

## Fieldwork Experiences in Special Education and Rehabilitation Centers: A Qualitative Approach to the Perspective of Child Development Students\*

Esra Hazal ÇELEPİ\*\*, Rabia Nazıkar BOZACIOĞLU\*\*\*, Berk Efe ALTINAL\*\*\*\*

### Abstract

**Aim:** This study examines the experiences of child development students who had done fieldwork at various rehabilitation centers through a qualitative approach. The aim of the research was to reveal the experiences and problems encountered by the students in the institutions.

**Method:** To collect data, a set of questions were prepared and asked using a semi-structured face-to-face interview method. The study was conducted with 15 child development students who interned at special education and rehabilitation centers. The data was later analyzed using MAXQDA.

**Results:** Five main themes emerged in the data; theory-practice discrepancy, suggestions, insufficiencies, diversity, and experience. It was observed that special education and rehabilitation centers were generally perceived as inadequate by the fieldwork participants, but the fieldwork process itself is deemed valuable due to the opportunity to use theoretical knowledge in practice.

**Conclusion:** Universities should clarify fieldwork guidelines and create effective feedback mechanisms to align student experiences with learning goals

**Keywords:** Child development, rehabilitation centers, special education, fieldwork, higher education.

### Özel Eğitim ve Rehabilitasyon Merkezlerinde Alan Çalışması Deneyimleri: Çocuk Gelişimi Öğrencilerinin Niteliksel Görüşleri

### Öz

**Amaç:** Bu çalışma, farklı rehabilitasyon merkezlerinde alan çalışması gerçekleştiren çocuk gelişimi öğrencilerinin deneyimlerini nitel bir yaklaşımla incelemektedir. Araştırmanın amacı, alan çalışması gerçekleştirilen kurumlardaki deneyimlerini ve karşılaştıkları sorunları ortaya çıkarmaktır.

**Yöntem:** Veri toplamak için yarı yapılandırılmış yüz yüze görüşme yöntemi kullanılarak hazırlanan bir dizi soru setiyle 15 çocuk gelişimi öğrencisiyle çalışma yürütülmüştür. Veriler daha sonra MAXQDA kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir.

**Bulgular:** Verilerde beş ana tema belirlenmiştir: teori-pratik uyumsuzluğu, öneriler, eksiklikler, çeşitlilik ve deneyim. Alan çalışması gerçekleştiren öğrenciler tarafından genel olarak özel eğitim ve rehabilitasyon merkezlerinin yetersiz olarak algılandığı ancak alan çalışması sürecinin teorik bilginin pratiğe dönüştürülme fırsatı nedeniyle değerli bulunduğu gözlemlenmiştir.

### Özgün Araştırma Makalesi (Original Research Article)

**Geliş / Received:** 15.01.2025 & **Kabul / Accepted:** 07.07.2025

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.38079/igusabder.1599776>

\* The study has been supported and funded by TUBITAK as a part of the 2209-A Research Project Support Program for Undergraduate Students (2023/2 Term Call) ; This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 9th National Child Development Student Congress on December 13, 2024, with the title 'Özel Eğitim ve Rehabilitasyon Merkezlerinde Staj Deneyimi: Çocuk Gelişimi Öğrencilerinin Bakış Açısına Nitel Bir Yaklaşım'.

\*\* 2023/24 BA Alumni, Istanbul Gelisim University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Child Development (English), Istanbul, Türkiye. E-mail: [esrahazal15@gmail.com](mailto:esrahazal15@gmail.com) [ORCID https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4638-4895](https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4638-4895)

\*\*\* 2023/24 BA Alumni, Istanbul Gelisim University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Child Development (English), Istanbul, Türkiye. E-mail: [bzcogluabia@gmail.com](mailto:bzcogluabia@gmail.com) [ORCID https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7801-5631](https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7801-5631)

\*\*\*\* (Corresponding Author) Lecturer, Istanbul Gelisim University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Child Development (English), Istanbul, Türkiye. E-mail: [bealtinal@gelisim.edu.tr](mailto:bealtinal@gelisim.edu.tr) [ORCID https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6987-8012](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6987-8012)

**ETHICAL STATEMENT:** Istanbul Gelisim University Ethical Review Board approved the research protocol (Date: 29.02.2024, Decision Number: 2024-03).

**Sonuç:** Üniversiteler, alan çalışması deneyimlerini öğrenme hedefleriyle uyumlu hale getirmek için alan çalışması kılavuzlarını netleştirmeli ve etkili geri bildirim mekanizmaları oluşturmalıdır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Çocuk gelişimi, rehabilitasyon merkezleri, özel eğitim, alan çalışması, yükseköğrenim.

## Introduction

The fieldwork process is a fundamental aspect of health science education as it gives an opportunity for students to experience practical implementation of the theoretical knowledge acquired through bachelor's degree courses. As a health science department, Child Development education<sup>1</sup> also requires students to complete several fieldwork experiences both in preschool education and in special education and rehabilitation centers. The aim of these fieldwork requirements is to provide the right set of circumstances to observe the typical development of children as well as children with disabilities, neurodivergent children, and children who have special behavioral or mental conditions<sup>2</sup>.

The crucial role the fieldwork process plays in the health science undergraduate students, and particularly child development students, entails careful planning and implementation of the process. This is important not only for the students but also for the children who will encounter the fieldwork participants during the process and benefit from the services. For this reason, the vital purpose of maximizing the efficiency and educational value of the fieldwork process requires obtaining feedback from all involved parties — such as internship institutions, schools, and especially the undergraduate students who directly participate in the fieldwork.

Child development department is an undergraduate program that provides students with the necessary theoretical and practical knowledge to understand and support children's development. As in 2025, 44 different universities in Türkiye are training undergraduate students in Child Development departments<sup>3</sup>. In this department, detailed information is provided about children's physical, social, cognitive, and emotional development, and strategies are taught to support these developmental areas. Students examine the processes from the prenatal period to the end of adolescence of children. Language development, cognitive development, motor skills, socio-emotional development, and learning are among the focal points of this program. The standard curriculum in such programs covers typical developmental milestones and includes identifying atypical developmental patterns along with related interventions<sup>4</sup>.

The field of child development can be seen as an interdisciplinary field; considering the multifaceted nature of development, child development students are expected to explore many fields such as psychology, physiology, education science, and social sciences<sup>5</sup>. Child development studies, which largely depend on the literature of the fields such as education, public health, social services, medicine, biology, and anthropology, guide the practitioners' details, such as providing accurate information about children's development and creating realistic expectations for parents, guiding what to pay attention to and how to behave during the development process, and providing support in detecting developmental differences and making correct referrals<sup>2,6</sup>.

Special education and rehabilitation centers represent one of the key multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary domains where child development professionals play a significant role<sup>7</sup>. Special education encompasses services designed to elevate the developmental levels of children with significantly different developmental characteristics from their peers, aiming to meet their specific needs to the highest possible extent<sup>8</sup>. Special education centers are known as educational environments that aim to integrate individuals with special needs into society, aim to make them self-sufficient individuals, aim to support their cognitive, language, self-care, social, and physical developments, provide behavior teaching, and provide information and support to the families of individuals with special needs<sup>8</sup>.

In Türkiye, these centers operate under the supervision of the Ministry of National Education and are mostly private institutions contracted by the state. They provide individualized education programs (IEPs) for children with various developmental needs, including intellectual disabilities, autism spectrum disorder, and speech and language delays<sup>9</sup>. The core aim of these institutions is to support the cognitive, linguistic, motor, social-emotional, and adaptive development of children with disabilities, while also offering family education and psychosocial support. Services are typically delivered as weekly, outpatient-based sessions. Multidisciplinary teams collaborate in delivering these services, often comprising child development specialists, special education teachers, psychologists, physiotherapists, speech and language therapists, and social workers<sup>8,10</sup>.

Within these teams, child developmentalists take on a distinct and multi-faceted role. They are primarily responsible for identifying each child's developmental needs through formal and informal assessment methods, preparing individualized developmental programs, and selecting appropriate support materials and intervention strategies. Moreover, they provide play-based developmental support, monitor children's progress, and organize structured activities tailored to each child's cognitive and socio-emotional profile<sup>7,8</sup>. One of their most significant contributions is in family engagement: they provide guidance to parents about developmental goals, home-based reinforcement strategies, and emotional support throughout the intervention process<sup>7,8</sup>.

Even though there is at least one detailed report<sup>11</sup> considering the problems and areas of development for the special education and rehabilitation centers in Türkiye, to this day, very little has been done to document the perspectives, experiences, and opinions of the undergraduate fieldwork participants.

A review of the literature reveals that studies on the subject are limited. Kumru and Demirtaş's study focuses on the views of vocational high school students in child development. The findings showed that students positively evaluated skill training but expressed negative views about problems experienced with instructors. Additionally, it was stated that students emphasized art activities in their work with children during the fieldwork and were successful in applying theoretical knowledge. However, it can be said that this study does not cover the general student population and focuses only on a specific high school<sup>12</sup>.

In Acar-Çiftçi's evaluation, it was determined that despite students making various observations and applications during their fieldwork, reflective practices that form a

bridge between theory and practice were limited. The study focused only on associate degree programs and did not cover 4-year undergraduate programs<sup>13</sup>.

This study draws inspiration from the personal fieldwork experiences of two researchers who explored rehabilitation centers in socio-economically diverse environments. During their observations, they encountered striking disparities between two institutions they completed their fieldwork. The first, situated in a business center and characterized by low socio-economic status, lacked essential tools and exhibited indifferent instructors. In contrast, the second institution, designed specifically for autistic children, boasted high socio-economic status, proper tools, and attentive instructors. Based on these observations by the researchers, the study question, how the special education and rehabilitation centers and the fieldwork process were experienced by undergraduate fieldwork participants, emerged.

This study addresses rehabilitation centers from the perspective of students using qualitative phenomenological analysis. Specifically, understanding how students' fieldwork experiences reflect differences between institutions, how the students reflect differences between theoretical knowledge and applications of them in the field, and problems in the field from their perspective are main aims. Also, with an additional focus on international students, the effects of cultural diversity on these experiences are documented.

## Material and Methods

### *Participants*

In the research, the data collection process was facilitated through semi-structured in-depth interviews. For this purpose, one-on-one interviews were arranged with 15 child development students who conducted their fieldwork at Rehabilitation Centers or Special Education Centers. The interviews included open-ended questions that allowed students to share their experiences in depth. The full list of questions can be accessed from Table 1.

**Table 1.** Question list for semi-structured interviews.

English Translation of the questions
<p>What do you know about rehabilitation centers?</p> <p>Have you experienced anything that bothered you at the institution? Could you share?</p> <p>Was the education provided at the institution sufficient? If not, what solution would you propose?</p> <p>Were your experiences at the institution different from what you learned in school?</p> <p>In rehabilitation centers, which disciplines should educators receive training in? Do you think instructors from different fields should provide education, apart from special education teachers and child development specialists?</p> <p>In your opinion, should individuals with different special education needs receive education in a single institution, or should separate educational institutions be established based on each individual's needs?</p> <p>For international students: Have you experienced any incidents related to understanding, language, cultural differences, or other matters?</p>

Before the interview, the purpose and objectives of the research were explained in detail to the participants, and informed consent was obtained from the participants. The interviews to be conducted were recorded on a voice recorder with the participant's permission, and then the voice recording was transcribed, anonymizing the participant's name and the institution where they did their fieldwork. Participants were asked to fill out a form containing basic demographic information (such as age, gender, and university). Then a code number was given to the interview, matching the form and the interview. In this way, the participant's name was anonymized, and confidentiality was maintained.

Participants were selected from different universities and cultures to gather information from various perspectives. For this purpose, the aim was to conduct in-depth interviews with 15 participants who were students in the Child Development four-year undergraduate program and who have completed or are in the process of completing fieldwork at relevant institutions. The demographic information of the participants can be seen in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Demographic information about participants.

Code	Age	Gender	Grade	Fieldwork span
Participant 1 (P1)	22	Woman	Senior	1 semester
Participant 2 (P2)	24	Woman	Senior	2 semesters
Participant 3 (P3)	23	Woman	Senior	2 semesters
Participant 4 (P4)	24	Woman	Senior	2 semesters
Participant 5 (P5)	23	Woman	Senior	2 semesters
Participant 6 (P6)	23	Woman	Senior	1 semester
Participant 7 (P7)	22	Woman	Senior	2 semesters
Participant 8 (P8)	23	Woman	Senior	1 semester
Participant 9 (P9)	24	Woman	Graduate	More than 2 semesters
Participant 10 (P10)	24	Woman	Senior	1 semester
Participant 11 (P11)	23	Woman	Senior	2 semesters
Participant 12 (P12)	23	Woman	Senior	1 semester
Participant 13 (P13)	23	Man	Senior	1 semester
Participant 14 (P14)	26	Woman	Senior	2 semesters
Participant 15 (P15)	24	Woman	Senior	2 semesters

### ***Ethical Statement***

The research protocol has been approved by Istanbul Gelisim University Ethical Review Board (Date: 29.02.2024, Decision Number: 2024-03). The study has been supported and funded by TUBITAK as a part of the 2209-A Research Project Support Program for Undergraduate Students (2023/2 Term Call)

## Data Analysis

For the evaluation of the data, the phenomenological analysis method was used. Phenomenological analysis is a methodological approach that focuses on participants expressing their experiences without any mediation and is frequently used in health sciences<sup>14,15</sup>. This qualitative analysis allowed the data to be divided into meaningful themes and the interpretation of these themes. Thus, the data were analyzed in depth and in an explanatory manner in accordance with the purpose of the research. In the analysis, MAXQDA 2020 software was used in the stages of coding the data and creating a word cloud.

## Results

Based on the data obtained through interviews, a total of five main themes have emerged: theory-practice discrepancy, suggestions, insufficiencies, diversity, and experience. The themes will be examined with quotes from the interviews.

Figure 1 represents a word cloud containing frequently used words in the interviews conducted.

**Figure 1.** Word frequency cloud.



As can be seen, the most frequently used word was “education,” followed by “different”, “special”, “institution”, “rehabilitation”, and “teacher”. In the following section, the themes that emerged in the interviews are conveyed sequentially using quotations.

## Theory-Practice Differences

Participants mention the differences between the education they received at school and their fieldwork experiences in their interviews. It is emphasized that education at school is learned only theoretically from teachers, books, and other educational resources and does not have as much permanence as practice. It is emphasized that the fieldwork experience is more practical, the learned information is physically applied, and it is more permanent. The majority of the participants argued in their comments that practical experience is different from the theoretical knowledge learned and is more permanent. For example, participant (P11) stated in her comment that the education she received at school was superficial and insufficient, and that practice was more beneficial. She stated,



*“Of course it was different. I don’t think we covered very detailed topics related to special education at school. It was always theoretical, just a superficial process, but when I did my fieldwork, I witnessed almost all types of obstacles and learned how children developed. Therefore, doing fieldwork was better for me.”*

On the other hand, participant (P9) stated in her comment that the education she received at school was at a sufficient level, but practicing added more depth to the knowledge, and practicing was more important. She expressed,

*“Of course, when you go to the field, you are adding more knowledge to your existing knowledge, and you are also learning something from the teachers you interned with. Therefore, there are differences between what I learned at school and my experiences at the institution.”*

### **Suggestions**

Participants provided suggestions regarding both the educational content and the educators, as well as the institution itself. They highlighted that the quality of education and the competence of educators were perceived as insufficient within fieldwork institutions. The majority of participants emphasized the necessity of having professionals such as child development experts, psychologists, special education teachers, and occupational therapists within these institutions. While some participants advocated for the inclusion of all types of disabilities within a single institution, others suggested the establishment of separate institutions tailored to each specific type of disability.

For example, participant (P14) emphasized in her comment that the education given in the institution was not sufficient, and as a solution, the educators to be taken to the institution should be more knowledgeable and compassionate.

*“The education given in the institution was not sufficient, the solution I will suggest, I think the people taken or the people who graduate should be more knowledgeable or more compassionate.”*

Participant (P4) also emphasized in her comment that the education should be based on play and the educators should be gentler.

*“We learned that they’re supposed to be play-based and gentler, and you’re supposed to be patient with the children, but I never experienced that during my fieldworks.”*

Participant (P11) emphasized in her comment that different institutions should be opened for each type of disability, and as a reason, it can be focused more on a type of disability and more support can be provided for the child’s development.

*“I think different educational institutions should be established. As a reason for this, I can say this, if an institution is focused on only one type of disability, that type of disability is focused on a lot and more support is provided for the development of children. Therefore, I think a separate rehabilitation center should be established for each type of disability.”*

Participant (P5), on the other hand, emphasized in her comment that many types of disabilities should be in the same institution, and as a reason, a single child can have

multiple disabilities and need to receive education according to their needs in an institution.

*“There should be many types of disabilities in an institution, children, there is no child with only one disability. Let’s say a child needs physical therapy. At the same time, that child can also be mentally disabled, can be autistic. So, I don’t think it’s something specific to a single branch. Education should not be given from a single direction; education should be given according to the need.”*

### **Insufficiencies**

Participants highlighted both the inadequacy and deficiency of the education and educators, as well as the institutional shortcomings, in their comments. A significant number of participants emphasized the substandard education provided by the educators within the institutions. Some participants also pointed out the inadequacies of the institutional environment. For instance, one participant (P3) noted that interventions for disabled children were inappropriate, incorrect information was given to parents, and the education provided to the children was both insufficient and deficient.

*“So, there were disabled children and then maybe autistic. Another child with ADHD, another with language difficulties aged between 3-4 and five years old, and she wasn’t doing intervention properly and she was pretending to the parents that she was working with them day by day. So, she was working on just marketing. She was probably ohh every day like every. Half an hour, even taking videos and photos of stuff that she never applied on the children and then sending it to the group of the parents. And I am the one with the who’s attending there. I observed that nothing from the from such stuff has been actually applied.”*

Participant (P8) emphasized in her comment that the rooms in the institution were very small and there was not enough ventilation.

*“In the rehabilitation center, our rooms were very small and there was not enough ventilation. So, there were no rooms that saw the sun. I can say that we didn’t have windows inside the rooms. So, this situation was a bit disturbing but there was no other problem besides that.”*

### **Diversity**

In the interviews, the subject of diversity was only asked to international participants. It was asked to find out whether international participants had any incidents regarding mutual understanding, language difficulties, difficulties related to cultural differences or other issues in the institutions where they conducted their fieldwork.

For instance, participant (P3) used the following expressions in her comments, emphasizing that the institution is an international institution and that she did not have a problem with mutual understanding. She stated,

*“No, I didn’t endorse special education centers because my fieldworks were in international institutions that were speaking my language.”*



Participant (P4), on the other hand, used the following expressions in her comments, emphasizing that she had a language problem in the institution where she did her fieldwork and had a problem with understanding. She expressed,

*“Yes, I have as I been a foreign student here in Türkiye, so I have experienced the language barrier sometimes. And but after that there isn’t that much misunderstanding with the kids, but with parents, they might not understand you.”*

### **Experience**

Participants discussed the experiences they gained from situations and events during their fieldwork at the institutions. The comments made by the participants can be categorized into two groups: positive experiences and negative experiences. Some participants reported positive experiences, expressing satisfaction with the staff, educators, and educational programs provided at the institutions where they interned. Conversely, other participants reported negative experiences, highlighting dissatisfaction with the attitudes of educators towards children, the quality of education at the institution, and the behaviors of students.

As an example of a positive experience reported, participant (P13) emphasized in her comments that the institution where she did her fieldwork has an experienced and diverse staff. She stated,

*“The place where I am currently doing my fieldwork is quite good because it has a very experienced staff. There are experienced educators in many fields such as speech and language therapist, physiotherapist, occupational therapist, and psychologist.”*

Participant (P15), on the other hand, emphasized in her comments that she had a negative experience, stating that the attitudes towards children and the education provided at the institution where she did her fieldwork were insufficient, and that incorrect information was conveyed to parents. She expressed,

*“I think the attitudes towards children and the education provided are insufficient. These really bothered me because what was told to the parents was different from the attitude shown to the children, it was upsetting to see this.”*

Participant (P9) emphasized in her comments that she had a negative experience, highlighting situations such as a student with autism spectrum disorder not entering the class, trying to escape from the class, and biting the intern’s hand at the institution where she did her fieldwork. She stated,

*“The child was atypical autism but there were more typical autism behaviors than atypical autism, such as not entering the class and trying to escape from the class. Of course, I was standing at the door of the class because she had to take a session for 40 minutes and she should not leave the class, and at that time there was a situation like biting my hand.”*

### **Discussion**

This study aimed to explore the experiences of child development undergraduate students completing fieldwork in special education and rehabilitation centers in Türkiye. The interview data are organized into five key themes—theory-practice discrepancy, suggestions, insufficiencies, diversity, and experience—reveal multiple tensions between

the educational preparation of students and the structural realities of fieldwork institutions.

The most dominant theme was the gap between theoretical coursework and practical application. While students acknowledged the importance of foundational knowledge provided by university education, they frequently described it as overly abstract or lacking in real-world applicability. This is consistent with existing research highlighting that child development curricula often remain disconnected from field realities, especially in specialized contexts such as disability services<sup>8</sup>. Many students felt unprepared for the diversity and severity of needs they encountered in the field. This suggests that university programs should revisit the depth and breadth of their special education coursework, ensuring that theoretical content is more closely aligned with the practical demands of field settings. At the same time, it should be acknowledged that child development programs in Türkiye often include intensive fieldwork components, which serve as a critical bridge between theory and practice. This approach is a strong asset of in-person education, offering students invaluable real-life experience that cannot be fully replicated in online or distance education models.

Another theme centered around institutional capacity and staff competencies. Students reflected on instances where they perceived a lack of adequately prepared or responsive educators, and some described witnessing practices they found ethically concerning. Although special education and rehabilitation centers in Türkiye are subject to periodic inspections by the Ministry of National Education, student observations suggest that these evaluations may not always provide continuous insight into the everyday dynamics of child–educator interactions or the developmental relevance of implemented practices. In some cases, students reported that inaccurate or misleading information was conveyed to parents. While the accuracy of such accounts cannot be independently verified, the fact that students were able to identify and interpret these situations through an ethical lens indicates a growing sense of professional responsibility. This highlights the role of fieldwork not only as a platform for skill development but also as a critical context for fostering ethical awareness and reflective engagement with institutional practices.

There were also important divergences in how students envisioned the ideal institutional model. Some supported integrated institutions serving children with multiple disabilities, emphasizing flexibility and responsiveness to comorbidity. Others advocated for specialization by diagnosis, arguing that tailored environments could offer more targeted developmental support. This debate reflects an unresolved policy-level tension between inclusive and specialized service delivery in Türkiye’s special education and rehabilitation system. It also provides a valuable insight that students are not passive learners but emerging professionals actively engaging with educational philosophy and institutional structure.

The theme of diversity—though only addressed by international students—surfaced important contextual issues. Language barriers and cultural mismatches were experienced primarily in communication with parents, rather than with children. While these challenges reflect the need for better preparatory support for international students engaging in local fieldwork, they also point toward a promising direction for the

future of child development education in Türkiye. In particular, they underscore the potential benefits of expanding English-medium Child Development programs alongside Turkish-language offerings. Such programs not only increase accessibility for international students but also help cultivate multicultural competencies and broaden intervention practices in special education and rehabilitation settings. Given the ongoing global population movements driven by factors such as employment mobility, political conflict, and climate change, particularly in a country like Türkiye, the development of inclusive and linguistically diverse educational environments presents an opportunity for future advancement in university-level Child Development education. Such diversity in instruction makes the field more accessible to international students and supports the development of multicultural intervention practices in special education and rehabilitation centers.

Finally, students' overall experiences were polarized: some described centers as ethically questionable or structurally inadequate, while others reported highly professional and collaborative environments. A key differentiator appears to be the staff composition and institutional culture; centers with experienced, multidisciplinary teams (including psychologists, occupational therapists, and physiotherapists) were viewed more positively. This reinforces the importance of effective institutional coordination and suggests that fieldwork placement quality is not consistent, which could be addressed by stricter selection and support mechanisms from universities.

In sum, the findings point to areas within child development education that would benefit from thoughtful enhancement. Ensuring that students have access to structured internship opportunities and face-to-face learning environments within university settings is crucial. These spaces allow for the integration of theoretical knowledge with hands-on experience, guided by reflective dialogue and supervision from instructors. Strengthening the fieldwork process also requires fostering deeper collaboration between universities and special education and rehabilitation centers. These centers should be seen not merely as placement sites, but as active parties in the educational process—partners who help nurture the professional growth of students. Importantly, students participating in fieldwork should not be viewed as unpaid labor but as future professionals whose presence in the institution contributes to their academic formation. This shared responsibility model can lead to more ethically sound, pedagogically rich, and mutually beneficial field education experiences.

While these findings offer insights into the complexities of field training in child development, several limitations of the current study should be acknowledged. First, participants sometimes avoided speaking freely or offered contradictory responses. It appeared that the presence of the recording device created tension, leading some to portray their experiences more positively than they may have been. To address such challenges, future research could employ mixed-method designs, allowing for the combination of qualitative and quantitative data to strengthen the reliability of findings.

Second, the geographical scope of the study presents a limitation. All participants were based in İstanbul, yet only 12 out of the 44 universities in Türkiye with Child Development departments are located in the city. Broader research incorporating

participants from diverse provinces, including rural regions, would allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the national landscape.

Finally, future studies could benefit from including additional stakeholder perspectives, such as parents, educators, and institution administrators. A multi-voiced approach would contribute to a more holistic picture of the fieldwork experience and its systemic implications.

## Conclusion

This study explored the experiences of undergraduate child development students during their fieldwork in special education and rehabilitation centers in Türkiye. The findings highlighted meaningful tensions between university-based theoretical education and the realities of applied practice, raised concerns about institutional capacity and educator preparedness, and revealed diverse student perspectives on service models within special education. Experiences shared by international students also brought attention to linguistic and cultural dynamics in the field.

Considering these insights, there are several areas that offer opportunities for constructive development. University programs may consider enhancing the alignment between coursework and the complexities of fieldwork environments while also reinforcing supportive supervision structures. Special education and rehabilitation centers, in turn, could be engaged more actively as educational stakeholders—contributing not only to service delivery but also to the professional formation of future practitioners. Promoting open communication between universities and rehabilitation centers, as well as ensuring mutual understanding of the fieldwork’s educational objectives, may foster more consistent and enriching learning environments.

Importantly, the study highlights the value of empowering students not only as recipients of knowledge but also as reflective participants in shaping ethical and pedagogical standards. Field training, when grounded in strong institutional collaboration, holds the potential to cultivate not just skills, but professional judgment, critical engagement, and a sense of shared responsibility for quality care and inclusive practice.

## REFERENCES

1. Keskin AD, Bayhan NP. Çocuk gelişiminin dünü, bugünü ve yarını. *Erken Çocukluk Çalışmaları Dergisi*. 2020;4(3):881-900. doi: 10.24130/eccd-jecs.1967202043242.
2. Keskin AD, Baykoç N. Türkiye’de bulunan üniversitelerin lisans programlarının çocuk gelişimi açısından incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, Uluslararası Katılımlı 3 Çocuk Gelişimi ve Eğitimi Kongre Kitabı*. Published online 2015.
3. Çocuk Gelişimi (Fakülte) Programı Bulunan Tüm Üniversiteler. YÖK Lisans Atlası. 2025. Accessed June 29, 2025. <https://yokatlas.yok.gov.tr/lisans-bolum.php?b=10701>.
4. Aral N, Fındık Tanrıbuyurdu E, Yurteri Tiryaki A, Sağlam M, Aysu B. Türkiye Çocuk Gelişimi Alanındaki Lisansüstü Tezlerin İncelenmesi. *Ankara Sağlık Hizmetleri Dergisi*. 2015;14(1):7-16. doi: 10.1501/Ashd\_0000000103.

5. Berk LE. *Child Development*. (Edn 9Th, ed.). Pearson; 2017.
6. Gander MJ. *Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimi*. İmge Kitabevi; 2001.
7. Kaçmaz C, Kay MA, Boğa E, Temiz A, Ayanoğlu M, Sağlam M. Türkiye’de çocuk gelişimci olmak: çalışma alanları, görev ve yetkileri. *Çocuk ve Gelişim Dergisi*. 2022;4(8):117-133.
8. Yavuz EC, Kahraman ÖG. Özel eğitim ve rehabilitasyon merkezlerinde çocuk gelişimci olmak. *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet*. 2022;33(3):811-840. doi: 10.33417/tsh.979999.
9. *Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği (24736)*.; 2018. Accessed August 26, 2024. <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=24736&MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatTertip=5>
10. Elmacı D. Türkiye’de özel eğitim alanında korunmaya ihtiyacı olan çocuklar. *Ankara. Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*. 2022;23(2):409-429.
11. Çiftçi A. *Destek Özel Eğitim Hizmetlerinin Verimliliğinin Araştırılması Projesi (Desöp)*. T.C. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı Engelli ve Yaşlı Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü; 2013.
12. Kumru M, Demirtaş Z. İşletmelerde beceri eğitimine (staja) giden meslek lisesi çocuk gelişimi öğrencilerinin staja ilişkin görüşleri. *Hacettepe Fakültesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*. 2015;1(Özel Sayı 12):433-445.
13. Acar-Çiftçi Y. Bilgi ve eylem arasında köprü oluşturmak: Çocuk gelişimi önlisans programı öğrencilerinin yaz stajlarındaki öğrenmeleri üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Medeniyet Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 2022;6(1):45-64.
14. Larkin M, Watts S, Clifton E. Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qual Res Psychol*. 3(2):102-120.
15. Creswell JW. *Research Design*. SAGE Publications; 2009.