

Cultural Variations in Parents and Teachers Perceptions of Special Education Collaboration in USA and Egypt

Gamal A. Fayed
El-Mansoura University

The school and classrooms requires an active effort to create and welcoming to the diverse cultures of their students and families (Montgomery, 2001; Parette & Petch-Hogan, 2000; Salend & Taylor, 1993). According to Cros, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs (1989) "culture is a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals and enables that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations" (p. 13).

Many students may question others as peers who come from other cultures and speak other language, wear different clothes, and different customs. The teachers of special education can help student overcome these attitudes by teaching them about different cultures and the value of cultural diversity (Banks, 2006; Byrnes, 2005a).

In addition cultural is a essential element of providing education and human services to diverse populations. Cultural implies an active effort to ensure that organizations and individuals provide services and supports in a manner that is culturally competent (Barrera & Corso, 2002).

It is apparent that disabilities, poverty, limited family support, cultural differences, language differences, ineffective teaching and lack of educational funding are reflect collaboration teaching teaming.

Education is a multidimensional and comprehensive event connecting varied professionals and experiences. The choice to work as a cooperative unit or independently directly affects the form and extent of learning (Cook, Klein, and Tessier, 2004).

Effective teamwork... will enhance the development of the child with special needs and the satisfaction of the family. On the other hand, lack of effective teaming results in insufficient access for key players' input... and perhaps even harmful service delivery. (Ibid, p. 403).

The purpose of this research is to investigate whether there is significance difference between the collaboration as pereceived by specials Education teachers, and by the parents in the US an Egypt.

Literature Review

Collaboration

Collaboration refers to a process of interaction in which the partners share resources and knowledge and work together in achieving a common goal (Turnbull & Turnbull, 2001). Also collaboration is an umbrella term that includes a wide array of interactions between individuals where as co-teaching is a specific instructional service-delivery model by which "two or more professionals jointly deliver substantive instruction to a diverse, or blended, group of

students in the same physical space" (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 1).

Collaboration is more than different individuals simply working together, working on the same project, or being agreeable with each other. Instead, collaboration is the process by which people with different areas of expertise work together to identify needs and problems and then find ways to meet the needs and solve the problems. Collaboration may occur between as few as two people, such as between a special educator and parent, but more ideally collaborative teams consisting of several professionals, paraprofessionals, and parents work together on behalf of individual students. (Westling & Fox, 2004, p. 60).

Recognition of the need for collaboration has occurred in recent years because of the complexity of the needs of students with disabilities. This complexity calls for the knowledge and skills of many different persons if maximum learning and development are to occur (Cook & Friend, 2002; Downing, 2002; Orelove & Sobsey, 1996; Pugach & Johnson, 1990, 2002; Rainforth & York, 1997; Vandercook & York, 1990). As noted by a number of authorities, successful collaboration especially in the area of disabilities is characterized by several features, including the following:

- Concern with mutual exchanges.
- Recognition of diverse areas of expertise.
- Sharing of expertise.
- Equality of team members.
- Decision making by consensus.
- Shared responsibility and accountability.

Pugach and Johnson (2002) maintain that professionals who are successful collaborators have several personal or professional characteristics that contribute to their roles as collaborators. These characteristics should be considered important by those teaching or planning to teach students with severe disabilities.

- Collaboration is recognized as a complex process.
- Creativity generated by working together is acknowledged.
- Collaboration is enjoyed process.
- Professional experience and growth are realized through collaboration.
- Collaborators are reflective professionals.
-

The models of collaboration Teams

In the formation of collaborative teams, there are different possible structures, all of which are not equal in terms of their potential success. Three common team models exist: the multidisciplinary model, the interdisciplinary model, and the trans-disciplinary model. These models are:

First Model

Multidisciplinary: in this model every member in the team assessment separately, individual

participate, separate planed, individualized responsibility, implemented the part of the plan, formal communication, (Carter et al., 2009).

Second Model

The difference between the second model and first model in the parent participation, in develop plans, sharing information, grouping responsibility, periodic communication.

Third Model

In this model all members and family conduct a comprehensive parents are full active, develop a service plan together, are responsible and accountable for the services implementation, information knowledge and skills are shared among team members. (Woodruff & McGonigel, 1988).

Of these, the transdisciplinary team is considered to be most effective for providing services to students with severe disabilities (Orelve & Sobsey, 1996; Rainforth & York, 1997).

Cultural Diversity and cultural views of Disability

Ethnographic studies reveal severe cultural mismatches in understandings of the meaning of the disability construct. (Harry's, 1992). Egyptian parents definitions resulting in shock and disbelief at the application of labels, such as "learning disabled" and "emotionally disturbed" for children who could speak, read and write Arabic, there is communication gaps between parents and teacher of special education. And most of the parents no understanding that their meetings with the teacher were actually conferences that produced an official document.

A series of studies provided multiple perspectives on issues related to discrimination and cross-cultural misunderstanding (Bailey, Skinner, Correa, et al., 1999; Bailey, Skinner, Rodriguez, Gut, & Correa, 1999; McHatton & Correa, 2005).

The review of these studies identifies the ideal collaborative relationships between special education professionals and culturally diverse families of children with disabilities, examines research on actual collaboration with such families, and makes recommendations regarding improvement of such collaboration. The main sources of literature are research and opinion publications in peer-reviewed journals and books by leading scholars. The review concludes that barriers to the implementation of ideal practices include deficit views of families of students with special needs, cross-cultural misunderstandings related to the meanings of disability, differential values in setting goals for individuals with disabilities, and culturally based differences in caregivers' views of their roles, recommendations for change and improvement focus on personnel preparation and on implementing existing models of effective practice (Harry, 2008).

Disability views of families

Discussions of the concept of "disability", "risk" with families have produced many of variables some of it they for exam, it poverty, family structure, educational level of parents, and parents

age are beyond disputation (Donovan & Cross, 2002; Scarborough et al., 2004).

Some ethnographic interviews with service providers revealed that thoughtless generalizations of such information were fueled by racial stereotype embedded in the taken – for – granted belief systems of professionals of all ethnic groups (Harry & Klingner's, 2006).

Most distressing is the finding that these beliefs actually influenced the decisions made about children. However, misunderstanding in the concepts can result from cultural differences in how disability is viewed and miscommunication between parents and school. (Gargiulo, R., 2003). Different families cope with illness and disability in diverse ways. Some of these are influenced by their particular culture. For example, some Hmong view epilepsy as a sign of distinction that could qualify them for the divine office of shaman (Fadiman, 1997). More often the cultural influences are subtler.

Misunderstandings can occur between the school and family as a result of cultural differences. For example, culturally and linguistically diverse, parents described themselves as being very involved in the transition process while school officials reported far less involvement in talking with their children about life after high school and caring for their disability, but lack of participation in the school-based transition process. Understanding and respecting cultural differences is important to providing positive educational experiences for the student. (Geenen, Powers, & Lopez-Vasquez, 2001).

More specifically, this study attempted to answer the following research:

- 1- Are there significance differences between the collaboration by special education teachers in USA and Egypt?
- 2- Are there significance differences between the collaboration by the parents of special education students in USA and Egypt?
- 3- Are there significance differences between parents of special education students and teachers of special education students in perceived collaboration in Egypt?
- 4- Are there significance differences between the collaboration by parents of special education students and teachers of special education students in USA?

Methods

Participants

Egyptian of special education teachers. All special education teachers from Urban (El-Mansoura city) included elementary, middle school, secondary. The number of special education teachers approximately 150 teachers we were able to get overall responses from 40%, male and female teachers were almost equally represented in the group.

Measure

The collaborative survey was developed for this research. The instrument is designed to assess special education teachers and parents of special education students attitudes, beliefs, and

perceptions of collaborative practices in the United states and Egypt. The survey was developed through a review of relevant literature and previous surveys designed to measure collaboration practices at the field of special education (Trunbull & Trunbull, 2001; Dinnebeil & Rule, 1994; Fennick & Liddy, 2001; Wiggins & Damore, 2006).

Following initial scale development. The survey was piloted with five professors (two American, three Egyptian), Based on feedback provided by these professors, several items were revised for easier comprehension, and several redundant items were removed.

The survey contains 30 items designed to assess parent and teachers attitudes and beliefs about collaborative practices, these items were created using major themes identifies in prior research on collaborative practices models (Orelove & Sobsey, 1996; Rainforth & York, 1997).

Evidence of validity

In addition we used exploratory factor analysis to study the characteristics of the theoretical factors on expectations of collaborative Team practices. The scree plot and eigenvalues were examined to determine the final number of factors to accept and only factors that to accept and only factors that had eigenvalues greater than 1 were included in the final model. As recommended by (Orelove & Sobsey, 1996; Rainforth & York, 1997). The factor structure matrix was interpreted. The results of this analysis indicate that there were three well specified factors that accounted for a total of 51.203% of the variance in teacher and parent responses given Table 1.

The first factor, professional development accounted for eigenvalue 7.676 and 25.588% of the variance and contained 16 items related to the need for professional development related to collaboration (e.g., in order for collaborative team practices, to work well, teachers and parents need development on how to work together.

The second factor, communication accounted for eigenvalue 5.213 and 17.377% of the variance and contained 9 items related to the need for communication related to collaboration, the importance of open communication a ware with messages of nonverbal body language.

The third factor, shared responsibility accounted for eigenvalue 2.471 and 8.237% of the variance and contained 5 items related to the importance of sharing power and information. These three factors constructs fit the theoretical Background which the instrument was intended.

Evidence of Reliability

Since the instrument used a likert-type scale 5 points (1= Not Relevant, 2= Unimportant, 3= Somewhat Important, 4= Important, 5= Very important) we was used two ways to calauted items Reliability, Cornbach's Alpha with belete item score from the score total, and internal consistency.

As to calauted total reliability to the instrument, we used Cronbach's Alpha, Guttman Split-Half Coefficient. The reliability Coefficient for the data as a whole was, 0.91, and 0.90, 0.85, 0.66, to

three factors. These high alpha values indicate that the instrument parts, and its items measure the same characteristics, this is consistent with reliabilities for collaborative teaming practices (Orelove & Sobsey, 1996; Rainforth & York, 1997).

Results

One hundred three American parents, forty seven American special Education teachers, twenty six Egyptian parents, forty seven Egyptian special Education teachers, were surveyed in this study. Means and standard deviations, and standard error, Means for all responses to 30 statements regarding importance are given in table 3, 4, 5, 6. Means of American and Egyptian special Education teachers ranged from 4.87 for the statement "...open communications and listening" to 1.89 for the statement "... have paternalistic attitudes". Deviations ranged from 0.337 for the statement "...open communications and listening" to 1.502 for the statement "... lack self confidence".

A paired t-test for independent samples was used to determine if the differences between the two groups of teachers significantly differ from zero. The 95% confidence interval was calculated for each comparison. The results of the t-test are shown in table 3.

Data were examined for two groups (American and Egyptian special education teachers) on item-by-item level, there were nineteen differences. For the statements "... respect team members", "...feel safe with sharing information", "... Evaluate feedback when others are speaking", "... Be unaware with negative messages of nonverbal body language", "... give and receive feedback effectively", "... Evaluate, train and solve problems", "... Recognize the contributions of other professionals", "... Respect family's attributes", "... Emphasize family patience", "... Encourage and support each other", "... Open communications and listening", "... Promote self confidence", "... Be tactful and honest", "... Facilitate good team building", "... Be well informed / provide information", "... Be prompt to follow up", "... Does not use family centered approach", "... Try to remove problems", "... Display emotional detachment",

To answer the second question about the difference between American parents and Egyptian parents, means and standard deviations and standard error for all response to 30 statements are in table 3, it ranged from 4.91 for the statement "... Respect family's attributes", to 3.06 for the statement "... Evaluate feedback when others are speaking", Deviations ranged from, 3.989 for the statement "... Rush through meetings", to 0.099 for the statement "... be cold / rude."

A paired t-test for independent samples was used to determine if the differences between the two groups of parents significantly differ from zero. The 95% confidence interval was calculated for each comparison. The results of the t-test are shown in table 4.

Data were examined for two groups (American and Egyptian special education parents) an item-by-item level, there were nineteen differences, for the statements "...Respect team members", "...Feel safe with sharing information", "...Use jargon language when sharing ideas", "...Give and receive feedback effectively", "... Recognize the contributions of other professionals", "... Respect family's attributes", "... Emphasize family patience", "... Encourage and support each other", "... Build rapport", "... Promote self confidence", "... Be tactful and honest", "...

Facilitate good team building", "... Be well informed / provide information", "... Be prompt to follow up", "... Emphasize family weaknesses", "... Have paternalistic attitudes", "... Display emotional detachment", "... Use protective dishonesty", "... Be cold / rude".

To answer the third question about the difference between the Egyptian special education teachers and Egyptian parents of special education students, means standard deviations and standard error for all responses to 30 statements are in table 5, it ranged from 4.85 for the statement "... Create an atmosphere of mutual trust", to 1.89 for the statement "... Have paternalistic attitudes". Deviations ranged from 1.484 for the statement "... Display emotional detachment", to 0.416 for the statement "... Create an atmosphere of mutual trust".

A paired t-test for independent samples was used to determine if the differences between the two groups (Egyptian parents Egyptian teachers) differ from zero the 95% confidence interval was calculated for each comparison, the results of the t-test are shown in table 5. Data were examined for two groups, an item-by-item level, there were six differences, for the statements "... Use jargon language when sharing ideas", "... Be unaware with negative messages of nonverbal body language", "... Be well informed / provide information", "... Emphasize family weaknesses", "... Display emotional detachment", "... Use protective dishonesty", most of these statements including in communication.

To answer the fourth question about the difference between the American special education teachers and American parents of special education students, means and standard deviations are in table 6, means ranged from, 4.91 for the statement "... Respect family's attributes", to 3.13 for the statement "... Evaluate feedback when others are speaking". Deviations ranged from 3.98 for the statement "... Rush through meetings", to 0.000 for the statement "... Be judgmental".

A paired t-test for independent samples was used to determine if the differences between the two groups (American parents and American teachers) differ from zero to 95% confidence interval was calculated for each comparison, the results of the t-test are shown in table 6. Data were examined for two groups, an item-by-item level, there were 5 differences, for the statements "... Use jargon language when sharing ideas", "... Respect family's attributes", "... Use protective dishonesty", "... Be judgmental", "... Be cold / rude", most of these statements including in communication.

Limitations

There are three major limitations to this study both relating to the participants. First, the small sample size of the Egyptian parents of special education students. This due to low-education level to Egyptian parents of special students, this lead to variations between two samples of USA parents and Egyptian parents. And second all of the Egyptian special Education teachers were from El-Mansoura city Urban area.

The small sample size does not allow great generalization beyond this group. Although American participants the of (parents and teachers) came from all parts of the of the state of Arkansas, including rural and areas, these findings cannot be generalized beyond our sample because of the characteristics and policies unique to the state. A third and related concern is that

this study focused solely on teachers perceptions. We did not conduct observations of these teachers. So these findings are vulnerable to perceptual biases. Future research that blends survey methodology and classroom observation would help to strengthen the findings.

Discussion

The purpose of this investigation was to add to a growing body of research on collaborative teaming practices. Collaborative teaming practices are widely recommended and have adopted as one approach to address the needs of a growing number of students with disabilities.

There are several limitations that should be acknowledged prior to discussing the findings. First, we did not identify patterns of difference related to the teachers of special education, backgrounds (e.g., number of years teaching, levels of education, relationship with their collaboration partners). Second, we did not considered the variations in size samples between Egyptian samples and American samples. Third, we did not identify patterns of difference related to the American and Egyptian parents of students with special needs backgrounds (e.g., Ages, levels of economic and social parents level of education. The factors that significantly influenced the teachers perceptions collaboration were their philosophies and beliefs about the nature of disabilities, and their collaboration skills.

In regard to the first aim of the study, are there significance differences between the collaboration by special education teachers in United States and Egypt? The means of 20 items of 30 items American special education teachers were significantly Grater than Egyptian special education scores on a number of the constructs, 13 items including professional development, 4 items including shared responsibility, 3 items including communication, As such these findings can be interpreted in different ways, on one hand, they suggest that American special education teachers perceived and have experienced challenges in implementing collaborative practices and that they believe that increased levels of professional development, shared responsibility, and communication very important to improved collaborative practice.

Alternatively, it is possible that American special cultural have more understanding than Egyptian special educational about collaborative practices and so place a higher value on the importance of these items and practices. Recognition of the need for collaboration in recent years because of the complexity of the needs of students with disabilities, this complexity calls for the knowledge and skills of many different persons if maximum learning and development are to occur (Cook & Friend, 2002).

In regard to the second aim of the study, are there significance differences between the collaboration by the parents of special education students in United States and Egypt? The means of 15 items of 30 items, American parents of special education students were significantly greater than parents Egyptian special education students in 11 items including professional development, 4 items including in shared responsibility, but the means of 4 items, parents of Egyptian special education students were significantly greater than parents of American special education students including communication. As such these findings can be interpreted in different ways, on one hand, as awareness increased regarding issues in communicating with parents of children in special education, professional interactions with Egyptian parents of

children special needs continued to fall far from the ideal communication, the literature three main themes: cross – cultural differences in understandings of the meaning of disability, deficit views of special needs families, differential understanding of parents roles in the special education system, then there is a severe communication gaps with parents not knowing that their children had been moved to another school, and others having no understanding that their "meetings with the teacher" were actually conferences that produced an official document in Egyptian parents there are a confusion about and disagreement with labels. In Egypt the professional emphasis on compliance rather than communication undermined parents' intentions to attend conferences (Harry, 2008).

In regard to the third aim and fourth aim of the study, are there significance differences between parents of special education students and teachers of special education students in Egypt? Are there differences between parents of special education students and teachers of special education students in USA?

In regard to the third aim the means of 6 items, Egyptian parents of special education students were significantly greater than Egyptian teachers, 5 items of 6 items including communication, 1 item including professional development, in regard to fourth aim the means of 5 items, 4 items of 5 items including communication, 1 item including professional development, American teachers were significantly greater than American parents in 4 items, and American parents were significantly greater than American teachers in 1 item including professional development.

As such these findings can be interpreted in different ways, on one hand, there is a great difference in communication styles between parents and teachers in Egypt and USA, there are differences in beliefs and values way pose dilemmas of challenges collaboration practices, for example, Egyptian value the collective and the extended family. Extended family members may play important roles in decision making or discipline for the child. There may be differences in cultural groups relating to child discipline. (Barrera & Corso, 2002; Salend & Taylor, 1993).

In regard to the result of the fourth aim of the study, as such finding can be interpreted in different ways on one hand, an open line of communication is the most important feature of teacher – parent relations. Although services such as counseling and case management are usually provided other professionals on the collaborative team (e.g., counselors, psychologists, and social workers).

The teacher is most likely the professional with whom the parent has the greatest amount of direct contact. Additionally, the teacher is the primary link between the collaborative team and the parent, the teachers of special needs students realize that they can be help in many ways, but not in all ways. For the most part, the objective when working with parents is to find ways to support them as they try to meet their own needs.

References

- Bailey, D.B., Skinner, D., Correa, V., Arcia, E., Reyes, Blanes M., Rodriguez, P., et al. (1999). Needs and supports reported by Latino Families of young children with developmental disabilities. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, 104 (5), 437-451.

- Bailey, D., Skinner, D., Rodriguez, P., Gut, D., & Correa V. (1999). Awareness, Use, and Satisfaction with services for latino parents of young children with disabilities. *Exceptional children*, 65, 376-381.
- Banks, J.A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum and teaching* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Barrera, L., & Corso, R. (2002). Cultural Competency as skilled dialogue. *Topics in Early childhood special Education*, 22, 103-113.
- Byrnes, D.A. (2005a). Addressing race, ethnicity, and culture in the classroom. In D.A. Byrnes & G. Kiger (Eds.), *Common bonds: Anti-bias teaching in a diverse society* (3rd ed., pp. 9-23). Olney, M.D.: Association of childhood Education International.
- Carter, N., Prater, M.A., Jackson, A., & Marchant, M. (2009). Educators perceptions of collaborative planning processes for students with Disabilities. *Preventing school failure*, Vol. 54, No. 1.
- Cook, R.E., Klein M.D., & Tessier, A. (with Daley, S.E.). (2004). *Adapting early childhood curricula for children in inclusive settings*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-Teaching Guidelines for Creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*. 28(3). 1-22.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M.P. (2002). *Interaction: Collaboration Skills for school professionals* (4th Ed.), Boston; Allyn and Bacon.
- Cross, T.L., Bazron, B.J., Dennis, K.W., & Isaacs, M.R. (Eds.), (1989). Towards a culturally competent system of care; Vol. I. *A Monograph on effective services for minority children who are severely emotionally disturbed*, Washington, DC; Georgetown University, Child Development Center, Child and Adolescent Service System Program, Technical Assistance Center.
- Dinnebeil, L.A., & Rule, S. (1994). Variables that influence collaboration between parents and service coordinators, *Journal of Early Intervention*, 18, 349-361.
- Donvan, S. & Cross, C. (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Downing, J.E. (2002). *Including Students with Severe and multiple disabilities in typical classrooms* (2nd Ed.) Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Fadiman, A. (1997). *The Spirit catches you and you fall down*. New York; Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

- Gargiulo, R. (2003) *Special Education in Contemporary Society An Introduction to Exceptionality*. Wadsworth / Thomson Learning, U.S.A.
- Geenen, S., Powers L.E., & Lopez-Vasquez, A. (2001). Multicultural aspects of involvement in transition planning. *Exceptional children*, 67, 265-282.
- Harry, B., & Klinger, J. (2006). *Why are so many minority students in special education? Understanding race and disability in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harry, B. (1992). *Cultural diversity, families, and the special education system; communication and empowerment*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harry, B. (2008). Collaboration with Culturally and linguistically Diverse families: Ideal versus Reality. *Exceptional children*; 74, 3, 372-388.
- Idol, L., & West, J.F. (1991). Educational Collaboration: A Catalyst for effective schooling. *Intervention in school and clinic*, 27, 70-78.
- McHatton, P.A., & Correa, V. (2005). Stigma and discrimination: Perspectives from Mexican and Puerto Rican mothers of children with special needs. *Topics in Early childhood special Education*, 25(3), 131-142.
- Montgomery, W. (2001). Creating Culturally responsive, inclusive classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional children*, 33(4), 4-9.
- Orelove, F.P., & Sobsey, D. (1996). *Education Children with multiple disabilities; A Transdisciplinary approach* (3rd Ed.). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Parette, H.P., & Petch-Hogan, B. (2000). Approaching families: Facilitating Culturally / Linguistically diverse family involvement. *Teaching Exceptional children*, 33(2), 4-10.
- Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L.J. (1990). Meeting diverse needs through professional peer collaboration. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education* (pp. 123-137). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L.J. (2002). *Collaborative practitioners, Collaborative schools* (2nd ed.) Denver: Love Publishing.
- Rainforth, B., & York, J. (1997). *Collaborative teams for students with severe disabilities: Integrating therapy and educational services* (2nd Ed.). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Salend, S.J., & Taylor, L. (1993). Working with families: A cross-cultural perspective. *Remedial and special Education*, 14(5), 25-32, 39.
- Scarborough, A.A., Spiker, D., Mallik, S., Hebbeler, K.M., Bailey, D.B., & Simeonsson, R.J.

- (2004). A National look at children and families entering early intervention. *Exceptional children*, 70, 469-483.
- Turnbull, A.P., & Turnbull, H.R. (2001). *Families, professionals, and exceptionality: Collaboration for empowerment* (4th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill / Prentice Hall.
- Vandercook, T., & York J. (1990). A Team approach to program development and support. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.) *Support networks for inclusive schooling: interdependent integrated education* (pp. 95-122). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Westling, L.D. & Fox, L. (2004). *Teaching Students with Severe Disabilities*. (3rd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Woodruff, G. & McGonigel, J.M. (1988). Early intervention Team Approaches: the Transdisciplinary Model, *Early childhood special Education: Brith to three*, p. 166. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Appendix
The Collaborative Survey

Items	Very important	Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Not Relevant
1. Create an atmosphere of mutual trust					
2. Respect team members					
3. Feel safe with sharing information					
4. Evaluate feedback when others are speaking					
5. Use jargon language when sharing ideas					
6. Be unaware with negative messages of nonverbal body language					
7. Give and receive feedback effectively					
8. Evaluate, train and solve problems					
9. Recognize the contributions of other professionals					
10. Respect family's attributes					
11. Emphasize family patience					
12. Encourage and support each other					
13. Open communications and listening					
14. Build rapport					
15. Promote self confidence					
16. Be tactful and honest					
17. Facilitate good team building					
18. Be well informed / provide information					
19. Be prompt to follow up					
20. Does not use family centered approach					
21. Emphasize family weaknesses					
22. Rush through meetings					
23. Try to remove problems					
24. Have paternalistic attitudes					
25. Display emotional detachment					
26. Lack self confidence					
27. Use protective dishonesty					
28. Prescribe to families					
29. Be judgmental					
30. Be cold / rude					

Are you a:

..... Special Education Teacher

..... Parent of a special education student

Table 1.

Summary of Items and Factor Loadings for Varimax with Kaiser Normalization three-factor for collaboration Survey (N=229)

Items	Factor Loading		
1	.513		
2			.526
3			.572
4	.390		
5		.793	
6		.408	
7	.701		
8	.697		
9	.647		
10	.660		
11	.665		
12	.790		
13	.666		
14	.747		
15	.735		
16	.665		
17	.743		
18	.658		
19	.625		
20		.425	
21			.492
22		.657	
23	.326		
24			.525
25		.570	
26		.784	
27		.830	
28		.712	
29			.510
30		.761	

Table 2.

Alpha Cronbachs Coefficeients

Item	Cronbachs Alpha if Item Deleted
1	.901
4	.921
7	.895
8	.896
9	.896
10	.896
11	.896
12	.893
13	.896
14	.895
15	.894
16	.897
17	.895
18	.896
19	.896
23	.910
Item	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
5	.818
6	.860
20	.855
22	.832
25	.848
26	.827
27	.818
28	.828
30	.830
Item	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
2	.640
3	.604
21	.608
24	.636
29	.595

Table 3.

Means, Standard Deviations, t statistics between Special education Teachers in USA and Egypt

Item	ethnicity	Mean	Std. Deviation	T
1	American	4.81	.398	-.507
	Egyptian	4.85	.416	
2	American	4.70	.462	2.053
	Egyptian	4.45	.717	
3	American	4.77	.428	2.996
	Egyptian	4.43	.651	
4	American	3.13	1.115	2.216
	Egyptian	2.60	1.210	
5	American	4.04	.509	1.223
	Egyptian	3.81	1.209	
6	American	3.77	.840	3.485
	Egyptian	3.00	1.251	
7	American	4.68	.515	2.611
	Egyptian	4.34	.731	
8	American	4.79	.414	3.438
	Egyptian	4.32	.837	
9	American	4.81	.398	3.917
	Egyptian	4.36	.673	
10	American	4.72	.498	2.173
	Egyptian	4.45	.717	
11	American	4.77	.428	2.895
	Egyptian	4.40	.742	
12	American	4.74	.441	4.274
	Egyptian	4.19	.770	
13	American	4.87	.337	3.459
	Egyptian	4.53	.584	
14	American	4.64	.486	2.472
	Egyptian	4.34	.668	
15	American	4.81	.398	1.803
	Egyptian	4.62	.610	
16	American	4.77	.428	3.599
	Egyptian	4.36	.640	
17	American	4.62	.610	4.993
	Egyptian	3.83	.892	
18	American	4.77	.560	3.627
	Egyptian	4.21	.883	
19	American	4.79	.414	5.329
	Egyptian	4.09	.803	
20	American	3.89	.729	3.718
	Egyptian	3.11	1.255	
21	American	4.04	.464	4.770
	Egyptian	3.15	1.197	

22	American	4.09	.408	1.228
	Egyptian	3.87	1.115	
23	American	4.38	.990	1.056
	Egyptian	4.17	.963	
24	American	3.79	.778	9.703
	Egyptian	1.89	1.088	
25	American	3.60	.851	.767
	Egyptian	3.40	1.484	
26	American	4.06	.438	2.425
	Egyptian	3.51	1.502	
27	American	4.09	.408	1.690
	Egyptian	3.72	1.410	
28	American	4.02	.442	1.789
	Egyptian	3.70	1.140	
29	American	4.11	.375	1.850
	Egyptian	3.79	1.122	
30	American	4.11	.375	-.259
	Egyptian	4.15	1.063	

Table (4)
Means, Standard Deviations, *t* Statistics between Parent of students with special Needs in USA and Egypt

Item	Ethnicity	Mean	Std. Deviation	T
1	American	4.85	.354	.925
	Egyptian	4.78	.491	
2	American	4.80	.405	1.910
	Egyptian	4.59	.798	
3	American	4.74	.442	1.965
	Egyptian	4.53	.718	
4	American	3.37	.929	1.399
	Egyptian	3.06	1.480	
5	American	3.87	.413	-6.132
	Egyptian	4.53	.803	
6	American	3.78	.523	-.855
	Egyptian	3.91	1.228	
7	American	4.74	.559	3.838
	Egyptian	4.22	.941	
8	American	4.66	.552	1.557
	Egyptian	4.47	.761	
9	American	4.75	.537	3.492
	Egyptian	4.28	.958	
10	American	4.91	.316	3.956
	Egyptian	4.53	.803	
11	American	4.85	.354	3.328
	Egyptian	4.50	.880	
12	American	4.82	.390	3.852
	Egyptian	4.34	1.035	
13	American	4.75	.437	1.182
	Egyptian	4.63	.707	
14	American	4.60	.530	2.555
	Egyptian	4.28	.851	
15	American	4.78	.441	2.486
	Egyptian	4.47	.983	
16	American	4.81	.397	3.405
	Egyptian	4.44	.840	
17	American	4.65	.537	4.388
	Egyptian	3.97	1.257	
18	American	4.81	.397	2.212
	Egyptian	4.59	.665	
19	American	4.74	.610	3.727
	Egyptian	4.19	1.030	
20	American	3.89	.441	1.321
	Egyptian	3.69	1.378	

21	American	3.96	.311	4.395
	Egyptian	3.31	1.401	
22	American	4.24	3.989	.164
	Egyptian	4.13	1.385	
23	American	4.48	.873	.714
	Egyptian	4.34	1.035	
24	American	3.65	.696	8.086
	Egyptian	2.19	1.355	
25	American	3.70	.624	-4.907
	Egyptian	4.44	1.045	
26	American	3.98	.139	-.661
	Egyptian	4.06	1.243	
27	American	3.95	.216	-3.914
	Egyptian	4.31	.859	
28	American	3.96	.194	-.061
	Egyptian	3.97	1.231	
29	American	4.00	.000	.782
	Egyptian	3.91	1.228	
30	American	3.99	.099	-5.728
	Egyptian	4.53	.950	

Table 5.

Means, Standard Deviations, *t* statistics between Parents and Teachers in Egypt

Item	Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	T
1	Parents	4.78	.491	-.681
	Teachers	4.85	.416	
2	Parents	4.59	.798	.855
	Teachers	4.45	.717	
3	Parents	4.53	.718	.680
	Teachers	4.43	.651	
4	Parents	3.06	1.480	1.537
	Teachers	2.60	1.210	
5	Parents	4.53	.803	2.963
	Teachers	3.81	1.209	
6	Parents	3.91	1.228	3.185
	Teachers	3.00	1.251	
7	Parents	4.22	.941	-.646
	Teachers	4.34	.731	
8	Parents	4.47	.761	.809
	Teachers	4.32	.837	
9	Parents	4.28	.958	-.439
	Teachers	4.36	.673	
10	Parents	4.53	.803	.490
	Teachers	4.45	.717	
11	Parents	4.50	.880	.522
	Teachers	4.40	.742	
12	Parents	4.34	1.035	.750
	Teachers	4.19	.770	
13	Parents	4.63	.707	.638
	Teachers	4.53	.584	
14	Parents	4.28	.851	-.345
	Teachers	4.34	.668	
15	Parents	4.47	.983	-.827
	Teachers	4.62	.610	
16	Parents	4.44	.840	.455
	Teachers	4.36	.640	
17	Parents	3.97	1.257	.575
	Teachers	3.83	.892	
18	Parents	4.59	.665	2.071
	Teachers	4.21	.883	
19	Parents	4.19	1.030	.496
	Teachers	4.09	.803	
20	Parents	3.69	1.378	1.941
	Teachers	3.11	1.255	
21	Parents	3.31	1.401	.556
	Teachers	3.15	1.197	

22	Parents	4.13	1.385	.895
	Teachers	3.87	1.115	
23	Parents	4.34	1.035	.763
	Teachers	4.17	.963	
24	Parents	2.19	1.355	1.066
	Teachers	1.89	1.088	
25	Parents	4.44	1.045	3.402
	Teachers	3.40	1.484	
26	Parents	4.06	1.243	1.716
	Teachers	3.51	1.502	
27	Parents	4.31	.859	2.110
	Teachers	3.72	1.410	
28	Parents	3.97	1.231	.988
	Teachers	3.70	1.140	
29	Parents	3.91	1.228	.446
	Teachers	3.79	1.122	
30	Parents	4.53	.950	1.637
	Teachers	4.15	1.063	

Table 6.
Means, Standard Deviations, *t* Statistics between Parent and in UAS

Item	Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	T
1	Parents	4.85	.354	.707
	Teachers	4.81	.398	
2	Parents	4.80	.405	1.261
	Teachers	4.70	.462	
3	Parents	4.74	.442	-.365
	Teachers	4.77	.428	
4	Parents	3.37	.929	1.384
	Teachers	3.13	1.115	
5	Parents	3.87	.413	-2.156
	Teachers	4.04	.509	
6	Parents	3.78	.523	.096
	Teachers	3.77	.840	
7	Parents	4.74	.559	.593
	Teachers	4.68	.515	
8	Parents	4.66	.552	-1.406
	Teachers	4.79	.414	
9	Parents	4.75	.537	-.695
	Teachers	4.81	.398	
10	Parents	4.91	.316	2.813
	Teachers	4.72	.498	
11	Parents	4.85	.354	1.326
	Teachers	4.77	.428	
12	Parents	4.82	.390	.991
	Teachers	4.74	.441	
13	Parents	4.75	.437	-1.736
	Teachers	4.87	.337	
14	Parents	4.60	.530	-.400
	Teachers	4.64	.486	
15	Parents	4.78	.441	-.422
	Teachers	4.81	.398	
16	Parents	4.81	.397	.556
	Teachers	4.77	.428	
17	Parents	4.65	.537	.339
	Teachers	4.62	.610	
18	Parents	4.81	.397	.499
	Teachers	4.77	.560	
19	Parents	4.74	.610	-.504
	Teachers	4.79	.414	
20	Parents	3.89	.441	-.004
	Teachers	3.89	.729	
21	Parents	3.96	.311	-1.265
	Teachers	4.04	.464	
22	Parents	4.24	3.989	.270
	Teachers	4.09	.408	
23	Parents	4.48	.873	.578
	Teachers	4.38	.990	
24	Parents	3.65	.696	-1.075
	Teachers	3.79	.778	
25	Parents	3.70	.624	.836
	Teachers	3.60	.851	
26	Parents	3.98	.139	-1.753
	Teachers	4.06	.438	

27	Parents	3.95	.216	-2.621
	Teachers	4.09	.408	
28	Parents	3.96	.194	-1.160
	Teachers	4.02	.442	
29	Parents	4.00	.000	-2.891
	Teachers	4.11	.375	
30	Parents	3.99	.099	-2.938
	Teachers	4.11	.375	
