КАЗАЧІНЕР Олена Семенівна,
кандидат педагогічних наук, старший викладач
кафедри методики навчання мов і літератури,
КВНЗ «Харківська академія неперервної освіти»,
Україна
e-mail: *kazachiner@yandex.ru*

TEACHING SPECIAL-NEEDS STUDENTS IN A REGULAR CLASSROOM: PROBLEMS AND STRATEGIES

Анотація. Розглянуто проблему навчання дітей з особливими освітніми потребами у звичайних класах закладів загальної середньої освіти. Визначено основні проблеми, що пов'язані з особливостями впровадження інклюзивного навчання в сучасних умовах. Схарактеризовано провідні стратегії навчання дітей з особливими освітніми потребами разом з однолітками типового розвитку.

Ключові слова: інклюзивне навчання; діти з особливими освітніми потребами; навчальні стратегії, навчання за станціями; паралельне навчання; навчання в командах; альтернативне навчання; диференційовані інструкції.

Introduction. The need for teachers who have both the knowledge and the ability to teach special-education students is more critical today than ever before. A national push to take students with disabilities out of isolation means most now spend the majority of their days in general-education classrooms, rather than in separate special-education classes. That means general-education teachers have to teach students with disabilities.

Much recent research focuses on results for one of three groups of students: students with mild disabilities; those with more significant disabilities; or students who have not been identified as needing special education.

Even though the majority of the research available today supports inclusive education, there are a handful of studies that take an alternative position. For the most part, these studies report situations in which students are placed in general education classrooms without proper supports (Baines, Baines & Masterson, 1994), or they are in regular classrooms but not receiving special education, as defined by law (Zigmond & Baker, 1995). Such studies should definitely raise concerns. It is most inappropriate to «dump» students in classrooms where teachers are unprepared and lack resources to support special education needs in the regular class. These issues reflect the concern stated earlier that both of the terms «special education» and «inclusion» frequently become confused with a program or a place. When this happens, the discussion moves away from a focus on the goal of education, which is to create a successful school experience and to prepare students for life.

Numerous studies have examined various aspects of attitudes and relationships resulting from inclusion. For the most part, these studies document that efforts to include students with disabilities in the general education classroom have resulted in positive experiences and improved attitudes on the part of students, both with and without disabilities, and teachers alike. Studies by Helmstetter, Peck, and Giangreco (1994) and Stainback, Stainback, Moravcek, and Jackson (1992) found that students develop positive attitudes toward students with disabilities based on the experience of having disabled students in their classrooms. Helmstetter, et al. (1994) also noted that student friendships and relationships seem to be enhanced by inclusion, with greater understanding and empathy evidenced. Staub, Schwartz, Gallucci, and Peck (1995) noted, too, that inclusion facilitated peer friendships. Friendship networks and social relationships were enhanced for students with severe disabilities placed in general education in Fryxell and Kennedy's (1995) study. Both Hall (1994) and Evans, Salisbury, Palombaro, and Goldberg (1994) studied young children's social relationships. Hall (1994) identified reciprocal, positive relationships between children with

disabilities and their classmates. Evans, et al. (1994) found that children who attended classrooms with fully included peers with severe disabilities were able to display sophisticated judgments and suggestions when presented with scenarios of common situations.

Purpose. The aim of our research is to identify and to analyze the problems and strategies of teaching special-needs students in a regular classroom.

Main material. Many researchers (Lilly, 1988; Little, 1988; Pugach, 1988; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1988) hold that special education is really nothing more than a thoroughly good ordinary education and assume that the same sort of generic teaching skills, attitudes, and beliefs will be effective regardless of students' characteristics. However, research does not support the contention that all students can be taught successfully in general classes and many disagree that regular educators can assume responsibility for education and programming for all students with disabilities (Algozzine, Maheady, Sacca, O'Shea, & O'Shea, 1990; Braaten et al., 1988; Lieberman, 1991; Walker & Bullis, 1991).

Teachers struggle with the concept of inclusion for a variety of reasons. Some feel that the students with special needs slow the progression of the class, making it difficult to get through the curriculum. Educators often asked: Are students in core classes able to complete the entire required curriculum? How will this affect the outcome of standardized achievement tests? If merit pay is tied to achievement test scores, what will the effects be on education and teacher recruitment? Others believe that they will need to work harder to find meaningful assignments for those with special needs. One of the biggest fears for many teachers is that they will not be able to teach in the same way that they have become accustomed; special adaptations to style of teaching and content need to be made. For these and other reasons, some teachers view inclusion as a problem for teachers and regular education students.

A classroom teacher is expected to select educational methodology to best suit each student. This is a challenging goal for one teacher who potentially has more than 30 students in each of five to seven classes. Most students can be grouped with other students whose educational needs are similar. This may reduce the planning required to two or three groups.

The biggest problem for teachers who have students in inclusive classrooms is being available to every student. Students may have to be pulled out of class a few times a week for additional services, which also impacts the ability of the child and classroom teacher to maintain pace.

In a classroom of 30, with one or two special education students, it can be difficult for the classroom teacher to give the individual time and attention the students require and deserve. If the teacher is focusing on the special needs students, the students who need a more challenging environment may be overlooked because they are able to succeed with minimal assistance. While the students will likely succeed in the class, they may not feel challenged and may become bored and disinterested in the class. If the teacher tries to make the class more challenging for the mainstream students, the special education students may feel singled out when their IEP exceptions become more noticeable in areas such as presentations, projects, and homework requirements. Being in every class together may actually alienate the students more than, if they were separated for specific classes.

Students with behavioral disorders are viewed by many teachers as the most difficult to teach and the least likeable (Kauffman & Wong, 1991). Moreover, students are not included in a vacuum. They are in real classrooms in which the characteristics of teachers, children, and programs differ markedly. Teachers vary greatly in their attitudes, standards, tolerances, and expectations. Teachers' belief systems determine the standards they maintain for students, what behavior they will tolerate, how they expect individual students to behave, and the way they approach the tasks of instruction and management (Kauffman & Wong, 1991).

Though inclusion can occur with or without involvement from a special education teacher, a co-teaching arrangement is typical (Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, & McCulley, 2012). By working

together the general and special education teacher are better able to provide support for students with learning difficulties (LD) than the former could independently. As such, the need to remove students with LD for specialized instruction is eliminated. Although the definition of co-teaching is commonly simple, as suggested here, it is often operationalized broadly. For instance, Vaughn, Schumm, and Arguelles (1997) described five evidence-based models for co-teaching.

One such model is described as *One Teach, One Assist*. In this model one teacher is responsible for instructing all students while the second provides additional support for those who need it. A benefit to using this model is that not only students with LD benefit but also all students who need additional support are provided with extra instruction in the general education environment.

In some cases, the most effective use of two adults in one classroom is to have one person keep primary responsibility for teaching while the other circulates through the room assisting students as needed. The teacher in the supportive role monitors student work, addresses behavior issues, manages materials, and assists with student questions.

This model gives the teacher leading the lesson more power in the classroom than the teacher assisting. This can create an unwanted imbalance of power in the classroom both in the eyes of the students and the teachers. Assisting individual students one at a time can be an ineffective way to support them.

Station Teaching is another model for co-teaching. Students are divided into three separate groups in this model. During a block period, each group works with one of the two teachers in addition to having an independent work time. All students are able to benefit from this model by being able to receive small group instruction.

The Station Approach is a method of instruction in which small groups of students move through a series of learning centers, or stations, allowing teachers with limited resources to differentiate instruction by incorporating students' needs, interests, and learning styles. The Station Approach supports teaching abstract concepts as well as concepts that need a great deal of repetition. Stations can cover a single topic such as density, or several independent topics such as reviewing the scientific instruments. Stations can last one class period or several.

The Station Approach is actually an adaptation of the reading groups used in elementary school classrooms. The difference, however, is that in the elementary school model students rotate only to those stations that meet their specific learning needs, while in our approach every student rotates through each station and performs all the activities. Perhaps the greatest strength of the Station Approach is that it incorporates many concepts used for differentiated instruction.

In another model, *Parallel Teaching*, teachers are required to plan lessons together before splitting students in two groups. The teachers then teach the same lesson to these two small groups. In this model not only do students get the benefits of working in small groups, teachers also benefit by learning from each other's expertise.

The purpose of this model is to lower the student to teacher ratio while delivering the same content. This model of teaching can be beneficial to identify student need, and allow students a smaller setting to help create a higher comfort level among peers. Physical space can be a barrier in this type of setting, because sometimes having two people speaking at the same time can be distracting. A suggestion to alleviate this problem would be to teach the same content, but time the lesson so that the groups are on different schedules. For example, if one teacher is delivering content, the other teacher will have students work independently, and then switch.

Alternative Teaching is a co-teaching model where one teacher is responsible for teaching and the other is responsible for pre-teaching and re-teaching concepts to students who need additional support.

Alternative teaching refers to when one teacher works with the majority of students in a full class setting, and the second teacher pulls a small group of students out of the classroom

(or to an area of the classroom) to work together in a small group. In the small group, the second teacher can either teach the same content, while providing extra support to students who need it, or address individual student needs and academic gaps in content. Something to keep in mind is that it is important that the students do not feel singled out, and that they don't feel like working with one teacher over another «labels them».

Finally, in a *Team Teaching* model teachers provide instruction together in the same classroom. Teachers may take turns leading instruction or may model student behavior while the other teacher is instructing (e.g. how to take notes or ask questions appropriately). Research regarding the effectiveness of co-teaching is limiting. For instance, Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie (2007) suggested that the model was being used less effectively than it could be, in particular in regards to the (lack of) a role being played by special education teachers. Earlier, Murawski and Swanson (2001) concluded a lack of an empirical basis for the use of co-teaching, though more recent research (e.g., Scheeler, Congdon, & Stansbery, 2010) has used technology to provide immediate feedback to co-teachers with success. However, as stated above co-teaching is not the only means by which to educate students with LD in inclusive classrooms. It is possible for an individual teacher to differentiate their instruction for this purpose as well.

Differentiated instruction involves students with LD, and others with diverse learning needs, being supplied with instructional methods and materials that are matched to their individual needs (Scruggs, Mastropieri, & Marshak, 2012). The use of differentiated instruction requires general and special educators to possess flexible teaching approaches as well as to be flexible in adjusting the curriculum based upon student need (Obiakor, Harris, Mutua, Rotatori, & Algozzine, 2012). Tomlinson (2001) provides five guidelines for successfully differentiating instruction in inclusive classrooms: a) clarify all key concepts and generalizations, b) use assessment as a teaching tool to extend, not only measure, instruction, c) make critical and creative thinking a goal of lesson design, d) engage every student in learning, and e) provide a balance of tasks between what is assigned by the teacher and selected by the student. Being able to provide learning opportunities to all students within an inclusive classroom is certainly an advantage of differentiated instruction. Despite this advantage, the practice is not without limitations. One limitation is that some students may feel stigmatized because of receiving a perceived less challenging curriculum (Scruggs, Mastropieri, & Marshal, 2012). However, this limitation can be addressed when teachers provide effective differentiated instruction without appearing to single out any one student. Thus, by addressing this limitation, differentiated instruction can certainly be an effective method to include students with LD in inclusive classrooms. One example of a specific way to effectively meet the needs of diverse learners in heterogeneous learning groups, i.e. inclusive classrooms, is the use of peer mediated instruction and interventions (Maheady, Harper, & Mallette, 1991; Utley, Mortweet, & Greenwood, 1997).

Originality. Among dozens of technologies of teaching children with special educational needs, we singled out the most widespread and the most suitable of them for the teacher who works in general educational establishments. We also showed the problems connected with providing inclusive education in modern conditions.

Conclusions. While the regular classroom may not be the best learning environment for every child with a disability, it is highly desirable for all who can benefit. It provides contact with age peers and prepares all students for the diversity of the world beyond the classroom. In our research, we showed such problems connected with teaching in inclusive learning environment as: 1) some teachers feel that the students with special needs slow the progression of the class, making it difficult to get through the curriculum; 2) inability to teach in the same way that they have become accustomed; special adaptations to style of teaching and content need to be made; 3) a classroom teacher is expected to select educational methodology to best suit each student, what is a challenging goal for one teacher who

potentially has more than 30 students in each of five to seven classes; 4) teachers vary greatly in their attitudes, standards, tolerances, and expectations.

We analyzed and described five evidence-based models for co-teaching: One Teach, One Assist, Station Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Alternative Teaching, Team Teaching and besides differentiated instruction.

References

1. Algozzine, B., Maheady, L., Sacca, K., Q'Shea L., & Q'Shea D. (1990). Sometimes patent medicine works: A reply to Braaten, Kauffman, Polsgrove, and Nelson. *Exceptional Children*, 56, 552–557 (in Engl.)
2. Baines, L., Baines, C., & Masterson, C. (1994). Mainstreaming: One school's reality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76 (1), 39–40 (in Engl.)
3. Braaten, S., Kauffman, J. M., Braaten, B., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson C. M. (1988). The regular education initiative: Patent medicine for behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children*, 55, 21–28 (in Engl.)
4. Fryxell, D., & Kennedy, C. H. (1995). Placement along the continuum of services and its impact on students' social relationships. *Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 20 (4), 259–269 (in Engl.)
5. Helmstetter, E., Peck, C. A., & Giangreco, M. F. (1994). Outcomes of interactions with peers with moderate or severe disabilities: A statewide survey of high school students. *The Journal of the Association for Persons With Severe Handicaps*, 19 (4), 263–276 (in Engl.)
6. Kauffman, J. M., & Wong, K. L. H. (1991). Forum: Effective teachers of students with behavioral disorders: Are generic teaching skills enough? *Behavioral Disorders*, 16, 225–237 (in Engl.)
7. Lieberman, L. (1991). REI revisited ... again. *Exceptional Children*, 56, 561–526 (in Engl.)
8. Lilly, M. S. (1988). The regular education initiative: A force for change in general and special education. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*, 23, 253–260 (in Engl.)
9. Little, D. (1988). The redefinition of special education: Special ordinary education as individualizing in the regular classroom. *Education Canada*, 28, 36–43 (in Engl.)
10. Maheady, L., Harper, G. F., & Mallette, B. (1991). Peer-mediated instruction: A review of potential application for special education. *Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities International*, 7, 75–103 (in Engl.)
11. Obiakor, F. E., Harris, M., Mutua, K., Rotatori, A., & Algozzine, B. (2012). Making inclusion work in general education classrooms. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35, 477– 490 (in Engl.)
12. Pugach, M .C. (1988). Special education as a constraint in teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 52–59 (in Engl.)
13. Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 53, 391–398 (in Engl.)
14. Scheeler, M. C., Congdon, M., Stansbery, S. (2010). Providing immediate feedback to co teachers through bug-in-ear technology: An effective method of peer coaching in inclusion classrooms. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33, 83–96 (in Engl.)
15. Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. Exceptional Children, 73, 392–416 (in Engl.)
16. Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & Marshak, L. (2012). Peer-mediated instruction in inclusive secondary social studies learning: Direct and indirect learning effects. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 27, 12–20 (in Engl.)
17. Solis, M., Vaughn, S., Swanson, E., & McCulley, L. (2012). Collaborative models of instruction: The empirical foundation of inclusion and co-teaching. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49, 498–510 (in Engl.)
18. Staub, D., Schwartz, E., Gallucci, C., & Peck, C. (1994). Four portraits of friendship at an inclusive school. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 19 (4), 314–325 (in Engl.)
19. Utley, C. A., Mortweet, S. L., & Greenwood, C. R. (1997). Peer-mediated instruction and intervention. Focus of Exceptional Children, 29, 1–24 (in Engl.)
20. Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., & Arguelles, M. E. (1997). The ABCDE's of co-teaching. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 24, 67–74 (in Engl.)
21. Walker, H. M., & Bullis, M. (1991). Behavior disorders and the social context of regular class integration: A conceptual dilemma? In J. W. Lloyd, N. N. Singh, and A. Crepp (Eds.) The regular education initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues, and models (pp. 75–93)
22. Zigmond, N., & Baker, J. (1995). Concluding comments: Current and future practices in inclusive schooling. *The Journal of Special Education*, 29 (2), 245–250 (in Engl.)

Abstract. KAZACHINER Olena Semenivna. Teaching special-needs students in a regular classroom: problems and strategies.

Purpose. *The aim of this research is to identify and to analyze the problems and strategies of teaching special-needs students in a regular classroom.*

Methods of research are *analysis of scientific literature, synthesis, generalization, classification.*

The results of the research showed that there are such problems connected with teaching in inclusive learning environment as: 1) some teachers feel that the students with special needs slow the progression of the class, making it difficult to get through the curriculum; 2) inability to teach in the same way that they have become accustomed; special adaptations to style of teaching and content need to be made; 3) a classroom teacher is expected to select educational methodology to best suit each student, what is a challenging goal for one teacher who potentially has more than 30 students in each of five to seven classes; 4) teachers vary greatly in their attitudes, standards, tolerances, and expectations. We analyzed and described five evidence-based models for co-teaching: One Teach, One Assist, Station Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Alternative Teaching, and Team Teaching and besides differentiated instruction.

Originality. Among dozens of technologies of teaching children with special educational needs, we singled out the most widespread and the most suitable of them for the teacher who works in general educational establishments. We also showed the problems connected with providing inclusive education in modern conditions.

Conclusion. While the regular classroom may not be the best learning environment for every child with a disability, it is highly desirable for all who can benefit. It provides contact with age peers and prepares all students for the diversity of the world beyond the classroom.

Key words: inclusive education; children with special educational needs; educational strategies; Station Teaching; Parallel Teaching; Alternative Teaching; Team Teaching; Differentiated instruction.

УДК 373.29.2.015.31(045)   **КАЙКОВА Марина Миколаївна,**
викладач Уманського гуманітарно-педагогічного коледжу ім. Тараса Шевченка, м. Умань, Україна
e-mail: *m.kaikova@gmail.com*

ФОРМУВАННЯ ЖИТТЄВИХ ЦІННОСТЕЙ БАКАЛАВРІВ ДОШКІЛЬНОЇ ОСВІТИ НА РІЗНИХ ТИПАХ ЗАНЯТЬ ІЗ МУЗИЧНОГО МИСТЕЦТВА

Анотація. *Проаналізовано проблему формування життєвих цінностей у контексті професійної підготовки майбутнього бакалавра дошкільної освіти засобами музичних занять. Уточнено сутність поняття «формування життєвих цінностей бакалаврів дошкільної освіти», який розуміється як систематичний, сталий процес, що детермінований аксіологічним підходом до здійснення професійної підготовки педагогічних кадрів, спрямований на опануванням бакалаврами знань про загальнолюдські цінності, формування вмінь і навичок, переконань щодо неповторності дошкільного дитинства та ролі педагога в житті дитини, якими студент керуватиметься у своїй подальшій професійній діяльності та житті. Презентовано аналіз особливостей формування життєвих цінностей бакалаврів дошкільної освіти на заняттях із музичного мистецтва в контексті професійної підготовки і запропоновані методичні рекомендації щодо вдосконалення музичної освіти фахівців не музичних спеціальностей.*

Ключові слова: *бакалаври; дошкільна освіта; діти дошкільного віку; заняття; музичне мистецтво; освітній процес; аксіологічний підхід; життєві цінності.*

Постановка проблеми. Необхідність формування професійної культури студентів педагогічних закладів вищої освіти зумовлена зростаючими вимогами до рівня загальнокультурної, спеціальної й педагогічної підготовки випускників, потребами в постійній професійній самоосвіті й самовихованні, підготовкою майбутніх фахівців до професійного компетентного входження до ринку праці, що потребує готовності й уміння втілювати в життя гуманістичні ідеї, становлення системи