



**RESEARCH PAPER**

**Liking and Disliking Factors about going to School perceived by the Parents of Children with Special needs enrolled in Special Schools of Lahore City**

**<sup>1</sup>Dr. Hina Fazil\* <sup>2</sup>Attia Zulfiqar <sup>3</sup>Hifza Nawaz**

1. Assistant Professor, Institute of Special Education, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Master degree student, Institute of Special Education, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Master degree student, Institute of Special Education, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

**\*Corresponding Author**      [hinafazil.dse@pu.edu.pk](mailto:hinafazil.dse@pu.edu.pk)

**ABSTRACT**

Online education has been turned into an effective opportunity for students, especially after COVID -19. This paper aimed to investigate the liking and disliking factors of school-going children with special perceived by their parents and to compare the liking and disliking of school-going special needs children. The quantitative research approach was applied by the researchers to complete the study. 40 parents of school-going children with special needs residents of Lahore city were selected as a sample by using a stratified sampling technique for this research. One close-ended self-constructed reliable questionnaire (Cronbach Alpha=.84) was used by the researchers. The results found liking to do activities in the school more than disliking (liking score= 83.7500 and disliking score=52.5500). There is no significant difference in parental views based on their gender about the liking ( $t=.388$ ,  $df=38$  and  $p=.700$ ) and disliking factors ( $t=.788$ ,  $df=38$ , and  $p=.436$ ) and there are no significant differences in the liking and disliking of students with special needs based on their disabilities about going to school. Researchers recommended that reinforcement should be given to the special needs students to maintain their likeness for attending school.

**Keywords:** Children With Special Needs, Disliking Factors, Liking Factors, Parents

**Introduction**

Online Education plays a critical role in the development and growth of children. For children with special needs, the right educational environment can make a significant impact on their lives. Special schools are designed to cater to the unique needs of children with disabilities, providing a supportive and inclusive learning environment. However, despite the benefits that special schools can offer, not all parents of children with special needs may have a positive experience with this type of education. In this paper, we will examine the liking and disliking factors about going to school as perceived by the parents of children with special needs enrolled in special schools.

It is well established that the experiences of children with disabilities and their families can be influenced by a range of factors, including the availability of appropriate educational resources and support. In the case of special schools, these factors can include the quality of the educational program, the qualifications and expertise of the teachers, the level of individualized attention and support provided to each student, and the opportunities available for socialization and community building. When these factors are positive, parents of children with special needs may have a very positive experience with special schools and may see these institutions as the best choice for their child's education. On the other hand, when these factors are lacking, parents of children with special needs

may have a negative experience with special schools. For example, they may feel that their child is not receiving the appropriate level of support or that the teachers are not sufficiently trained or equipped to meet their child's needs. They may also feel that their child is not being adequately challenged academically, or that there are limited opportunities for the child to participate in mainstream activities or events.

Going to school is a significant aspect of a child's development, and it can have a profound impact on the child's future. However, for children with special needs, the experience of going to school can be different compared to their non-disabled peers. Children with special needs often have unique needs, challenges and considerations when it comes to their education. In this paper, we will explore the different perspectives of parents of children with special needs enrolled in special schools, and examine the specific factors that contribute to their positive and negative experiences. Through a review of the existing literature and a survey of parents of children with special needs, we aim to identify the most common liking and disliking factors about going to school as perceived by these parents. The results of this study can be used to inform policies and practices in special education, and to improve the quality of educational experiences for children with special needs.

The experiences of parents of children with special needs enrolled in special schools are shaped by a range of factors, including the quality of the educational program, the qualifications and expertise of the teachers, and the level of individualized attention and support provided to each student. By examining the likes and dislikes of these parents, we can gain a deeper understanding of their perspectives and the factors that contribute to their positive and negative experiences with special schools. This information can be used to improve the quality of educational experiences for children with special needs and to ensure that they receive the support and resources they need to succeed.

## Literature Review

Education is the most important and fundamental element for the success of every special child of the world. It's a matter of fact that every child develops his/her own learning pattern. But there are few factors that influence students learning. Among these developmental factors, family and parents of the child is the biggest factor. As it depends upon the understanding of the parents in making a choice about school. Parents likings and disliking about the school largely based on the socio-economic status, religion, ethnicity, and race of the parents which are considered to be equally important factors that deemed to establish a student to academic success (Davis-Kean & Sexton 2009).

A number of researches had been conducted to investigate the role of parental involvement in the education of children. Since education of a special child is very important in order to make them independent and to live life like a normal person of our society. But unfortunately, there are only a few studies available that highlight the value of parents liking and disliking in choosing a school for their child's education. As every special children has very unique and diverse needs which can only be fulfilled in specially designed educational settings. So parents must consider about professionally trained and qualified teachers along with other qualities of school while making a choice about the school.

Parents influence children in multifaceted ways as a fundamental support system and socialization source. The term involvement is defined in different ways as helping the child in different activities, making the child participate and engage in various school assignments, taking care of child health etc, at the same time it also give parents the right to like and dislike a school for the child before finalizing a school. (Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998). Parental involvement is not only about attending parent-teacher meetings; voluntarily helping the school, assisting the child at the time of doing home work just to encourage the child for high achievements by providing ample opportunities for the child to

fulfill expectations of their parents but also to make a wise decisions about child's school (Balli, Demo & Wedman, 1998).

As explained by Epstein (2001) children learn and develop through three overlapping "spheres of influence:" family, school, and community. Students who are supported by their parents at home often manifest better performance at school, while those students who remain unattended struggle immensely in achieving their educational targets. Involvements of parents in the education of their children prove to be a vital factor for the continuing educational development and success of children in school. Parental involvement is an individual right and responsibility for families and a social need that should be considered as a lever to promote the academic achievements of children (Castro, Casas, Martin, Lizasoain, Asencio and Gaviria, 2015). Parental involvement is an essential agent in supporting a child educationally and has a profound effect on student's ability to become a successful individual of the society (Anderson & Minke, K. M. (2007). Compton-Lily (2009) stated in her study that "many forms of family and community involvement influence student's achievement at all age".

It is general perception that parental participation contribute a lot in the education of child. A large number of researchers indicate that education of children are largely influenced by the parents and school (Strange & Banning, 2015). However, parents consider several factors while selecting a school for their children. These factors include academic achievements, safety measures, school management, accessibility, provision of educational facilities, professionalism of the staff among others. Rollefson (2015) conducted research identifying numerous factors that parents consider before selecting a school for their children. These factors include competency of the staff, environment of the school, safety and security, quality curriculum, extended learning opportunities, availability and use of modern technology, school results and its leadership. At the same time parents liking and satisfaction about the educational institute of their child affect by multiple factors like education and marital status of the parents, their economic and social status and their exposure about educational institutes, along with some other factors.

All over the world parents choose a school for their children, based on several expectations. They believe their children will learn and succeed academically from one level to onward (Boyle, Brock, Mace, & Sibbons, 2002). However, there are many other factors which are associated with child's potential to learn efficiently in school to fulfill expectations of the parents. Many researches also identify factors that influence children ability to learn. These factors are significantly related to school, home and child's aptitude (Hanushek, & Woessmann, 2014). Role of family, peer and support of the community is also important for the desired outcome of the children (Kim et al., 2012).

Parents liking and disliking while making a choice of a school is very vital and significantly affect the learning outcome of the children. Parental involvement has been highlighted by many researchers as a leading factor that can enhance child's learning. At the same time this phenomena can't be rejected that choosing a result oriented school can be very helpful to groom child's learning potential (Baker, 2006). A large number of research in western countries and United States second the idea that parents ability to select a school has significant impact on the child academic success and failure. Those parents who remain closely involved in child schooling become much aware of school annual goals. Resultantly, parents discuss the importance of education with their children and help them to comprehend learning strategies to maximize their learning (Hill & Taylor, 2004).

Parental involvement is certainly an essential factor in the development of the foundation in children's education. Despite all that, many parents do not engage in their children's education. Parental non involvement in the education may have a negative impact on the child performance within the school and sometime even out of the educational institutes; resultantly influence students educational progress and achievements.

## Material and methods

The quantitative research design with survey method was applied by the researchers to get the answers of the study.

### Population

The targeted population was the parents of children with special needs residents of Lahore city. All the parents of school-going special children of four categories (hearing impairment, physical impairment, visually impaired, and intellectual disability) were the study's population.

### Sample

Researchers used stratified random sampling and recruited 40 parents of special children, and 10 parents of the children with intellectually disability enrolled in Govt. Shadab institute for the mentally retarded, 10 parents of children of hearing impairment enrolled in Hamza Foundation, 10 parents of physically impaired children from PSRD, and 10 parents of children with blindness enrolled in Govt. National Special Education Center for blind children, Johar Town.

**Table 1**  
**Sample characteristics**

Demographics	Variables	Percentage %	Frequency
Parents gender	Female	52.5	21
	Male	45.0	18
Parents age	20-30 years	22.5	9
	31-40 years	42.5	17
	41-50 years	32.5	13
	51-60 years	2.5	1
Child disability	Hearing impairment	25.0	10
	Visual impairment	25.0	10
	Mentally challenged	25.0	10
	Physical impairment	25.0	10
Child gender	Female	37.5	15
	Male	62.5	25
Child age	5-10	60.0	24
	11-15	30.0	12
	16-20	7.5	3
	21-25	2.5	1

### Instrument

A self-designed questionnaire having 40 close-ended questions (21 on liking and 19 on disliking) with 5point scale (strongly agree (five), agree (four), neutral (three), disagree (two), and strongly disagree (one) was used as an instrument by the researchers. Researchers went to different schools of special needs children and collected data from their parents in the school timing with the permission of the school headmasters. After raw data collection answers to the questions were coded through a coding scheme, analyzed, and interpreted. The researchers analyzed the data on SPSS (Statistical package for social sciences). A self designed questionnaire having 40 close-ended questions (21 on liking and 19 on disliking) with 5point scale (strongly agree (five), agree (four), neutral (three), disagree (two), and strongly disagree (one) was used as an instrument by the researchers.

## Results and Discussion

The collected data was analyzed on SPSS and the results are discussed as under

**Table 2**  
**Descriptive analysis**

No.	Statements	Strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	Strongly agree
<b>Willingness</b>						
1	The child is willing to go school	F 1 % 2.5	F 3 % 7.5	F 3 % 7.5	F 15 % 37.5	F 18 % 45.0
2	The child enjoys school	F %	F 2 % 5.0	F 5 % 12.5	F 14 % 35.0	F 19 % 47.5
3	Regularly shows interest in school affairs	F 1 % 2.5	F 5 % 12.5	F 6 % 15.0	F 16 % 40.0	F 12 % 30.0
4	Regularly shows interest in school affairs	F %	F 4 % 10.0	F 2 % 5.0	F 18 % 45.0	F 16 % 40.0
<b>Pleasant experiences</b>						
5	The child does school activities with pleasure	F 1 % 2.5	F 3 % 7.5	F 5 % 12.5	F 22 % 5.0	F 9 % 22.5
6	The child is friendly with other children at school	F %	F 4 % 10.0	F 6 % 15.0	F 9 % 22.5	F 21 % 52.5
7	The child is happy with educational activities at school	F %	F 5 % 12.5	F 6 % 15.0	F 21 % 52.5	F 8 % 20.0
8	The child feels good about non-academic activities at school	F 2 % 5.0	F 2 % 5.0	F 10 % 25.0	F 13 % 32.5	F 13 % 32.5
9	The child feels happy while doing classwork	F %	F 7 % 17.5	F 11 % 27.5	F 14 % 35.0	F 8 % 20.0
10	The child behaves well with the teacher in class	F 1 % 2.5	F 2 % 5.0	F 9 % 22.5	F 12 % 30	F 16 % 40.0
11	The child likes the rules at the school	F 2 % 5.0	F 3 % 7.5	F 8 % 20.0	F 11 % 27.5	F 16 % 40.0
12	The child likes to eat lunch at school	F 2 % 5.0	F 5 % 12.5	F 13 % 32.5	F 8 % 20.0	F 12 % 30.0
<b>Participation</b>						
13	The child attends all the classes held in the school	F 1 % 2.5	F 5 % 12.5	F 7 % 17.5	F 14 % 35.0	F 13 % 32.5
14	The child finishes their classwork during class	F 4 % 10.0	F 6 % 15.0	F 15 % 37.5	F 14 % 35.3	F 1 % 2.5
15	The child participates in the educational activities of the school	F %	F 6 % 15.0	F 4 % 10.0	F 19 % 47.5	F 11 % 27.5
16	The child participated in school sports	F %	F 6 % 15.0	F 6 % 15.0	F 16 % 40.0	F 12 % 30.0
17	The child participated in the exams eagerly	F 3 % 7.5	F 7 % 17.5	F 4 % 10.0	F 19 % 47.5	F 7 % 17.5
<b>Achievement</b>						
18	The child feels happy when going back to school to take a position in the class	F 2 % 5.0	F 5 % 12.5	F 5 % 12.5	F 12 % 30.0	F 16 % 40.0
19	The child takes a happy attitude when he comes first in sports	F %	F 4 % 10.0	F 9 % 22.5	F 13 % 32.5	F 14 % 35.0
20	The child expresses happiness in front of their parents for passing a class	F %	F 2 % 5.0	F 12 % 30.0	F 14 % 35.0	F 12 % 30.0
21	A child is happy to receive a reward at school	F 1 % 2.5	F 5 % 12.5	F 7 % 17.5	F 10 % 25.0	F 16 % 40.0
<b>Disliking Scale</b>						
<b>Unwillingness</b>						
22	The child is not willing to go to school	F 10 % 25.0	F 16 % 40.0	F 6 % 15.0	F 7 % 17.5	F 1 % 2.5
23	The child does not go to school with enthusiasm	F 7 % 17.5	F 18 % 45.0	F 10 % 25.0	F 5 % 12.5	F %

24	The child does not come back from school happy	F 9 % 22.5	F 18 % 45.0	F 10 % 25.0	F 3 % 7.5	F %
25	The child is not interested in regular school activities	F 9 % 22.5	F 18 % 45.0	F 9 % 22.5	F 4 % 10.0	F %
<b>Unpleasant</b>						
26	The child is fed up with the behavior of other children a school	F 8 % 20.0	F 8 % 20.0	F 10 % 25.0	F 10 % 25.0	F 4 % 10.0
27	The child is unhappy with the teacher's personality	F 5 % 12.5	F 12 % 30.0	F 16 % 40.0	F 4 % 10.0	F 3 % 7.5
28	The child is not interested in school activities	F 15 % 37.5	F 12 % 30.0	F 12 % 30.0	F 1 % 2.5	F %
29	The child does not like to share food with other children in the school	F 11 % 27.5	F 9 % 22.5	F 8 % 20.0	F 9 % 22.5	F 3 % 7.5
<b>Failure</b>						
30	The child cannot complete classwork before the end of the class	F 8 % 20.0	F 6 % 15.0	F 12 % 30.0	F 5 % 12.0	F 9 % 22.5
31	The child cannot do the class work because of fear of the teacher	F 6 % 15.0	F 15 % 37.5	F 12 % 30.0	F 4 % 10.0	F 3 % 7.5
32	The child refuses to drop out of school if he fails	F 6 % 15.0	F 14 % 35.0	F 6 % 15.0	F 7 % 17.5	F 1 % 2.5
33	The child avoids going to school if homework is not completed	F 8 % 20.0	F 4 % 10.0	F 9 % 22.5	F 7 % 17.5	F 12 % 30.0
<b>Disappointment</b>						
34	The child does not like going to school because the teacher does not allow him to get up from a place	F 2 % 5.0	F 11 % 27.5	F 13 % 32.5	F 7 % 17.5	F 7 % 17.5
35	The child does not like to get up early in the morning and go to school	F 2 % 5.0	F 11 % 27.5	F 11 % 27.5	F 10 % 25.0	F 6 % 15.0
36	The child runs away from studies for not taking a position in the class	F %	F 16 % 40.0	F 10 % 25.0	F 7 % 17.5	F 7 % 17.5
37	The child is tired of school rules	F 3 % 7.5	F 14 % 35.0	F 14 % 35.0	F 4 % 10.0	F 5 % 12.5
38	Inappropriate behavior of the teacher is the main reason for not going to school	F 1 % 2.5	F 9 % 22.5	F 13 % 32.5	F 10 % 25.0	F 7 % 17.5
<b>Teasing</b>						
39	Inadequate behavior of children is the main reason for not going to school	F %	F 13 % 32.5	F 14 % 35.0	F 5 % 12.5	F 8 % 20.0
40	The child gets scolded for sharing his things in class	F 19 % 47.5	F 4 % 10.0	F 7 % 17.5	F 5 % 12.5	F 5 % 12.5

**Table 3**  
**Mean score of liking and disliking**

Variables	N	Mean	S.D
Liking score	40	83.7500	17.69507
Disliking score	40	52.5500	11.24540

The mean of the liking score is 83.7500 and the Standard deviation of the liking score is 17.69507. Whereas, the mean of the disliking score is 52.5500 and the Standard deviation of the disliking score is 11.24540. It shows that the score for liking special children is higher than that of disliking for attending schools.

**Table 4**  
**Means of subscales**

Variables	N	Mean	S.D
Willingness score	40	16.3750	3.04401
Pleasant experience score	40	30.7250	5.63409
Participation score	40	20.0500	7.46256
Achievement score	40	16.6000	7.24233
Unwillingness score	40	9.0250	2.93945
Unpleasant experience score	40	10.1250	3.09828
Failure score	40	12.2500	5.42903
Disappointment score	40	15.6250	4.20432
Teasing score	40	5.5250	1.85344

Table No. 4 represents that the willingness score is greater (16.3750) than the unwillingness score and the pleasant experiences score (30.7250) of children is greater than that of unpleasant experiences. In the same way, the participation score (20.0500) of special children is greater than that of the disappointment score. Consequently, the achievement score of the children is higher than that of failure.

**Table 5**  
**t-test Group statistics show differences**

	Child gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	One-sided p	Two-sided p
liking score	Female	15	82.3333	12.68107	3.27424	.388	38	.350	.700
	Male	25	84.6000	20.32240	4.06448				
disliking score	Female	15	50.7333	9.58024	2.47361	.788	38	.218	.436
	Male	25	53.6400	12.19248	2.43850				
willingness score	Female	15	16.7333	3.65409	.94348	.572	38	.285	.571
	Male	25	16.1600	2.67208	.53442				
pleasant experience	Female	15	30.4000	5.30229	1.36905	-.279	38	.391	.782
	Male	25	30.9200	5.92256	1.18451				
participations score	Female	15	19.5333	4.05087	1.04593	.335	38	.370	.739
	Male	25	20.3600	8.98091	1.79618				
achievement score	Female	15	15.6667	3.22195	.83190	.626	38	.267	.535
	Male	25	17.1600	8.84911	1.76982				
unwillingness score	Female	15	9.0667	3.23964	.83647	.069	38	.473	.946
	Male	25	9.0000	2.81366	.56273				
unpleasant score	Female	15	9.4000	3.45998	.89336	1.151	38	.128	.257
	Male	25	10.5600	2.84429	.56886				
failure score	Female	15	11.0000	3.81725	.98561	1.132	38	.132	.265
	Male	25	13.0000	6.15088	1.23018				
disappointment score	Female	15	15.4000	4.33919	1.12037	.259	38	.399	.797
	Male	25	15.7600	4.20595	.84119				
teasing score	Female	15	5.8667	2.03072	.52433	.901	38	.187	.373
	Male	25	5.3200	1.7499	.34986				

There is no significant difference in parental views based on their gender about the liking ( $t=.388$ ,  $df=38$  and  $p=.700$ ) and disliking factors ( $t=.788$ ,  $df=38$ , and  $p=.436$ ) of going to school. There is no significant difference between the willingness score ( $t=.572$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.571$ ) and the unwillingness score ( $t=.069$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.946$ ). there is no significant difference between the pleasant experiences score ( $t=-.279$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.782$ ) and the unpleasant experiences score ( $t=1.151$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.257$ ). There is no significant difference between participation score ( $t=.335$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.739$ ) and disappointment score ( $t=.259$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.797$ ). There is no significant difference between achievement score ( $t=.626$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.535$ ) and failure score ( $t=1.132$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.265$ ). The teasing score ( $t=.901$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p=.373$ ).





**Table 6**  
**Difference among groups (ANOVA)**

Perception score on liking and disliking					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2606.200	3	868.733	2.363	.087
Within Groups	13236.200	36	367.672		
Total	15842.400	39			

**Table 7**  
**Effect size**

		Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Perception score	Eta-squared	.165	.000	.327
	Epsilon-squared	.095	-.083	.271
	Omega-squared Fixed-effect	.093	-.081	.266
	Omega-squared Random-effect	.033	-.026	.108

- a. Eta-squared and Epsilon-squared are estimated based on the fixed-effect model.  
b. Negative but less biased estimates are retained, not rounded to zero.

**Table 8**  
**Multiple comparisons based on LSD**

(I) child disability	(J) child disability	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
visually impairment	hearing impairment	-4.90000	8.57522	.571	-22.2914	12.4914
	physically impairment	13.20000	8.57522	.132	-4.1914	30.5914
	mentally retardation	-7.90000	8.57522	.363	-25.2914	9.4914
hearing impairment	visually impairment	4.90000	8.57522	.571	-12.4914	22.2914
	physically impairment	18.10000*	8.57522	.042	.7086	35.4914
	mentally retardation	-3.00000	8.57522	.728	-20.3914	14.3914
physically impairment	visually impairment	-13.20000	8.57522	.132	-30.5914	4.1914
	hearing impairment	-18.10000*	8.57522	.042	-35.4914	-7.086
	mentally retardation	-21.10000*	8.57522	.019	-38.4914	-3.7086
mentally retardation	visually impairment	7.90000	8.57522	.363	-9.4914	25.2914
	hearing impairment	3.00000	8.57522	.728	-14.3914	20.3914
	physically impairment	21.10000*	8.57522	.019	3.7086	38.4914

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

There are no significant differences in the liking and disliking of students with special needs based on their disabilities. Since the P value is greater than 0.05 ( $P = 0.571, 0.132, \text{ and } 0.363$ ). However, significant differences were found between physically impaired students with hearing impairment and intellectually disabled students ( $P = 0.42 \text{ and } .019$ ).

## Discussion

### Student engagement measurement

In general, there is a lot of discussion on how to evaluate student engagement in educational research. The policy community is finding it more difficult to define "engagement" as the traditional emphasis on formal "academic success" assessed by test scores (Cassen and Kingdon 2007; Browder and Cooper-Duffy 2003) is being replaced by a

more comprehensive understanding of engagement based on informal processes and activities. The accessibility of the data was one of the factors contributing to the emphasis on measuring student involvement through test results. Relationships with peers, for instance, have a significant theoretical impact on students' involvement in school (Furlong et al. 2003; Ou 2005; Sinclair et al. 2003). Similar perspectives have been used in special education studies to gauge participation through more subtle day-to-day experiences such as students' social standing (Pijl 2007; Scheepstra, Nakken, and Pijl 1999); Koster et al. 2007), their classroom experiences (Schiller, Sandford, and Blackorby 2008; Shah and Priestley 2009), peer group participation (Pijl Skaalvik, and Skaalvik 2010; Fredrickson 2010; Perceptions, stigma, and prejudice (Davis and Watson 2001; Cambria and Silvestre 2003). The literature focuses on how fostering healthy relationships and a supportive learning environment is one of the key drivers of inclusive education.

By evaluating children with disabilities who spent most of the day in special education settings with their counterparts who did not have disabilities, they looked at teacher-student relationships. Their findings demonstrate that students with disabilities, particularly those who experience emotional difficulties, are more likely to have poor teacher-student relationships. According to this study, the main qualities that these kids felt their interactions with instructors lacked were trust, respect, reliability, and attention (Murray and Greenberg 2001). However, for children with disabilities in mainstream classes, the composition of the peer group can have an impact on the classroom climate. If there are no other pupils with special needs or very few, the peer group may become less inclusive (Pijl et al. 2010). Research indicates that when students with special educational needs join mainstream schools, the number of connections and friendships does not grow naturally (Pijl and Hamstra 2005). Social acceptance studies frequently demonstrate that students with special needs who attend normal schools are accepted less fully than their peers without such requirements (e.g., Larrivee and Horne 1991; Koster et al. 2007). Some kids are regarded to be at more risk of social exclusion, more likely to encounter bullying, and have lower levels of support from parents, peers, and friends depending on the type of special educational need (Humphrey and Symes 2010). A bulk of the research emphasizes how this peer rejection destroys motivation and academic performance by eliminating a student's sense of belonging at school and restricting their access to social activities (Asher and Coie 1990; Pijl et al. 2010). This is evident from past research that indicated that students who were rejected generally had worse academic performances and a higher likelihood of dropping out (Ollendick et al. 1992).

The school has a good impact on everybody even if it is a special or normal child. The emergence of various diseases or developmental hurdles in people with special needs is a phenomenon that requires more attention so they can still live fulfilling lives and make the most of whatever limited abilities they do have. The prevalence of disabilities in children is increasing 3 times more than in the 1990s.

Still, the system needs to be smooth and satisfying more than before because of the high increasing rates of special children. Educational institutes are supposed to be satisfactory enough including the environment, staff, educational equipment, behavioral standards, way of dealing, etc. The study found that the majority of special children are willing to go to school.

## **Conclusions**

The study concluded that special children enjoy school, and they like to study in school. The results were more in the likeness of school than disliking by the guardians of the special needs children. The finding concludes that the majority of parents agreed on the liking scale. Significant differences were found between physically impaired students with hearing impairment and intellectually disabled students. There is no significant difference

in parental views based on their gender about the total liking and disliking factors of going to school.

### **Recommendations**

- Parents should work on their children's positive thinking about going to school.
- Schools should create and enhance a welcoming environment so that children may enjoy school activities.
- Schools should arrange co-curricular activities regularly so that students may have more opportunities to play games and enhance their likeness about school.
- Teachers should give reinforcement to children during class so the child would like to work.
- Teachers must have polite behavior with the students so that they come to school pleasantly/happily.
- The teachers should put a chart of the classroom wall on which the names of regular students are written, in this way the students become regular.
- Teachers should not use corporal punishment for the student.
- The students with special needs who are not good in academics co-curricular activities may be designed by the school side for the healthy engagement in schools.
- Counselling and behavior therapy should be an essential component of class routine for those students who has rebellious attitude schooling.

**References**

- Anderson, K. J., & Minke, K. M. (2007). Parent involvement in education: Toward an understanding of parents' decision making. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*(5), 311-323.
- Appleton, J., S.L. Christenson, and M.J. Furlong. (2008). Student engagement with school, critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools 45*: 369–86.
- Asher, S. R., & Coie, J. D. (1990). *Peer rejection in childhood*. Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, J. A. (2006). Contributions of teacher–child relationships to positive school adjustment during elementary school. *Journal of school psychology, 44*(3), 211-229.
- Balli, S. J., Demo, D. H., & Wedman, J. F. (1998). Family involvement with children's homework: An intervention in the middle grades. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 47*(2), 149–157.
- Boyle, S., Brock, A., Mace, J., & Sibbons, M. (2002). *Reaching the Poor: The costs of sending children to school: a six-country comparative study, synthesis report* (No. 666-2016-45490).
- Browder, D. M., & Cooper-Duffy, K. (2003). Evidence-based practices for students with severe disabilities and the requirement for accountability in “No Child Left Behind”. *The Journal of Special Education, 37*(3), 157-163.
- Cambra, C., & Silvestre, N. (2003). Students with special educational needs in the inclusive classroom: Social integration and self-concept. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 18*(2), 197-208.
- Cassen, R., and G. Kingdon (2007). *Tackling low educational achievement*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Cassen, R. and Kingdon, G. (2007). *Tackling low educational achievement*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Castro, M., Expósito-Casas, E., López-Martín, E., Lizasoain, L., Navarro-Asencio, E., & Gaviria, J. L. (2015). Parental involvement on student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 14*, 33-46.
- Coie, J. D., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1983). A behavioral analysis of emerging social status in boys' groups. *Child development, 54* (6), 1400-1416.
- Compton-Lilly, C. (2010). Breaking the Silence; Recognizing the Social and Cultural Resources Students Bring to the Classroom. *Education Review//Reseñas Educativas. Research Review, 14*, 33-46.
- Davis, M., and N. Watson. (2001). Where are the children's experiences? Analyzing social and cultural exclusion in ‘special’ and ‘mainstream’ schools. *Journal of Disability and Society, 16* (5), 671–87.
- Davis-Kean, P. E., & Sexton, H. R. (2009). Race differences in parental influences on child achievement: Multiple pathways to success. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly (1982-), 285*-318.
- Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60* (2), 277-292.

- Elsabbagh, M., Divan, G., Koh, Y. J., Kim, Y. S., Kauchali, S., Marcín, C., & Fombonne, E. (2012). Global prevalence of autism and other pervasive developmental disorders. *Autism research*, 5(3), 160-179.
- Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Westview Press, 5500 Central Avenue, Boulder, CO 80301.
- Furlong, M. J., Whipple, A. D., St Jean, G., Simental, J., Soliz, A., & Punthuna, S. (2003). Multiple contexts of school engagement: Moving toward a unifying framework for educational research and practice. *The California School Psychologist*, 8(1), 99-113.
- Furlong, M.J. and Christenson, S.L. (2008). Engaging students at school and with learning: A relevant construct for all students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45: 365–368.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2014). Institutional structures of the education system and student achievement: A review of cross-country economic research. *Educational policy evaluation through international comparative assessments*, 145.
- Hill, N. E., & Taylor, L. C. (2004). Parental school involvement and children's academic achievement: Pragmatics and issues. *Current directions in psychological science*, 13(4), 161-164.
- Hughes, N.J. & Myung, H. Im.(2016).Teacher–Student Relationship and Peer Disliking and Liking Across Grades 1–4.*Child Development*. 87(2), 593-611.
- Humphrey, N., & Symes, W. (2010). Perceptions of social support and experience of bullying among pupils with autistic spectrum disorders in mainstream secondary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 25(1), 77-91.
- Koster, M., Pijl, S. J., Houten, E. V., & Nakken, H. (2007). The social position and development of pupils with SEN in mainstream Dutch primary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 22(1), 31-46.
- Larrivee, B., & Horne, M. D. (1991). Social status: A comparison of mainstreamed students with peers of different ability levels. *The Journal of Special Education*, 25(1), 90-101.
- McCoy, S., Smyth, E., & Banks, J. (2012). The primary classroom: Insights from the growing up in Ireland study. *Dublin: ESRI*.
- Ollendick, T. H., Weist, M. D., Borden, M. C., & Greene, R. W. (1992). Sociometric status and academic, behavioral, and psychological adjustment: a five-year longitudinal study. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 60(1), 80.
- Ou, S. R. (2005). Pathways of long-term effects of an early intervention program on educational attainment: Findings from the Chicago longitudinal study. *Journal of applied developmental psychology*, 26(5), 578-611.
- Perdue, N. H., Manzeske, D. P., & Estell, D. B. (2009). Early predictors of school engagement: Exploring the role of peer relationships. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(10), 1084-1097.
- Pijl, S. J. (2007). Introduction: The social position of pupils with special needs in regular education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 22(1), 1-5.
- Pijl, S. J., Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Students with special needs and the composition of their peer group. *Irish Educational Studies*, 29(1), 57-70.

- Rollefson, M. (2015). *Why parents choose to open enroll children into a rural school district*. Edgewood College.
- Rose, R., & M. Shevlin. (2010). *Count me in! Ideas for actively engaging students in inclusive classrooms*. Dublin: JKP Publishers.
- Ryan, A. M., & Ladd, G. W. (Eds.). (2012). *Peer relationships and adjustment at school*. IAP.
- Scheepstra, A. J., Nakken, H., & Pijl, S. J. (1999). Contacts with classmates: the social position of pupils with Down's syndrome in Dutch mainstream education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 14*(3), 212-220.
- Schiller, E., C. Sanford, & J. Blackorby. (2008). *A National Profile of the Classroom Experiences and Academic Performance of Students with Learning Disabilities: A Special Topic Report from the Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study*. US Department of Education. SAGE Publishers.
- Shevlin, M., & Rose, R. (2010). *Count me in!: Ideas for actively engaging students in inclusive classrooms*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Sinclair, M. F., Christenson, S. L., Lehr, C. A., & Anderson, A. R. (2003). Facilitating student engagement: Lessons learned from Check & Connect longitudinal studies. *The California School Psychologist, 8*(1), 29-41.
- Smyth, E., Dunne, A., Darmody, M. & McCoy, S. 2007. *Gearing up for the exam? The experiences of junior certificate students*, Dublin: ESRI.