

PARENT–SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: EXPERIENCE OF A KAZAKHSTANI SCHOOL

K. Adilzhanova^{1,*} , B. Turganbayeva² , Sh. Abisheva² , A. Tuksanbayev³ 

¹Semey Medical University, Republic of Kazakhstan, Semey

²Shakarim University, Republic of Kazakhstan, Semey

³International University of Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana

*e-mail: adilzhanova77@mail.ru, bejbitgulsakarimovna@gmail.com, Abisheva.s@bk.ru,
Dann54@mail.ru

Abstract. The article examines the specific features of parent–school partnership in the context of inclusive education in Kazakhstan. The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that the expansion of inclusive practice in general education schools requires not only organizational and regulatory changes but also the development of sustainable interaction between the family and the educational institution. The aim of the study is to analyze the characteristics of parent-school partnership and to identify dimensions and reported difficulties associated with parents' evaluations of interaction in the practice of a general education school. The study was conducted in the autumn of 2025 on the basis of a general education school in the city of Semey. The participants were 82 parents and legal representatives of schoolchildren, including 25 parents or legal representatives of children with special educational needs. Methodologically, the study has a descriptive-analytical design and combines quantitative and qualitative procedures of analysis. The main research instrument was an author-designed questionnaire that included items on parents' attitudes toward inclusive education, scaled assessments of interaction with the school, a block of typical difficulties, and open-ended questions. The results showed that although parents generally demonstrate a positive attitude toward the idea of inclusive education, their assessments of the actual quality of interaction with the school remain more restrained. The most vulnerable aspects were the regularity of feedback, the extent to which parents' opinions were taken into account in discussions of educational issues, and the coordination of actions among teachers and support specialists. The scientific value of the study lies in documenting, within a Kazakhstani school context, the coexistence of broad parental support for inclusion with mixed assessments of school readiness and moderate ratings of several partnership dimensions. The findings have practical value for strengthening regular feedback, parental participation in educational decisions, and coordination between teachers and support specialists.

Keywords: inclusive education, parents, school, partnership, children with special educational needs, family-school interaction, pedagogical support, inclusive environment.

Introduction

In recent years, inclusive education has been increasingly viewed not only as a mechanism for ensuring access to general education for children with special educational needs, but also as an indicator of the humanistic maturity of the educational system itself. However, international and Kazakhstani experience shows that the formal expansion of access does not guarantee a child's qualitative inclusion in school life. The real effectiveness of inclusive practice is determined by how well the key participants in the educational process act, primarily the school and the family. That is why the problem of partnership between parents and schools is gradually shifting from a peripheral topic to one of the central conditions for the success of inclusive education [1-4].

In the foreign scientific literature, there is a noticeable transition from a narrow understanding of parental involvement as an episodic participation of parents in school affairs to a broader understanding of family-school partnership as a stable, two-way and subjective interaction. Thus, G. Baxter and A. Kilderry emphasize that the terminology used to describe school-family interaction is often inconsistent, and therefore in practice the school is often limited to informing parents instead of building a genuine partnership [1]. T.M. Willemse, I. Thompson, R. Vanderlinde and T. Mutton, considering teacher training, show that the teacher education system still does not sufficiently prepare future teachers for effective interaction with students' families [2]. In turn, S.E. Goldman and M.M. Burke in a meta-analytical review on special

education conclude that specially organized interventions do enhance parental participation, but in most cases this participation remains procedural and does not always develop into equal inclusion in educational decision-making [3].

For the purposes of this study, parent-school partnership is understood as sustained, bidirectional, and participatory interaction characterized by accessible communication, regular feedback, consideration of parents' views in educational decisions, and coordinated action among the family, teachers, and support specialists. This definition distinguishes partnership from episodic or one-way informing, which may transmit information without involving parents in deliberation, shared problem-solving, or coordinated support [1, 4, 6].

Newer research confirms that the problem lies not just in the intensity of communication, but in its quality, sustainability and institutional security. J. Aouad and F. Bento, analyzing the cooperation of parents and teachers in special education, show that this interaction is not linear: it depends on trust, expectations of the parties, the organizational culture of the school and the extent to which parents are perceived as full participants in accompanying the child [4]. Hepburn and co-authors prove that a positive home-school partnership requires not spontaneous efforts by individual teachers, but purposeful professional teacher training [5]. A. Johnson, T. Ma, J. Hodges, C. Boyle, and M.R. Sanders additionally emphasize that the two-way nature of the partnership should not only be declared but also be measured, because only in this case it is possible to objectively assess the quality of interaction between family and school [6].

Equally important are studies that examine the parental perspective on inclusive practice. T. Koskela and H.-M. Sinkkonen, examining the experience of parents in Finland, show that even with a well-developed school support system, family-school cooperation is often unstable and varies from school to school, and trust between the parties requires constant maintenance [7]. M. Hyassat, A. Al-Bakar, A. Al-Makahleh and N. al-Zyoud note that teachers, as a rule, recognize the importance of parents' participation in inclusive education, but real practice is limited by a lack of time, special competencies and clear organizational mechanisms [8]. Finally, Shurr and co-authors emphasize that parents evaluate the success of inclusion not only by academic advancement, but also by the degree of social acceptance of the child, his psychological safety and the respectful attitude of the school environment [9]. Consequently, in the modern international agenda, effective inclusive education is no longer possible without the real, rather than symbolic, inclusion of parents in the educational process.

Studies conducted in Kazakhstan generally confirm this trend, although it also highlights a number of its own contradictions. E.K. Akhmetova explicitly points out that parents' attitude to inclusive education can either strengthen or, conversely, slow down the introduction of inclusive programs in secondary schools [10]. S.A. Uzakbayeva, analyzing the current state of inclusive education, shows that further development of the system is impossible without its substantial improvement, and not only without a formal expansion of coverage [11]. M.B. Turlubekova and R.O. Bugubayeva also note that organizational and substantive gaps remain in Kazakhstan between the declared principles of inclusion and the real mechanisms of their implementation [12].

A significant contribution to understanding the Kazakh context is made by research on the institutional and professional conditions of inclusive practice. A.N. Sakayeva emphasizes the need for interprofessional cooperation, the development of the institute of teaching assistants and targeted training of specialists capable of accompanying a child with special educational needs in a comprehensive school [13]. In their study of home-based education for children with special educational needs, Abayeva et al. highlight the risk of increasing distance between families and schools if the support system is not oriented toward the child's full inclusion in the general educational environment [14]. G.S. Mailybayeva and co-authors show that teachers' readiness for inclusive practice is directly related to their ability to interact with parents and build meaningful cooperation with them [15]. Nurseit et al. emphasize the importance of a socio-pedagogical approach to inclusive education, in which the interaction of family and school is an important condition for supporting a child in an educational environment [16].

Thus, the analysis of domestic and foreign studies shows that the problem of partnership between parents and schools in the context of inclusive education is recognized as significant both in the international and in the Kazakh scientific agenda. At the same time, few studies focus on how parents evaluate specific dimensions of partnership in the everyday practice of a particular general education school, where the quality of inclusive practice is manifested not in regulatory declarations, but in everyday communication, consistency of support, accessibility of feedback, and the degree of family involvement in the discussion of educational issues.

Most existing studies establish the general importance of family-school cooperation or examine teachers' readiness and institutional conditions, whereas less is known about how parents evaluate specific dimensions of partnership in the everyday practice of a Kazakhstani general education school. The present study addresses this gap by combining item-level assessments of six partnership dimensions with data on recurrent interaction difficulties and parents' open-ended responses, and by descriptively comparing parents or legal representatives of children with special educational needs with other respondents.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in documenting, within a single Kazakhstani school, the coexistence of broad support for inclusive education with mixed assessments of school readiness and moderate ratings of several partnership dimensions in routine family-school interaction. Its theoretical significance consists in treating partnership as an interconnected set of communicative, participatory, and organizational dimensions rather than as the mere frequency of contact. Its practical significance lies in identifying concrete priorities for strengthening feedback, parental participation in educational decisions, and coordination between teachers and support specialists.

In this regard, the *purpose* of the study is to analyze the specifics of partnership between parents and schools in inclusive education and identify dimensions and reported difficulties associated with parents' evaluations of such interaction in the practice of a single general education school.

The *object* of the study is the interaction of family and school in the context of inclusive education.

The *subject* of the study is the substantive and organizational characteristics of the partnership between parents and schools, manifested in the experience of family interaction with a general education organization.

In accordance with the purpose, the following research *objectives* were set:

1. to analyze scientific approaches to understanding the partnership between family and school in the context of inclusive education;
2. to identify the features of parental assessments of interaction with the school in the context of inclusive practice;
3. to identify the most significant difficulties that reduce the quality of school-family interaction;
4. to substantiate the directions of improving the partnership between parents and the school in the context of a general education organization.

The study was based on the assumption that the quality of partnership between parents and schools in inclusive education is determined not only by the general openness of the educational organization to interaction, but also by the regularity of feedback, the degree to which parents' opinions are taken into account, the coordination of actions of teachers and support specialists, as well as the ability of parents to participate in the discussion of educational decisions that are significant for the child.

Materials and methods

The study was carried out as part of an analysis of the conditions affecting the quality of interaction between family and school in the inclusive education system. Methodologically, the work was based on the idea that the effectiveness of inclusive practice is determined not only by the availability of organizational and regulatory conditions, but also by the coordination of actions of key participants in the educational process, primarily teachers and parents. In this logic, the family was considered not as an external party to the school but as an active participant in educational interaction,

involved in the discussion, support and assessment of the child's educational situation. This approach made it possible to interpret the partnership between parents and schools not as formal communication, but as a significant pedagogical condition for inclusive education.

Research design

The study had a descriptive and analytical design and combined quantitative and qualitative data processing procedures. The quantitative component was aimed at identifying general trends in parents' assessments related to the quality of interaction with the school, the level of openness of the educational environment and the nature of family involvement in solving educational issues. The qualitative component made it possible to clarify how parents themselves interpret the experience of communicating with the school, which difficulties they consider the most significant and which forms of interaction they perceive as productive. This combination of methods made it possible not only to record frequencies and average values, but to supplement them with a meaningful analysis of parental statements.

Research base and participants

The empirical part of the study was conducted in autumn 2025 at a comprehensive school in Semey. Eighty-two parents or legal representatives of pupils participated. Of these, 25 were parents or legal representatives of children with special educational needs, and 57 represented other pupils enrolled in general education classes (see Table 1). The inclusion of both groups was necessary in order to consider the problem of school-family partnership both in the general school context and in a more sensitive area of inclusive interaction, where coordination among teachers, support specialists, and parents may be especially important. The study used a non-probability, purposive single-site case design. The participating school enrolled children with and without special educational needs, which enabled a descriptive analysis of parents' direct experience of interaction with teachers and, where relevant, support specialists. Eligible participants were adult parents or legal representatives of pupils enrolled at the school who had such interaction experience. Recruitment was confined to the participating school and participation was voluntary; the resulting sample was not intended to represent schools in Semey or Kazakhstan. In cases where more than one school-age child was raised in the family, parents focused on the experience of school interaction with the child for whom the issues of inclusive support or school interaction seemed to them the most relevant.

Table 1 – Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample

Indicator	Category	n	%
Respondent's relationship to the child	Mothers	63	76.8
	Fathers	18	22.0
	Other legal representatives	1	1.2
Age	25–34 years	17	20.7
	35–44 years	46	56.1
	45–54 years	17	20.7
	55 years and older	2	2.4
Education	Secondary general education	5	6.1
	Secondary vocational education	24	29.3
	Higher education	47	57.3
	Postgraduate education	6	7.3
Children's grade levels	Grades 1–4	29	35.4
	Grades 5–9	38	46.3
	Grades 10–11	15	18.3
Study group of the focal child	Child with SEN	25	30.5
	Other pupil	57	69.5

Research tools

The main tool of the empirical stage was the author's questionnaire, developed in accordance with the purpose of the study and the logic of analyzing the partnership between parents and schools in inclusive education. The questionnaire structure included four content blocks.

The questionnaire was developed specifically for this exploratory study with reference to prior research on family-school partnership [1, 4, 6, 7]. School openness to dialogue, teacher accessibility, feedback regularity, consideration of parents' views, coordination of support, and an overall sense of partnership were treated as six separate descriptive indicators. The questionnaire was not treated as a standardized diagnostic scale.

The first block was aimed at identifying the general attitude of parents towards inclusive education and their assessments of the school's readiness to implement an inclusive approach. This section included questions to determine whether parents support the idea of inclusive education of children with diverse educational needs and how they assess the real ability of the school to provide such a practice.

The second block included scale statements reflecting the key parameters of the interaction between the school and the family. Parents were asked to rate on a five-point scale the degree of openness of the school to dialogue, the accessibility of teachers to discuss the difficulties of the child, the regularity of feedback, taking into account the opinions of parents when making decisions, the coordination of actions of teachers and support specialists, as well as the general feeling of partnership between the school and the family. Each statement was rated on a five-point scale, where 1 indicated that the relevant feature was weakly expressed and 5 indicated that it was fully expressed in school practice. This format made it possible to compare not only general trends in parental assessments, but also the relative severity of individual characteristics of the partnership between the school and the family.

The third block was devoted to the difficulties of interacting with the school. It included a list of typical problem situations, among which parents could choose one or more possible answers. This format made it possible to capture not a single dominant difficulty, but a range of difficulties accompanying school-family interaction.

The fourth block included open-ended questions focused on a deeper understanding of the parental experience. Parents were asked to briefly describe which forms of communication with the school they consider the most useful, which problems in interaction are most acutely experienced, and what, in their opinion, needs to be changed to build a more sustainable partnership.

For analytical reporting, the six scaled indicators in the second block were treated as separate items, not as a single latent scale; therefore, item means rather than a composite score are reported. The third block allowed respondents to select any of the six difficulties presented in Table 3, and the fourth block comprised three prompts about useful forms of communication, acute interaction problems, and desired changes. Formal psychometric validation is not reported in the manuscript; consequently, the findings should be interpreted at the item level, and the questionnaire's measurement properties require evaluation in future multi-site research.

Data collection procedure

Data collection was carried out in autumn 2025. Only adult parents or legal representatives participated; children were not surveyed directly. Before completing the questionnaire, respondents were informed about the study purpose, the voluntary and anonymous nature of participation, and the intended use of aggregated data. Questionnaires were completed individually and did not request personal data. These safeguards were intended to minimize re-identification risk and encourage candid responses on difficulties in school interaction, emotional strain, and the coordination of school specialists.

Respondents completed the questionnaire without external pressure. Responses were processed and reported only in aggregate form, and no child-level, family-level, class-level, or staff-level result is presented. Measures were taken throughout the study to protect confidentiality and minimize the risk of re-identification.

Methods of data processing and analysis

Quantitative data processing was descriptive in nature. At the first stage, the absolute values and percentage distributions of responses to questions related to parents' attitude to inclusive education, assessment of the school's readiness for inclusive practice, and difficulties in interaction were calculated. At the second stage, average scores were determined based on scale indicators characterizing the quality of school-family interaction. Additionally, an exploratory comparison of the single item 'overall sense of partnership' was made between parents of children with special educational needs and other respondents. No inferential significance test was conducted; the contrast was therefore descriptive and was not used to support causal or population-level claims.

The open-ended responses were analyzed using descriptive thematic grouping. First, all responses were read in full. Second, recurrent units of meaning related to communication, participation in decisions, recommendations for child support, and coordination among school staff were identified. Third, substantively similar units were grouped into broader themes and interpreted alongside the quantitative item results. This procedure was intended to contextualize the numerical patterns rather than to establish theme prevalence, inter-coder reliability, or theoretical saturation, which were beyond the exploratory design.

Limitations of the methodological approach

The chosen design was primarily focused on identifying trends and typical features of parent-school interaction in the context of a single educational organization. In this regard, the results reflect the local school context and cannot be directly generalized statistically to all schools in Kazakhstan. In addition, the study primarily captures the parental perspective, which makes the conclusions meaningfully valuable for analyzing school-family interaction, but does not replace the need to compare with the positions of teachers, administrators and support specialists in subsequent work.

Thus, the chosen set of methods allowed the study to examine parent-school partnership at three levels: as a theoretically significant condition of inclusive education, as a practice of everyday school interaction, and as parents' lived experience of differently situated participation in an inclusive educational environment. This logic supported the transition from a general discussion of the problem to an analysis of specific parental assessments, difficulties, and expectations.

Results and discussion

The study included responses from 82 parents and legal representatives who took part in the survey in autumn 2025 at a comprehensive school in Semey. Of these, 25 were parents or legal representatives of children with special educational needs, and 57 represented other pupils enrolled in general education classes. This sample composition allowed us to consider the specifics of school-family interaction both in the general school context and in the more sensitive area of inclusive practice, where coordination among teachers, support specialists, and parents may be especially important.

The initial analysis showed that the attitude of parents towards the very idea of inclusive education in general is predominantly positive. Thus, 71.9% of the participants noted that they consider joint education of children with different educational opportunities to be important and socially significant. At the same time, assessments of the school's practical readiness for the sustainable implementation of an inclusive approach turned out to be more restrained. Only 29.4% of parents indicated that the school was sufficiently prepared for such work, 43.8% described the level of readiness as partially sufficient, and 26.8% considered the existing conditions insufficient.

This distribution of responses suggests a noticeable difference between support for the very idea of inclusive education and an assessment of the conditions for its daily implementation in a particular school practice. In other words, parents generally accept the value of an inclusive approach, but parents' assessments of the school's practical readiness were mixed.

This finding extends the Kazakhstan-focused discussion by showing how the implementation concerns described by Turlubekova and Bugubayeva [12] appear in parents' everyday evaluations within one school. It also complements Akhmetova's emphasis on parental attitudes [10]: in the present sample, broad support for inclusion coexisted with mixed assessments

of school readiness. The comparison is conceptual rather than numerical because the studies used different designs, samples, and instruments.

For a more detailed analysis, parents were asked to evaluate certain aspects of school-family interaction on a five-point scale.

Table 2 – Parents' assessment of certain aspects of school-family interaction

Indicator	Mean score on a 5-point scale
School openness to dialogue with parents	3.42
Accessibility of teachers for discussing the child's difficulties	3.18
Regularity of feedback from the school	3.07
Consideration of parents' opinions in decision-making	2.91
Coordination of actions between teachers and support specialists	2.84
Overall sense of partnership between school and family	3.12

As shown in Table 2, the school's openness to dialogue with parents received a relatively higher rating (3.42 points). Teacher accessibility for discussing the child's difficulties received a mean rating of 3.18, while the overall sense of partnership received a mean rating of 3.12. At the same time, the most vulnerable aspects were taking into account parents' opinions when making decisions (2.91) and coordinating the actions of teachers and support specialists (2.84). This suggests that the possibility of communication between the school and the family as a whole is present, but it does not always develop into stable interaction in which the parent is perceived as a full participant in the discussion and resolution of educational issues.

The pattern corresponds to Baxter and Kilderry's distinction between one-way informing and genuine two-way partnership [1]. The higher rating for openness to dialogue (3.42) than for consideration of parents' opinions (2.91) suggests that access to communication does not necessarily imply shared participation in decisions. This interpretation is also consistent with Aouad and Bento's emphasis on trust and organizational culture [4] and with Goldman and Burke's finding that parental involvement may remain procedural without equal participation in educational decision-making [3].

Taken together, the item-level profile in Table 2 suggests that communicative access and substantive participation should be distinguished analytically: parents may be able to contact the school without being consistently involved in deliberation or coordinated support.

The analysis of the responses also showed that parents' interaction with the school is more often situational rather than systemic. Thus, 44.0% of the participants noted that the most active communication with the school occurs mainly when difficulties or tense situations arise. Another 38.6% of parents indicated that interaction is maintained periodically, but not with sustained regularity. Only 17.4% of respondents described contacts with the school as stable and pre-arranged.

An exploratory comparison of the single item 'overall sense of partnership' showed a mean of 2.87 among parents of children with special educational needs and 3.24 among other parents, compared with 3.12 in the full sample. Because no inferential test was conducted, this contrast is descriptive and does not establish a statistically significant group difference.

The observed contrast concerns only the overall partnership item; the reported data do not identify which specific partnership dimensions, if any, contributed to it. It should not be treated as evidence of a population-level difference because the sample was small, purposive, and drawn from one school.

The need for cautious interpretation is consistent with Koskela and Sinkkonen's account of variation in family-school cooperation [7] and with Shurr et al.'s emphasis on the quality and respectfulness of inclusive support [9]. However, the populations and instruments differ, and the present single-item subgroup contrast cannot identify the mechanisms behind the observed means.

To identify the most frequent difficulties, respondents were presented with six multiple-response items.

Table 3 – Main difficulties in parent-school interaction (multiple response)

Difficulties	% of respondents
Communication with the school becomes active only when problems arise	44.0
There is a lack of clear recommendations on how to support the child	36.7
There is insufficient coordination between the teacher, psychologist, and other specialists	41.5
Parents are not sufficiently involved in discussing decisions	39.2
There is not always enough time for personal contact with teachers	47.6
Parents experience emotional stress when contacting the school	21.8

Note. Multiple responses were permitted; therefore, percentages do not total 100%.

As shown in Table 3, parents most often indicated a lack of time for full contact with teachers (47.6%), as well as the fact that interaction with the school increases mainly in difficult situations (44.0%). A significant part of the respondents noted insufficient coordination between teachers and support specialists (41.5%) and weak involvement of parents in the discussion of decisions (39.2%). The lack of clear recommendations on child support was somewhat less frequent (36.7%). The least frequently selected difficulty was emotional stress when contacting the school (21.8%), although this still represented more than one fifth of respondents. Taken together, these data show that the main difficulties are not centered around the rejection of inclusive education as such, but around the quality of daily interaction between school and family. The most problematic are the regularity of contact, clarity of communication, consistency of support and the degree of real parental involvement in the discussion of educational issues. Additional material was provided by the answers to the open questions of the questionnaire. The descriptive grouping yielded three provisional themes. The first was related to the need for a respectful and calm dialogue, in which parents not only receive information but also feel that their views have been heard. The second concerned a request for more specific and practical help from the school: participants expected not only general recommendations, but also more understandable guidelines for child support. The third line reflected the need for greater coordination among all participants involved in supporting the child, especially in cases where the child needs additional pedagogical and psychological support measures. No claims about the prevalence of these provisional themes are made.

The prominence of limited time for personal contact (47.6%) and insufficient coordination (41.5%) aligns conceptually with the barriers identified by Hyassat et al. [8], including time constraints and unclear organizational mechanisms. The coordination finding also supports Sakayeva's emphasis on interprofessional cooperation [13] and Mailybayeva et al.'s connection between teachers' inclusive readiness and meaningful work with families [15]. These comparisons strengthen the interpretation of the local pattern but do not establish equivalence across settings.

Thus, the results of the study allow us to identify three interrelated levels of problems in school-family interaction. The first level is communicative, related to the irregularity and situationality of contacts. The second is organizational, which manifests itself in insufficient coordination of actions within the school team. The third is subjective, due to the fact that parents do not always perceive themselves as fully involved participants in the discussion of significant educational decisions. The findings highlight the difference between broad support for inclusive education and more cautious assessments of the school's readiness for its daily implementation.. This indicates that at the level of value perception, an inclusive approach is generally accepted by parents, while at the level of practical experience of interaction, certain doubts and tensions remain. The identified trends allow us to move from the description of parental assessments to their pedagogical interpretation in the context of modern inclusive practice.

These patterns require cautious interpretation. In real school practice, a parent evaluates inclusive education not in abstract normative categories, but through concrete experience of communicating with the school: accessibility of teachers, intelligibility of feedback, respect for dialogue, the ability to be heard, and the degree of coherence of the actions of specialists. Accordingly, parents' assessments of the school's practical readiness should be interpreted alongside their assessments of everyday communication between the school and the family. Special attention should be paid to the fact that the lowest ratings were given to the parameters related not to the general openness of the school, but to the deeper characteristics of the partnership – taking into account the opinions of parents and the coordination of support. Within the participating school, this pattern suggests that communication can be formally available without yet reaching the level of sustained cooperation. In other words, the school demonstrates readiness for contact, but this contact is not always accompanied by the involvement of parents in the discussion and joint solution of educational issues. It is also significant that parents of children with special educational needs, on average, are more restrained in their assessment of the quality of interaction with the school. In the framework of this study, this trend is not interpreted as a basis for strong generalizations, but it has an important analytical meaning. The reported overall-partnership contrast does not identify whether feedback, coordination, decision-making, or other dimensions account for the subgroup difference. Future research should determine whether the subgroup contrast in the overall partnership item is replicated and which partnership dimensions, if any, account for it. The most frequently selected listed difficulties concerned organizational and communicative aspects of school-family interaction: lack of time for contact with teachers, situational communication, poor coordination of support, and lack of understandable recommendations. This is fundamentally important for the pedagogical interpretation of the results. This configuration of responses suggests that the improvement of inclusive practice is not so much related to the declaration of values, but rather to improving the quality of everyday mechanisms of interaction between school and family. In this sense, the data obtained allow us to consider the partnership of parents and schools as a significant condition for the quality of inclusive practice. However, it does not arise automatically as a result of the implementation of an inclusive approach. Its development requires regular feedback channels, clearer and more transparent forms of discussion of educational decisions, coordinated work of teachers and support specialists, as well as the school's professional readiness for respectful and informal interaction with the family.

Overall, the findings indicate that, within the participating school, the problem of partnership between parents and the school remains not declarative, but practical. It manifests itself in specific forms of school communication, in parents' perception of their involvement in the educational process and in the degree of coordination of the actions of specialists accompanying the child. Consequently, the development of inclusive education requires considering the interaction of family and school not as an additional component of school work, but as one of its substantive foundations.

Limitations of the study

The present study has a number of limitations that should be taken into account when interpreting the results obtained. Firstly, the empirical part was conducted on the basis of one comprehensive school in Semey, so the identified trends primarily reflect the specifics of a particular school context and cannot be automatically extended to all educational organizations in Kazakhstan. Secondly, the study was based mainly on parental assessments and describes the problem of partnership between the school and the family through the perception of one side of the interaction. This approach allows for a deeper understanding of parental experience, but it does not make it possible to fully compare it with the positions of teachers, school administrators, and support specialists. Thirdly, the work was descriptive and analytical in nature and was aimed at identifying common trends, typical difficulties and meaningful features of the interaction between parents and the school. In this regard, the results do not pretend to establish causal relationships

and require further refinement in studies with a wider sample and an expanded set of variables. Fourth, this study did not provide in-depth differentiation of responses depending on the type of special educational needs of the child, the age of students, the duration of their involvement in inclusive practice, and other factors that could potentially affect the nature of school-family interaction. Fifth, the manuscript does not report formal psychometric testing of the purpose-built questionnaire; the item-level findings are therefore exploratory. Sixth, non-probability single-site recruitment may have introduced self-selection bias. Finally, the subgroup contrast was descriptive, and no inferential test established whether the observed difference exceeded sampling variation. Despite these limitations, the study identifies locally relevant features of parent-school partnership and provides a basis for broader multi-site research.

Conclusion

Within the studied sample, 71.9% of respondents supported the principle of inclusive education, whereas 29.4% considered the school sufficiently prepared for its sustainable implementation. The lowest mean ratings concerned coordination between teachers and support specialists (2.84) and consideration of parents' opinions in decision-making (2.91). The overall sense of partnership was descriptively lower among parents of children with special educational needs than among other parents (2.87 versus 3.24); however, no inferential test was conducted, so the statistical significance of this difference was not established. These statements summarize what the collected data directly demonstrate.

Taken together, these descriptive patterns show the coexistence, within the participating school, of broad support for inclusive education with mixed assessments of school readiness and moderate ratings of several partnership dimensions. This interpretation is context-bound and should not be generalized to other educational organizations. Future research should determine whether the subgroup contrast in the overall partnership item is replicated and which partnership dimensions, if any, account for it; this will require larger samples, validated measures, and inferential analysis. The practical significance of the study lies in identifying three priorities for the participating school and comparable settings: regular feedback, meaningful parental participation in educational decisions, and coordinated work among teachers and support specialists. Future research should include teachers and school administrators and compare family-school interaction across multiple educational organizations.

Author Contributions:

Adilzhanova K. – supervised the study, developed the conceptual framework of the article, participated in the interpretation of the results and performed scientific editing of the manuscript.

Turganbayeva B. – contributed to the development of the research methodology, organized the empirical part of the study, analysed the obtained data, and participated in writing and editing the manuscript.

Abisheva Sh. – collected, systematised and processed the research materials, contributed to the preparation of the results and the formatting of the manuscript.

Tuksanbayev A. – provided scientific and methodological consultation, contributed to the interpretation of the research results and edited the final version of the manuscript.

LITERATURE:

1 Baxter G., Kilderry A. Family-school partnership discourse: inconsistencies, misrepresentation, and counter narratives // *Teaching and Teacher Education*. – 2022. – Vol. 109. – Art. 103561. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103561>.

2 Willemse T.M., Thompson I., Vanderlinde R., Mutton T. Family-school partnerships: a challenge for teacher education // *Journal of Education for Teaching*. – 2018. – Vol. 44. – № 3. – P. 252–257. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1465545>

3 Goldman S.E., Burke M.M. The Effectiveness of Interventions to Increase Parent Involvement in Special Education: A Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis // *Exceptionality*. – 2017. – Vol. 25. – № 2. – P. 97–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2016.1196444>

4 Aouad J., Bento F. A Complexity Perspective on Parent-Teacher Collaboration in Special Education: Narratives from the Field in Lebanon // *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*. – 2020. – Vol. 6. – № 1. – Art. 4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6010004>

5 Hepburn S.J., Trompf M., Hodges J., MacLeod L.M., Ma T., Teng J., Johnson A., Boyle C., Sanders M.R. Creating a positive home-school partnership through professional learning for teachers – A scoping review of the international literature // *Teaching and Teacher Education*. – 2025. – Vol. 165. – Art. 105127. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.105127>

6 Johnson A., Ma T., Hodges J., Boyle C., Sanders M.R. Partners in Education Survey: validation of a brief, parent-report home-school partnership measure in Australia // *Children and Youth Services Review*. – 2025. – Vol. 177. – Art. 108455. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2025.108455>

7 Koskela T., Sinkkonen H.-M. Parental involvement in supporting their children in inclusive education: Cooperation with school professionals in Finland // *Cogent Education*. – 2025. – Vol. 12. – № 1. – Art. 2464272. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2464272>

8 Hyassat M., Al-Bakar A., Al-Makahleh A., Al-Zyoud N. Special Education Teachers' Perceptions of Parental Involvement in Inclusive Education // *Education Sciences*. – 2024. – Vol. 14. – № 3. – Art. 294. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030294>

9 Shurr J., Minuk A., Holmqvist M., Östlund D., Ghaith N., Reed B. Parent perspectives on inclusive education for students with intellectual disability: A scoping review of the literature // *International Journal of Developmental Disabilities*. – 2023. – Vol. 69. – № 5. – P. 633–643. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/20473869.2021.2003612>

10 Ахметова Э.К. Формирование позитивного отношения родителей к инклюзивному образованию // *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Педагогические науки*. – 2021. – Т. 72. – № 4. – С. 262–270. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2021-4.1728-5496.30>

11 Узакбаева С.А. Современное состояние инклюзивного образования и пути его совершенствования // *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Педагогические науки*. – 2020. – Т. 66. – № 2. – С. 49–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-2.1728-5496.09>

12 Турлубекова М.Б., Бугубаева Р.О. Инклюзивное образование в Казахстане: анализ процесса организации и возможности дальнейшего его развития // *Central Asian Economic Review*. – 2021. – № 3. – С. 89–109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52821/2224-5561-2021-3-89-109>

13 Сакаева А.Н. О подходах к разработке и реализации учебного курса «Подготовка педагога-ассистента к деятельности в условиях инклюзивного образования» в фокусе непрерывного профессионального развития // *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series*. – 2024. – Vol. 29. – № 4 (116). – P. 104–116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2024ped4/104-116>

14 Абаева Г.А., Кудеринова А.М., Баймуратова А.Т., Куттыбаева Ж.К. Мониторинг состояния обучения на дому детей с особыми образовательными потребностями // *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Педагогические науки*. – 2022. – Т. 74. – № 2. – С. 317–327. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2022-2.1728-5496.35>

15 Майлыбаева Г.С., Абильдина С.К., Жолтаева Г.Н., Жексембаева Ж.Р., Исатаева А.А. О проблемах подготовки педагогов дошкольных организаций к работе в условиях инклюзивного образования // *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series*. – 2025. – Vol. 30. – № 3 (119). – P. 104–121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2025ped3/104-121>

16 Нұрсейт А.Т., Бейсенбекова Г.Б., Манашова Г.Н., Керимбаева Р.К. Возможности социально-педагогического подхода к инклюзивному образованию // *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series*. – 2025. – Vol. 30. – № 3 (119). – P. 30–38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2025ped3/30-38>

REFERENCES:

1 Baxter G., Kilderry A. (2022). Family-school partnership discourse: Inconsistencies, misrepresentation, and counter narratives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 109, article 103561. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103561>

2 Willemse T.M., Thompson I., Vanderlinde R., Mutton T. (2018). Family-school partnerships: a challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 252–257. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1465545>

3 Goldman S.E., Burke M.M. (2017). The Effectiveness of Interventions to Increase Parent Involvement in Special Education: A Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis. *Exceptionality*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 97–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2016.1196444>

4 Aouad J., Bento F. (2020). A Complexity Perspective on Parent-Teacher Collaboration in Special Education: Narratives from the Field in Lebanon. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, vol. 6, no. 1, article 4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6010004>

5 Hepburn S.J., Trompf M., Hodges J., MacLeod L.M., Ma T., Teng J., Johnson A., Boyle C., Sanders M.R. (2025). Creating a positive home-school partnership through professional learning for teachers – A scoping review of the international literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 165, article 105127. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.105127>

6 Johnson A., Ma T., Hodges J., Boyle C., Sanders M.R. (2025). Partners in Education Survey: validation of a brief, parent-report home-school partnership measure in Australia. *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol. 177, article 108455. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2025.108455>

7 Koskela T., Sinkkonen H.-M. (2025). Parental involvement in supporting their children in inclusive education: Cooperation with school professionals in Finland. *Cogent Education*, vol. 12, no. 1, article 2464272. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2464272>

8 Hyassat M., Al-Bakar A., Al-Makahleh A., Al-Zyoud N. (2024). Special Education Teachers' Perceptions of Parental Involvement in Inclusive Education. *Education Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 3, article 294. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030294>

9 Shurr J., Minuk A., Holmqvist M., Östlund D., Ghaith N., Reed B. (2023). Parent perspectives on inclusive education for students with intellectual disability: A scoping review of the literature. *International Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 633–643. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/20473869.2021.2003612>

10 Ahmetova E.K. (2021). Formirovanie pozitivnogo otnosheniya roditel'ei k inklüzivnomu obrazovaniiu [Formation of parents' positive attitudes towards inclusive education]. *Vestnik KazNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Pedagogicheskie nauki*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 262–270. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2021-4.1728-5496.30> (in Russian)

11 Uzakbaeva S.A. (2020). Sovremennoe sostoianie inklüzivnogo obrazovaniia i puti ego sovershenstvovaniia [The current state of inclusive education and ways to improve it]. *Vestnik KazNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Pedagogicheskie nauki*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 49–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-2.1728-5496.09> (in Russian)

12 Turlubekova M.B., Bugubaeva R.O. (2021). Inklüzivnoe obrazovanie v Kazahstane: analiz prosesa organizatsii i vozmozhnosti dälneishego ego razvitiia [Inclusive education in Kazakhstan: analysis of the organization process and opportunities for its further development]. *Central Asian Economic Review*, no. 3, pp. 89–109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52821/2224-5561-2021-3-89-109> (in Russian)

13 Sakaeva A.N. (2024). O podhodah k razrabotke i realizatsii uchebnogo kursa «Podgotovka pedagoga-asistenta k deiatelnosti v usloviiakh inklüzivnogo obrazovaniia» v fokuze nepreryvnogo profesional'nogo razvitiia [Approaches to the development and implementation of the training course “Preparation of a teacher-assistant for work in inclusive education” in the focus of continuous professional development]. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series*, vol. 29, no. 4 (116), pp. 104–116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2024ped4/104-116> (in Russian)

14 Abaeva G.A., Kuderinova A.M., Baimuratova A.T., Kuttybaeva Zh.K. (2022). Monitoriñ sostoiania obuchenii na domu detei s osobymi obrazovatel'nymi potrebnostiami [Monitoring the state of home education for children with special educational needs]. *Vestnik KazNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Pedagogicheskie nauki*, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 317–327. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2022-2.1728-5496.35> (in Russian)

15 Mailybaeva G.S., Abildina S.K., Zholtaeva G.N., Zheksembaeva Zh.R., Isataeva A.A. (2025). O problemakh podgotovki pedagogov doškol'nykh organizatsii k rabote v usloviiakh inklüzivnogo obrazovaniia [Problems of preparing preschool teachers to work in inclusive education]. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series*, vol. 30, no. 3 (119), pp. 104–121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2025ped3/104-121> (in Russian)

16 Nurseit A.T., Beisenbekova G.B., Manashova G.N., Kerimbaeva R.K. (2025). Vozmozhnosti sotsialno-pedagogicheskogo podhoda k inklüzivnomu obrazovaniiu [Possibilities of a socio-pedagogical approach to inclusive education]. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series*, vol. 30, no. 3 (119), pp. 30–38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2025ped3/30-38> (in Russian)

ИНКЛЮЗИВТІ БІЛІМ БЕРУДЕГІ АТА-АНАЛАР МЕН МЕКТЕП АРАСЫНДАҒЫ СЕРІКТЕСТІК: ҚАЗАҚСТАНДЫҚ МЕКТЕП ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ

К.С. Адильжанова^{1,*}, Б.Ш. Тұрғанбаева², Ш.Ш. Абишева², А. Туксанбаев³

¹Семей медицина университеті, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей қ.

²Шәкәрім университеті, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей қ.

³Астана халықаралық университеті, Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қ.

*e-mail: adilzhanova77@mail.ru, bejbitgulsakarimovna@gmail.com, Abisheva.s@bk.ru,
Dann54@mail.ru

Аңдатпа. Мақалада Қазақстандағы инклюзивті білім беру жағдайында ата-аналар мен мектеп арасындағы серіктестіктің ерекшеліктері қарастырылады. Зерттеудің өзектілігі жалпы білім беретін мектептерде инклюзивті практиканың кеңеюі тек ұйымдастырушылық және нормативтік өзгерістерді ғана емес, сонымен қатар отбасы мен білім беру ұйымы арасындағы тұрақты өзара әрекеттестікті қалыптастыруды да талап ететінімен айқындалады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – ата-аналар мен мектеп арасындағы серіктестіктің ерекшеліктерін талдау және ата-аналардың өзара әрекеттестікке берген бағаларымен байланысты қырлар мен хабарланған қиындықтарды айқындау. Зерттеу 2025 жылдың күзінде Семей қаласындағы жалпы білім беретін мектеп базасында жүргізілді. Зерттеуге оқушылардың ата-аналары мен заңды өкілдері қатарынан 82 респондент қатысты; олардың 25-і ерекше білім беру қажеттіліктері бар балалардың ата-аналары немесе заңды өкілдері болды. Әдіснамалық тұрғыдан жұмыс

сипаттамалық-талдамалық сипатқа ие және сандық әрі сапалық талдау рәсімдерін ұштастырады. Негізгі құрал ретінде ата-аналардың инклюзивті білім беруге қатынасы, мектеппен өзара әрекеттестікке берілген ишаралық бағалар, типтік қиындықтар блогы және ашық сұрақтарды қамтитын авторлық сауалнама пайдаланылды. Нәтижелер ата-аналардың инклюзивті білім беру идеясын жалпы оң қабылдайтынын, бірақ мектеппен нақты өзара әрекеттестік сапасына берілген бағалардың анағұрлым ұстамды болып қалатынын көрсетті. Ең осал қырлар ретінде кері байланыстың жүйелілігі, білім беру мәселелерін талқылау барысында ата-аналар пікірінің ескерілуі және педагогтер мен сүйемелдеу мамандары әрекеттерінің келісімділігі анықталды. Зерттеудің ғылыми құндылығы қазақстандық мектеп жағдайында ата-аналардың инклюзияны кеңінен қолдауы мектептің даярлығына берілген әркім бағалармен және серіктестіктің бірқатар қырларына берілген орташа бағалармен қатар жүретінін көрсетуінен тұрады. Нәтижелердің практикалық маңызы мектеп тәжірибесін жетілдірудің үш басымдығын айқындаумен байланысты: жүйелі кері байланыс, ата-аналардың білім беру шешімдеріне қатысуы және педагогтер мен сүйемелдеу мамандары әрекеттерінің үйлесімділігі.

Кілт сөздер: инклюзивті білім беру, ата-аналар, мектеп, серіктестік, ерекше білім беру қажеттіліктері бар балалар, отбасы мен мектептің өзара әрекеттестігі, педагогикалық қолдау, инклюзивті орта.

ПАРТНЁРСТВО РОДИТЕЛЕЙ И ШКОЛЫ В ИНКЛЮЗИВНОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ: ОПЫТ КАЗАХСТАНСКОЙ ШКОЛЫ

Адилъжанова К.С.^{1,*}, Турганбаева Б.Ш.², Абишева Ш.Ш.², Туксанбаев А.³

¹Медицинский университет Семей, Республика Казахстан, г. Семей

²Шәкәрім университет, Республика Казахстан, г. Семей

³Международный университет Астана, Республика Казахстан, г. Астана

*e-mail: adilzhanova77@mail.ru, bejbitgulsakarimovna@gmail.com, Abisheva.s@bk.ru,
Dann54@mail.ru

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются особенности партнёрства между родителями и школой в условиях инклюзивного образования в Казахстане. Актуальность исследования определяется тем, что расширение инклюзивной практики в общеобразовательных школах требует не только организационных и нормативных изменений, но и выстраивания устойчивого взаимодействия между семьёй и образовательной организацией. Цель исследования заключается в анализе особенностей партнёрства между родителями и школой и выявлении параметров и отмеченных респондентами трудностей, связанных с оценками взаимодействия со школой. Исследование проведено осенью 2025 года на базе общеобразовательной школы города Семей. В исследовании приняли участие 82 респондента из числа родителей и законных представителей школьников; 25 из них были родителями или законными представителями детей с особыми образовательными потребностями. Методологически работа имеет описательно-аналитический характер и сочетает количественные и качественные процедуры анализа. В качестве основного инструмента использовалась авторская анкета, включавшая вопросы об отношении родителей к инклюзивному образованию, школьные оценки взаимодействия со школой, блок типичных трудностей и открытые вопросы. Результаты показали, что при общем положительном отношении родителей к идее инклюзивного образования оценки реального качества взаимодействия со школой остаются более сдержанными. Наиболее уязвимыми аспектами выступают регулярность обратной связи, учёт мнения родителей при обсуждении образовательных вопросов и согласованность действий педагогов и специалистов сопровождения. Научная ценность исследования состоит в документировании на материале казахстанской школы сочетания широкой поддержки родителями идеи инклюзии со смешанными оценками готовности школы и умеренными оценками ряда параметров партнёрства. Практическая значимость результатов заключается в определении трёх приоритетов совершенствования школьной практики: регулярной обратной связи, участия родителей в образовательных решениях и согласованности действий педагогов и специалистов сопровождения.

Ключевые слова: инклюзивное образование, родители, школа, партнёрство, дети с особыми образовательными потребностями, взаимодействие семьи и школы, педагогическая поддержка, инклюзивная среда.

Information about authors:

Adilzhanova Kuralay – PhD, Acting Associate Professor, Semey Medical University (Kazakhstan, Semey, e-mail: adilzhanova77@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5690-0444>).

Turganbayeva Beibitgul – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Acting Associate Professor, Shakarim University (Kazakhstan, Semey, e-mail: bejbitgulsakarimovna@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5155-1126>).

Abisheva Sholpan – Lecturer, Shakarim University (Kazakhstan, Semey, e-mail: Abisheva.s@bk.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4444-8950>).

Tuksanbayev Asan – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, International University of Astana (Kazakhstan, Astana, e-mail: Dann54@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0499-1089>).

Авторлар туралы мәліметтер:

Адилжанова Куралай Советхановна – PhD, қауымдастырылған профессор м.а., Семей медицина университеті (Қазақстан, Семей қ., e-mail: adilzhanova77@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5690-0444>).

Тұрғанбаева Бейбітгүл Шәкәрімқызы – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор м.а., Шәкәрім университеті (Қазақстан, Семей қ., e-mail: bejbitgulsakarimovna@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5155-1126>).

Абишева Шолпан Шакаримовна – оқытушы, Шәкәрім университеті (Қазақстан, Семей қ., e-mail: Abisheva.s@bk.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4444-8950>).

Туксанбаев Асан – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент, Астана халықаралық университеті (Қазақстан, Астана қ., e-mail: Dann54@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0499-1089>).

Сведения об авторах:

Адилжанова Куралай Советхановна – PhD, и.о. ассоциированного профессора, Медицинский университет Семей (Казахстан, г. Семей, e-mail: adilzhanova77@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5690-0444>).

Турганбаева Бейбітгүл Шакаримқызы – кандидат педагогических наук, и.о. ассоциированного профессора, Шәкәрім университет (Казахстан, г. Семей, e-mail: bejbitgulsakarimovna@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5155-1126>).

Абишева Шолпан Шакаримовна – преподаватель, Шәкәрім университет (Казахстан, г. Семей, e-mail: Abisheva.s@bk.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4444-8950>).

Туксанбаев Асан – кандидат педагогических наук, доцент Международного университета Астана (Казахстан, г. Астана, e-mail: Dann54@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0499-1089>).