



# International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)

ISSN 2307-4531  
(Print & Online)

<http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied>



---

## Family and School - Creators of a Child's Educational Context

Snezana Mirascieva<sup>a\*</sup>, Sonja Petrovska<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Faculty of Educational Sciences, University "Goce Delcev", Krste Misirkov 10-A, Stip 2000, Macedonia

<sup>b</sup>Faculty of Educational Sciences, University "Goce Delcev", Krste Misirkov 10-A, Stip 2000, macedonia

<sup>a</sup>Email: [snezana.mirascieva@ugd.edu.mk](mailto:snezana.mirascieva@ugd.edu.mk)

<sup>b</sup>Email: [sonja.petrovska@ugd.edu.mk](mailto:sonja.petrovska@ugd.edu.mk)

### Abstract

A child's educational context is a creation of two crucial factors, family and school. Both environments, family and school, possess some specific features, and the quality and intensity of these features determine their educational power and create the educational context of a child. In that sense, our research presented in this paper focused on parents' and teachers' attitudes and opinions of the shape and content of cooperation, which directly affect the creation of the educational context of a child. We reviewed this subject on the issue of frequency, form, and content of their mutual communication from teachers' and parents' aspect. The goal in the research is, based on frequency, form and content of their communication, to determine their participation in the creating of the educational context of the child. The analysis of the research results show that teachers and parents have different opinions about the forms and content of their interpersonal communication, so their mutual cooperation is occasional and uniform in content. This gives us the right to conclude that statistically significant differences between the opinions of teachers and parents regarding the form and content of communication between them hinder cooperation between family and school, so there is a danger of different modeling and creating different models of a child's educational context. This disproportion does not have a positive impact on the child's personality and it leads to the disintegration of educational factors, family and school. In this respect, we consider that it is necessary to make a Program for developing collaborative relationships between family and school (PCFS) and creating an open curriculum.

---

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [snezana.mirascieva@ugd.edu.mk](mailto:snezana.mirascieva@ugd.edu.mk)

**Keywords:** Educational context; child; collaboration; family environment; school environment.

## **1. Introduction**

Educational context is an important factor in children development from the perspective of the community, especially in the development of their personality and further in the process of involvement in the life and work of the society and their future development. The problem of the children's educational context is imposed mainly for two reasons:

1. Scientific knowledge and technological progress and their impact on school curricula; expansive development of science, technological progress and the dominance of ICT in everyday life and business. The growth of scientific pool of knowledge not only highlights the need to change the content of the school curricula but it also increases the volume of subject content. With the presence of ICT in every home the forms of communication and interaction take new dimensions and create new connections and relationships in the environment, so it appears that school took over the role of a primary, almost a single factor in child development.
2. The second reason is a consequence of the first one, and it gives rise to new roles of parents thus changing the primary role of the family in the development of children's personalities. The increasingly frequent absence of parents from the home because of their engagement in providing material means of life is particularly evident concerning the changed status of the family, resulting in a reduction of communication frequency within the family and content poverty in the communication parents-children. Hence the question of who creates the educational context of a child today. In contrast, it is a well-known fact that family and school play a crucial role in creating the educational context of a child. Faced with the paradoxes of 21<sup>st</sup> century civilization, the family seems to again stand on the stronghold of its own autonomy and happiness, with elusive grand emotional charge in order to preserve the survival and functions that are eternally current and essential. In this age-old struggle the scientific present gives it unconditional support, permanently indicating its importance for both personal and social prosperity. Indeed, this declaration is supported by extensive literature on family issues and problems in school as creators of a child's educational context.

On the other hand, the complex structure of the school environment and the mosaic texture of the conditions therein single school out as one of crucial creators of the educational context of a child. School environment is a complex factor which has been studied from various aspects in professional and scientific literature.

## **2. Theoretical background**

Our intention is neither to interpret the context of family and school in professional literature through time parameters from antiquity to the present, nor to make a selection of perceptions of the impact of family and school transversely through scientific domains such as sociology, pedagogy, or psychology. We will only indicate perceptions of family and school contexts that are the starting point and leading principles in our research.

### ***2.1. Family - creator of a child's educational context***

Hence, during the last few decades the need to intensify the collaborative relationship between the family and the school has been increasingly expressed aiming at successful achievement of the goals and objectives of elementary school and beyond, and at overcoming of the social crisis manifested in all spheres of human life. After all, in pedagogical science there is a need to conduct research in this area that will contribute to solving the dilemma at two levels:

- Practical level (expansion of knowledge in the area of parental involvement in the education of children that are evidently necessary for both schools and families);
- Scientific level (creating coherent scientific foundations from cognitive-categorical or methodical-applicative aspect).

Therefore, in the interest of our subject of research, we used the following facts:

- Understanding that the family is a "world in miniature", or "society in miniature", that it is a starting point and a very important educational factor, or that it is a social environment which unifies numerous sides and forms of human life. Synthesized in a family, an individual develops simultaneously passing through the processes of culturalization, socialization and individualization;
- Understanding of the family as a mediator between the individual and the global society;
- Understanding those family relations and the quality of family life phenomena that can be educated and family environment has potentials that can be activated in the function of accepting responsibility for development prospects.

### ***2.2. School - creator of a child's educational context***

In school context, our research starting points are the following facts:

- treatment of school in the sense that it has all the features of the society and the world in which it exists and acts, from where the purpose, function and content of educational work are defined;
- school as a modern pedagogical community where program contents are planned, coordinated and realized for acquiring knowledge and encouraging individual's development, in order to facilitate the involvement of students in the social life in their environment and at the same time to prepare them for future life;
- healthy, human, educated, critical and creative personality is formed in the school context;
- The school is an eco-social composition where a collective mind is born through equal dialogue, by the principle everyone with everyone and for all [1].

### ***2.3. Child's educational context - link between the family and the school***

As already mentioned, the connection between the family and school context is rich, broad and diverse. Here we

dedicate ourselves to one aspect, the cooperation between teachers and parents, for several reasons.

The first reason is related to the affiliation to a community, so the teacher is a segment of the school context, and the parent is a part of the family context. The second reason is the time distance, because school and family both act from their sides, and they influence at the same time at a definite period in the development and formation of a child's personality. The third reason is intentionality; both environmental factors are focused on one goal, the development of a child's personality. The fourth reason is contained in the fact that environments, family and school, possess some specific features, and the quality and intensity of these features determine their educational power and create the educational context of a child. To illustrate the connection between family and school and their representatives, teachers and parents, a schematic view is shown [6].

<b>F</b>	← basic and natural social environment	<b>S</b>
<b>A</b>	← emotionality (love in relationships)	<b>C</b>
	knowledge, systematic education ⇒	
<b>M</b>	← length of time (socializing)	<b>H</b>
	organization of studying ⇒	
	Psychological - pedagogical, methodical and professional teacher education ⇒	
<b>I</b>	← full care for health, mental and physical development and association with life	<b>O</b>
<b>L</b>	← closeness, trust, benevolence, and personal example	<b>O</b>
<b>Y</b>	← responsibility and personal interest in the development	<b>L</b>

**Figure1.** Connection between family and school

The distinction made represented in Figure 1 must not be interpreted strictly, but it should be understood figuratively as giving preference to one of the educational environments in terms of the intensity of their expression, and that we should look out for their complementary action in this diversity. Just for clarification: it is necessary to intensify and develop in school closeness, trust, benevolence, and personal example that have greater intensity in family setting. Or the organization of studying needed for successful educational activity can be provided in the family setting, as highlighted by S. Petrovska [4]. As for the characteristic length of time for socializing, the intensity can be different in different environments - school and family, in a different time period (during school year, on weekdays children stay in school longer). And another feature that relates to emotionality in relationships and is intensive in the family is not excluded in the school either. Therefore, if thoroughly penetrate the very essence of cooperation between family and school through teacher and parent, we

will meet with a broad platform rich with content and forms [3]. That is why we chose to study the cooperation between family and school in the area of cooperation between teachers and parents. The starting point in the research in this sense is the notion that there is a close connection between the family and the school and the need for constant improvement and intensifying of their cooperation in order to realize a common task: education and upbringing of the young generation. The second part of the subject of interest in this paper is the educational context of the child. How have we determined the phrase educational context of the child?

The term education has been determined many times so far, but we accept the determination by which education is an interpersonal relationship filled with mutual influence between various subjects, such as adults-children, peers, individuals-group, group-individuals, relationships within a group, and relationships between groups. That is why we talk about the importance of socialization in any education [5]. The word context (Lat. contextus) is used to denote the relationship between thoughts and speech, the content of an act in its entirety, a combination of words [2]; both written and spoken. In fact, a context is a sum of ideas and facts within which and around which a certain thought is born. The context gives that thought a certain meaning with a concrete and specific message. The creator of that thought deeply penetrates the context in order to understand it and move through it. It is used in different situations, and here we use it to refer to the complexity of the educational process. In fact, the context is created by people in mutual interaction with a common goal. If creating means generating, discovering, making, then educational context of the child is the product of the creation of parents and teachers, aimed at one goal – child's development, and it relates to the process of learning and development, knowledge, skills, and abilities for meeting the child's needs.

### **3. Methodological frame of research**

#### ***3.1. Subject of research***

School can be seen as a context of investing personal resources and self-realization, i.e. as a context of mutual relations between teacher, student, and parent. Unlike the school context, the family context as the primary setting is framework of interpersonal relationships between parents and children. In fact, the research on the role of family and school in creating the educational context of a child stresses that family relationships affect a child's behavior in other environments important to the child such as school.

The survey results show that most parents contribute to the successful adaptation of their children to the school context. Therefore our research focused on parents' and teachers' attitudes and opinions of the shape and content of cooperation, which directly affects the creation of the educational context of a child. We reviewed this subject on the issue of frequency, form, and content of their mutual communication from teachers' and parents' aspect. We believe these communication parameters between teachers and parents will show which one of these contexts dominates in the educational context of the child. We hope that the research and the theoretical discussion will also be a meaningful contribution to the enrichment and improvement of the pedagogical theory and practice in the area of family-school collaboration from the perspective of active participation of both parties. This paper is a part of a more extensive research and some of the results are presented here.

### **3.2. Purpose and objective of the research**

The goal in the research is, based on frequency, form and content of their communication, to determine their participation in the creating of the educational context of the child. In accordance with the defined goal, we set the following task:

- To examine whether there are differences in the opinions of teachers and parents about the frequency, form and content of their communication.

### **3.3. Research hypotheses**

The basic premise was that cooperation between school and family expressed in a parent-teacher communication determines the educational context of the child. According to the previously assigned objectives, the following specifically derived auxiliary hypotheses arise:

- We assumed that there are no statistically significant differences in the opinions of teachers and parents, in terms of frequency, form and content of their communication

### **3.4. Population and sample**

A stratified sample is represented in the research. The sampling is performed in several stages. The first stage includes the selection of schools, departments, students' parents and teachers. The starting criterion in the selection of schools was their territorial affiliation or location. Based on this, 6 cities in eastern Macedonia and as many villages in their vicinity were determined. Cities were defined by size: three larger (Stip, Kocani and Strumica) and the villages Karabinci, Kuklis and Oblesevo, and three smaller cities (Sveti Nikole, Radovis and Vinica) and the villages Gorobinci, Injevo and Istibanja.

We decided to conduct the research on the fourth and eighth grade, for several reasons: elementary school includes students from the first to the ninth grade at two levels - class and subject teaching, so we anticipated this factor in our research. We chose the fourth grade because the parents already have an established idea of the relationship with the teacher and the communication with him/her and they have formed an opinion about the issue that is the subject of our research.

We chose the eighth grade for the same reasons, while taking into account the fact of the possibility of communication with more than one teacher. The population of teachers covers class teachers of fourth grades and subject teachers from upper classes, and the population of parents covers the parents whose children are students in the fourth and the eighth grade of the researched schools. The teacher sample consists of class teachers of the classes included in the research and subject teachers in classes of the eighth grade also included in the research (*Table 1*).

**Table 1:** Structure of the sample of teachers in relation to population

Teachers	city				village			
	P		S		P		S	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Class teachers	23	28,75	6	20	15	28,30	6	20
Subject teachers	57	71,25	24	80	38	71,70	24	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

The sample of parents consists of parents whose children are included in the research (Tables 2 and 3).

**Table 2:** Structure of the sample of parents in relation to population

Primary school	Stratum	IVgrade		VIII grade	
		P	S	P	S
„Vanco Prke”- Stip	City	86	26	101	30
„ Nikola Vapcarov”- Strumica	City	117	35	155	47
„Rade Kratovce ” – Kocani	City	112	34	101	30
„ Goce Delcev”- Vinica	City	68	20	105	32
„Nikola Karev”- Radovis	City	85	25	133	40
„Kiril I Metodij”- Sv.Nikole	City	99	30	160	48
„Straso Pindjur” – Karbinici	village	50	15	56	17
„ Dame Gruev” - Kuklis	village	34	10	55	16
„Kliment Ohridski”- Oblesevo	village	55	16	62	19
„ Goce Delcev ” - Istibanje	village	33	10	27	8
„ Orce Nikolov”- Injevo	village	85	25	95	28
„Aco Sopov” - Gorobinci	village	20	6	16	5
Total	City	<b>567</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>755</b>	<b>227</b>
	village	<b>277</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>93</b>
	Σ	<b>844</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>1066</b>	<b>320</b>

**Table 3:** Structure of the sample of parents

	city		village	
	IV	VIII	IV	VIII
parents	170	227	82	93
Total	397		175	
	$\Sigma = 572$			

**3.5. Research methods, techniques and instruments**

The research uses a method of theoretical analysis and the descriptive method. The method of theoretical analysis was applied in the analysis and display of various theoretical aspects of the problem of communication between teachers and parents in creating a child's educational context. The descriptive method in the form of description, analysis and generalization will be used. The impact of independent variables on dependent ones will be analyzed. Given the fact that the sample covers two categories of respondents, two types of questionnaires were used in the research. The questionnaire for teachers is intended for class teachers and subject teachers. The instrument consists of questions of different types grouped into two groups. With the first group of questions the data concerning the shape and content of communication between teacher and student in the classroom are obtained, and with the second, information concerning the frequency, form and content of the communication between teachers and parents is received. In the questionnaire for parents the questions are divided into two groups. With the first group information about parents' views are received, in terms of form and content of communication between teachers and students in the classroom, and the second group of questions provides data regarding frequency, form and content of their communication with teachers. The first set of questions that will not be presented here are in the function of comparing teachers' and parents' opinions on how teachers communicate with students, because we think that these findings reflect upon their communication.

**3.6. Research organization**

The questionnaires were sent directly to the respondents and they were anonymous, in order to provide greater objectivity in the responses, regardless of the location of schools and the number of respondents.

**3.7. Data processing**

The data obtained are processed quantitatively and qualitatively. First they were sorted, grouped, tabulated and ranked. Aggregate groupings were done by distributing the data according to their frequency. Specific groupings were done by calculating the percentage in order to obtain average results. For greater clarity, they were tabulated in simple and summary tables. Some of the data obtained during the evaluation of certain categories, with grades from 1 to 5, were calculated by multiplying the given grade by the number of responses. The



statistical data processing was performed using the chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ), the C coefficient, the correlation rank and the test of the sum of ranks. With  $\chi^2$  the statistical significance of differences in the views and opinions of teachers and parents was determined, and for the extent of their relationship the contingency coefficient (C) was calculated, thereby determining the level of significance of the chi-square test according to the table of the limit of  $\chi^2$  with the probability of 0.01 (99%) and 0.05 (95%). The range of correlation ( $\rho$ ) and the test of the sum of ranks (z) are used to draw conclusions about determining the relationship between respective variables that are covered in the survey. The qualitative analysis of the data was conducted through the procedures of comparison and differentiation.

#### 4. Analysis and data processing

##### 4.1. Teachers' and parents' opinions about the model and content of their mutual communication

The analysis and the comparison were made in terms of the following characteristics: frequency, causes, presence of parents and students at parents' meetings and at open class as a form of cooperation between teacher and parents.

**Table 4:** Opinion of teachers and parents about how often they communicate with each other

response category	teachers' responses		parents' responses	
	f	%	f	%
often	16	26,67	129	22,55
rarely	8	13,33	106	18,53
when there is need for it	29	48,33	319	55,77
they are not in contact	7	11,67	18	3,15
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>100</b>

$$\chi^2 = 11,749 \quad df=3 \quad p < 0,01 \quad C=0,14$$

Data presented in Table 4 show that teachers and parents communicate frequently when necessary. However, the percentage of teachers who think that communication with parents is frequent is larger than the percentage of parents. A higher percentage of teachers (11.67%) think that they are in contact with parents, compared with the percentage of parents (3.15). The calculated chi-square indicated the statistical significance of the differences, although with a minor intensity of significance level of 0.01.

**Table 5:** Opinions of class and subject teachers and parents of students in grades IV and VIII of how often they communicate with each other

response category	class teachers		parents of students in grade IV		subject teachers		parents of students in grade VIII	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
often	4	33,33	91	36,11	12	25,00	38	11,88
rarely	2	16,67	30	11,90	6	12,50	76	23,75
when there is need for it	4	33,33	123	48,81	25	52,08	196	61,25
they are not in contact	2	16,67	8	3,17	5	10,42	10	3,12
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>99,99</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>100</b>

$$x^2_{ctp} = 6,404 \quad df=3 \quad p > 0,01$$

$$x^2_{stp} = 9,319 \quad df=3 \quad p > 0,05 \quad C=0,16$$

We also made a comparison with regard to the opinions of class teachers and their students' parents. The comparison of results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in class teachers' opinions and the four graders' parents' opinions on how often they communicate with each other. On the other hand, the comparative analysis of the responses of subject teachers and eighth graders' parents showed that there are differences. Namely, 25.00% of subject teachers think that they frequently communicate with parents, and 11.88% of parents of the eighth grade students share their opinion. A larger percentage of subject teachers (10.42%) believe that they are not in contact with parents, while their opinion is shared by only 3.12% of the parents of students in the eighth grade. The calculated chi-square is statistically significant.

Concerning what the most common reasons for their communication are, parents and teachers have different opinions (Table 6).

**Table 6:** Opinion of teachers and parents about the most common reasons for their communication

response category	teachers' responses		parents' responses	
	f	%	f	%
success in studying	28	46,67	186	32,52
absence from class	16	26,66	252	44,05
unpleasant incident at school	16	26,66	134	23,43
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>99,99</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>100</b>

$$x^2 = 6,318 \quad df=2 \quad p < 0,01$$

Most teachers (46.67%) think that poor success in learning is the most common cause of communication with parents, while parents in the highest percentage (44.05%) think that they communicate with teachers when their child is absent from class. This opinion of parents is shared by 26.66% of teachers. About 23.43% of parents think that the most common cause is an unpleasant incident at school. 26.66% of teachers agree with their opinion. The identified differences are not statistically significant, so it can be rightly said that parents and teachers have a common opinion about what causes most often bring them into contact with each other.

During the school year teachers hold several joint group meetings with parents. It is possible for students to attend these meetings. The following question concerning whether the presence of students at parents' meetings is necessary is asked in this context. The data are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7 :** Opinion of teachers and parents about whether the presence of students at parents' meetings is necessary

response category	teachers' responses		parents' responses	
	f	%	f	%
always	7	11,67	163	28,50
sometimes	45	75,00	318	55,59
never	8	13,33	91	15,91
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>100</b>

$$x^2 = 9,512 \quad df=2 \quad p < 0,01 \quad C=0,12$$

According to the table above, a significantly higher percentage of teachers (75.00%) compared to parents (55.59%) believes that sometimes students need to attend parents' meetings. On the other hand, a higher percentage of parents (28.50%) compared to teachers (11.67%) believe that parents' meetings should always be attended by students too. The differences are evident in the third response category as well. Namely, 13.33% of teachers think that the presence of students at parents' meetings is not necessary at all. 15.91% of parents share this teachers' opinion. The calculated value of chi-square shows that differences are statistically significant but with a slight intensity significance level of 0, 01.

There are other forms of communication between parents and teachers. One of these is the open class. Asked how often this form of communication is realized, parents and teachers responded differently (Table 8).

Most of them (66.67%) think that they sometimes arrange an open class for parents to which they invite them, while the highest percentage of parents (39.69%) think that teacher never organize an open class for them. Quite a small percentage of teachers (8.33%) do not know about this form, compared to the percentage of parents that is significantly higher (22.73%). The calculated chi-square indicated the statistical significance of differences, and the C-coefficient indicated low intensity of significance level of 0.01.

**Table 8:** Opinions of teachers and parents about how often teachers invite parents to attend the open class in the class where their children study

response category	teachers' responses		parents' responses	
	f	%	f	%
always	7	11,67	150	26,22
sometimes	40	66,67	65	11,36
never	8	13,33	227	39,69
you are not familiar with such an opportunity	5	8,33	130	22,73
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>100</b>

$$x^2 = 119,99 \quad df=3 \quad p < 0,01 \quad C=0,40$$

**Table 9:** Opinion of teachers and parents about how often parents attend the open class organized by the teacher in their children's class

response category	teachers' responses		parents' responses	
	f	%	f	%
always	12	20,00	140	24,48
sometimes	27	45,00	70	12,24
never	21	35,00	362	63,28
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>100</b>

$$x^2 = 46,424 \quad df=2 \quad p < 0,01 \quad C=0,26$$

Table 9 contains data about how often parents accept the invitation of the teacher and attend the open class organized by the teacher in their children's class. 45% of teachers are of the opinion that parents sometimes attend this open class, organized by the teacher in their children's class, when invited. Their opinion is shared by only 12.24% of the parents. The largest percentage of parents (63.28%) opted for the third response category, which implies that they have never attended the open class, which we assume is due to the fact that they have never been invited to one by the teachers, or were not familiar with such an opportunity. The identified differences are statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01, which is confirmed by the calculated value of chi-square (46.424). C-coefficient indicated low intensity and is significant also at the level of 0.01, so we concluded with 99% probability that teachers and parents have a different opinion about parents' attendance of the open class on teacher's invitation and organized by the teacher in their children's class.

The survey provided data on how teachers and parents assess the possibilities of the open class (Table 10).

**Table 10:** Teachers’ and parents’ assessment of the opportunities offered to parents by the open class

Response category	teachers’ responses			parents’ responses		
	grade	%	rank	grade	%	rank
getting better acquainted with the teacher	219	23,47	4	2158	23,05	4
getting better acquainted with your child	250	26,79	1	2464	26,32	1
creating a complete picture of teaching	221	23,69	3	2341	25,00	3
forming a real image of teaching						
communication between teacher and student	243	26,05	2	2400	25,63	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>933</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>9363</b>	<b>100</b>	

$$\rho = 1$$

As can be seen from the data in the table, teachers and parents believe that the open class allows parents primarily to get to know their children better and thereby form a true idea of the teaching communication between a teacher and a student. Teachers and parents evaluate in the same way the possibility of the open class which refers to creating a complete picture of teaching and they ranked it in the third place. The possibility of parents getting to know teachers better took the last place in both ranking lists. The calculated rank of correlation indicated a very high matching of teachers’ and parents’ opinions.

Based on the results of this research and the data obtained concerning teachers’ and parents’ views about the form and content of their communication, we found that teachers and parents have different opinions about how often they communicate with each other. In teachers opinion communication between them is often triggered by poor school performance of students. Their opinion is not shared by the parents, and they think that the main reason is students’ absences from class. As for the presence of students at parents’ meetings, teachers and parents mostly agree that sometimes it is necessary that students attend parents’ meetings. Differences in the opinions of teachers and parents are found in terms of how often teachers urge parents to attend the open class, organized by the teacher in their child’s class. In that sense, a higher percentage of teachers think that they always invite parents to attend the open class. Parents have the opposite opinion and mostly think they have never been invited to attend the open class. In terms of how often parents accept the invitation of the teacher and attend the open class, we also found differences in teachers’ and parents’ opinions. Teachers were more likely to believe that their invitation is sometimes accepted by parents, while parents were more likely to believe they never attended. The reasons for this are various, but from the data from this survey we are not able to provide data that will give a reasoned response. Teachers and parents are united in the assessment of the opportunities offered by the open class as a form of communication between teachers and parents. Teachers and parents both think that the open class primarily allows parents to better get to know their children as members of the class

and as communicators in communication with the teacher during class. They are unified in the assessment that the possibility of the open class referring to getting to know each other better is at the end of the ranking; we assume this is due to the fact that there are other forms through which they can become better acquainted.

At the end of this analysis, we summarize: teachers and parents have different opinions about the form and content of their communication, thereby rejecting the hypothesis with which we assumed that there are no statistically significant differences between teachers' and parents' opinions in terms of forms and content of communication between them.

## **5. Conclusion**

Teachers and parents have different opinions about forms and contents of their mutual communication. We have established the following:

- Based on the results of this research and the data obtained concerning the views of teachers and parents about the form and content of their communication, we have found that teachers and parents have different opinions about how often they communicate with each other.
- When compared to teachers, parents in greater percentage think that their communication is realized when there is some need for it.
- In teachers' opinion communication between them is usually triggered by poor school performance. Their opinion is not shared by parents, and they determine students' absence from class as the main reason.
- As for the presence of students at parents' meetings, teachers and parents in greatest percentage think that sometimes students need to attend parent meetings.
- Differences in opinion between teachers and parents are found in terms of how often teachers invite parents to attend the open class organized by the teacher in the class where their children study. In that sense, a higher percentage of teachers believe that they always invite parents to attend the open class. Parents are of the opposite opinion, and were more likely to believe that they were never invited to attend the open class.
- In terms of how often parents accepted the invitation of the teacher and attended the open class, differences in the opinions of teachers and parents were also found. Teachers were more likely to believe that parents sometimes accept their invitation, while parents were more likely to believe that they never attended such a class. The reasons for this are varied, but the data from this survey cannot provide data that will give a well-argued response.
- Teachers and parents are united in their assessment of the opportunities offered by the open class as a form of communication between teachers and parents. Teachers and parents think that the open class primarily enables parents to become better informed about their children, both as members of the class and as communicators in communication with the teacher during class. They are united in the assessment that the possibility of the open class, which refers to getting more familiar with each other, is at the end of the ranking list, which we assume is due to the fact that there are other forms through which they become better acquainted.

To summarize, teachers and parents have different opinions on the forms and content of their interpersonal communication, so their mutual cooperation is occasional and uniform in content. This gives us the right to conclude that statistically significant differences between the opinions of teachers and parents regarding the form and content of communication between them hinder cooperation between family and school, so there is a danger of a different modeling and creating different models of a child's educational context. This disproportion does not have a positive impact on the child's personality and it leads to the disintegration of educational factors, family and school. In this respect, we consider that it is necessary to make a Program for developing collaborative relationships between family and school (PCFS) and creating an open curriculum. The program for cooperation of family with school should be rich in content and in one part be concerned about continuity, content and diversity of the forms of cooperation, which will ensure unity in the impact and working of the family and school in creating a child's educational context.

## **References**

- [1] Bežen A. - Jelavić F. - Kujundić H. - Pletenac V. *Osnove didaktike*. Zagreb: Školske novine, 1991, pp.110-112.
- [2] Вујаклија. М. *Лексикон страних речи и израза*. Београд: Просвета, 1974, pp. 463.
- [3] Мирасчиева. С. *Комуникација меѓу наставникот и ученикот во основното училиште*. Штип: Педагошки факултет „Гоце Делчев“, 2007, pp.55-59
- [4] Петровска. С. *Семејството и воспитанието на децата*. Скопје: АЛФА 94МА, 2009, pp. 53-54.
- [5] Поткоњак. Н. *Педагошки лексикон*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 1996, pp.337.
- [6] Трнавац. Н. *Педагог у школи*. Београд: Учитељски факултет, 1996, pp. 203.