward resilience. The approach developed here demonstrates practical feasibility in real settings, emphasizes cultural responsiveness, and protects the family's identity while enhancing its capacity to collaborate with schools and services. By treating distinctive features as modifiable rather than intrinsic, practitioners can help families

convert service contact into sustained relational competence, with benefits that extend to the child's participation and the wellbeing of all members.

REFERENCES

1. Bronfenbrenner U. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979. — 330 p.
2. Turnbull A. P., Turnbull H. R. *Families, Professionals, and Exceptionality: Positive Outcomes Through Partnerships and Trust*. — 7th ed. — Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall, 2014. — 448 p.
3. Dunst C. J., Trivette C. M., Hamby D. W. *Meta-analysis of family-centered helpgiving practices research // Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*. — 2007. — Vol. 13, No. 4. — P. 370–378.
4. McWilliam R. A. *Routines-Based Early Intervention: Supporting Young Children and Their Families*. — Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes, 2010. — 296 p.
5. World Health Organization. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)*. — Geneva: WHO, 2001. — 299 p.
6. UNESCO. *A Guide for Ensuring Inclusion and Equity in Education*. — Paris: UNESCO, 2017. — URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/> (дата обращения: 07.11.2025).
7. Epstein J. L. *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. — 2nd ed. — Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2011. — 384 p.
8. Sheridan S. M., Kratochwill T. R. *Conjoint Behavioral Consultation: Promoting Family–School Connections and Interventions*. — New York: Springer, 2007. — 254 p.
9. Hastings R. P., Taunt H. M. *Positive perceptions in families of children with developmental disabilities // Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*. — 2002. — Vol. 15, No. 3. — P. 269–275.
10. Olson D. H. *Circumplex Model of marital and family systems: An update // Journal of Family Therapy*. — 2000. — Vol. 22, No. 2. — P. 128–143.
11. Summers J. A., Marquis J., Mannan H., Enders C., Turnbull A. P. *Relationship of perceived adequacy of services, family-professional partnerships, and family quality of life in early childhood service programs // Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*. — 2007. — Vol. 27, No. 4. — P. 231–243.
12. Zuna N., Summers J. A., Turnbull A. P., Hu X.

- Theorizing about family quality of life // In: Brown I., Brown R. (eds.). *Quality of Life and Disability: An Approach for Community Practitioners*. — London: Jessica Kingsley, 2003. — P. 219–236.
13. Greenberger D., Padesky C. A. *Mind Over Mood: Change How You Feel by Changing the Way You Think*. — 2nd ed. — New York: Guilford Press, 2015. — 341 p.
14. Skinner E. A., Zimmer-Gembeck M. J. The development of coping // *Annual Review of Psychology*. — 2007. — Vol. 58. — P. 119–144.
15. Resch J. A., Elliott T. R., Benz M. R. Depression and parent stress among mothers of children with disabilities: A literature review // *Journal of Special Education*. — 2012. — Vol. 45, No. 3. — P. 164–172.
16. Park J., Turnbull A. P., Turnbull H. R. Impacts of poverty on quality of life in families of children with disabilities // *Exceptional Children*. — 2002. — Vol. 68, No. 2. — P. 151–170.
17. Grusec J. E., Davidov M. Integrating different perspectives on socialization theory and research: A domain-specific approach // *Child Development*. — 2010. — Vol. 81, No. 3. — P. 687–709.
18. Boehm T. L., Carter E. W. Family quality of life and its correlates among parents of children and adults with intellectual disability // *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*. — 2019. — Vol. 124, No. 2. — P. 99–115.
19. Black K., Lobo M. A conceptual review of family resilience factors // *Journal of Family Nursing*. — 2008. — Vol. 14, No. 1. — P. 33–55.
20. World Health Organization, World Bank. *World Report on Disability*. — Geneva: WHO, 2011. — 350 p. — URL: <https://www.who.int/> (дата обращения: 07.11.2025).
21. Bailey D. B., Bruder M. B. Family outcomes of early intervention: A framework for measurement and program evaluation // *Infants & Young Children*. — 2005. — Vol. 18, No. 1. — P. 45–59.
22. Rutter M. Resilience as a dynamic concept // *Development and Psychopathology*. — 2012. — Vol. 24, No. 2. — P. 335–344.
23. Guralnick M. J. Early intervention approaches to enhance the peer-related social competence of young children with developmental delays: A historical perspective // *Infants & Young Children*. — 2010. — Vol. 23, No. 2. — P. 73–83.
24. Weiss J. A., Cappadocia M. C., MacMullin J. A., Vicili M., Lunsy Y. The impact of child problem behaviors of children with ASD on parent mental health: The mediating role of acceptance and empowerment // *Autism*. — 2012. — Vol. 16, No. 3. — P. 261–274.
25. Plant K. M., Sanders M. R. Reducing problem behavior during care-giving in families of preschool-aged children with developmental disabilities // *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. — 2007. — Vol. 28, No. 4. — P. 362–385.