

## It Takes Two to Tango for Effective Co-Teaching: A Collaboration in Special Education

Lea Catherine Famisan

The Philippine Women's University

### Abstract

The growing utilization of co-teaching as an instructional delivery model in inclusive classrooms in the US and other inclusive school environments worldwide has contributed to the rising significance of classroom collaborations through co-teaching to support students with disabilities inside inclusive classrooms. Previous research about the efficacy of co-teaching and its benefits to the academic and social behavior outcomes of students with disabilities predominantly relied on a transverse study, thus unable to provide a defined and methodological outline or specification of the co-teaching efficiency and satisfaction. This study integrated Beninghof's five components of co-teaching, embedded the co-teaching models, individual or collaborative activities teachers used in inclusive classrooms, and the issues or challenges teachers face in administering co-teaching as an instructional delivery model. The study employed mixed methods, including thematic analysis and a Likert scale, to examine the qualitative data. A t-test, mean scores, and standard deviation were utilized to ascertain the quantitative data. The study's findings demonstrate that all components of co-teaching are necessary for successful collaboration in inclusive classrooms. The benefits of co-teaching are crucial for addressing students' academic, social-emotional, and independent functioning needs. The study also found that both co-taught teachers regularly use all six instructional models, with small groups being the most used practice for engaging students in individual or collaborative activities. Additionally, the study identified challenges faced by participants, including a lack of general understanding of co-teaching and how to implement it, highlighting the need for administrative support and initiatives.

**Keywords:** co-teaching activities, co-teaching components, co-teaching models, benefits of co-teaching, issues and challenges in co-teaching



## Introduction

Students with disabilities have a right to receive the same quality education and paired access to the same curriculum, learning opportunities, and resources provided by efficient teachers in the general education classroom. For this to happen, the least restrictive environment where students with disabilities should receive the service is determined by the IEP team and legally stated in Section 8 of their IEP. This specific section of the IEP presumes the least restrictive environment, the general education classroom unless there is a justification that the student will be provided service in a separate setting. The least restrictive environment underpins co-teaching as an instructional approach to provide special education services in the general education classroom and support the academic, social-emotional, and independent functioning needs of students with disabilities.

For a student to be eligible for special education services, an evaluation process called Eligibility Determination must be done first. The IEP team determines whether the child meets the eligibility criteria or not. Each member of the IEP gathers apposite data and documentation supporting the requirements that the disability harms the student's educational performance and whether special education services are required. Once it is determined that the student has a disability under the IDEA, an IEP evaluation follows. The IDEA also provides students with disabilities and their parents/guardians with procedural safeguards regarding identification, evaluation, educational placement, and the provision of FAPE to students with disabilities.

The reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2004 purveyed to educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. These two legislations accentuated the high standard of education students with disabilities should receive from the two teachers in the classroom, namely, the



general education teacher, who is an expert in content areas, and the special education teacher, in differentiation strategies. The commencement of a least restrictive environment has opened opportunities for inclusive education. These special education legislations induced the inclusive education movement to give the same learning opportunities to all students, especially those groups who have been traditionally excluded and marginalized due to their disabilities. This significant consideration has made inclusion a valuable learning opportunity for students with disabilities in general education classrooms. This expectation maximizes the services the special and general education teachers provide to support the diverse needs of students with disabilities in the classroom while working hand in hand.

Co-teaching is an instructional delivery model used by the general education teacher and special education teacher to support students with or without disabilities inside the general education classroom. It is a partnership between two teachers to meet the needs of all students despite their different learning styles. Both teachers demonstrate professionalism and share plans, responsibilities, assessments, and instructions with students. The general and special education teachers support all students in the classroom and comply with the service, accommodation, and modification stated in the IEP for students with disabilities. The researcher is a special education teacher who co-teaches with the general education teacher in a classroom in a US elementary school. The researcher has witnessed the effect of co-teaching and its benefit to students with or without disabilities inside the general education classroom. Using a co-teaching model, the researcher has observed good academic outcomes, positive social-emotional support, and increased independent functioning of most students, especially those with disabilities. For example, students with difficulty learning the skills and lessons are provided scaffolded instruction and modified activities through collaborative small-group learning. The researcher felt that when students with and without disabilities are



supported in the classroom, their engagement and confidence levels increase. Their independence, responsibility, self-advocacy, and task ownership improve. Their acquaintance with other peers promotes social awareness and a sense of belongingness.

The researcher was once a general education teacher in a public elementary school in the Philippines who had a chance to work with some special education teachers in the district. She had observed how students with disabilities were traditionally excluded and robbed of this kind of opportunity. Because of this, the researcher was inspired to use co-teaching as the focus of this study. The researcher believes co-teaching is an effective instructional delivery model that can be utilized in an inclusive classroom.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study investigated co-teaching as a means of meaningful collaboration between the general and special education teachers in the classroom toward addressing the academic, social-emotional, and functional needs of students with disabilities inside the general education classroom.

Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are the current practices of the participants with regard to co-teaching?
2. How do the participants assess the importance of co-teaching components based on their personal experience in inclusive classrooms in terms of:
  - 2.1 Roles and Responsibilities
  - 2.2 Professionalism
  - 2.3 Communication and Planning
  - 2.4 Assessment of the Academic Outcomes of Students with Disabilities
  - 2.5 Instruction?



3. To what extent do the participants consider the relevance of co-teaching benefits to students with and without disabilities in the area of:
  - 3.1 Academics
  - 3.2 Social-Emotional
  - 3.3 Independent Functioning?
4. How does the assessment of the two groups of participants regarding the importance of the co-teaching components based on their personal experience in inclusive classrooms compare?
5. How does the assessment of the two groups of participants concerning the relevance of the co-teaching benefits the students with and without disabilities in the general education classroom compare?
6. What are the issues or challenges faced by the participants in using co-teaching models to address the needs of students with disabilities and administering co-teaching in the general education classroom?
7. What training program may be proposed based on the findings of the study?

### **Literature Review**

This literature review discussed co-teaching-related studies, such as the history of special education, inclusion, co-teaching, current practices of teachers with regard to co-teaching, the importance of its component for a successful collaboration, and its benefits to students with disabilities in the general education classroom. It also includes issues or challenges teachers face in administering co-teaching and working with students with disabilities.



## Current Practices of Teachers with Regard to Co-Teaching

Friend and Bursuck (2009) described the six types of co-teaching models a general education teacher and special education teacher could utilize in the classroom; namely, *one teach, one observe*, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, team teaching, and one teach one assist. *One teach, one observe* is a model where one teacher delivers instruction, and the other gathers data about a specific student. Station teaching is where two teachers conduct different lessons simultaneously, related to the same content, through centers or stations. Parallel Teaching randomly divides the class in half, and teachers teach the same lesson to two groups simultaneously. Alternative Teaching is where one teacher works with a small group, and the others instruct the large group. Team Teaching is where teachers share responsibilities and teach together to the whole group. In using these teaching models, teachers provide students with disabilities services, accommodation, modification, and compliance to instructional goals stated in their IEPs while maximizing learning for the whole group of students. Rivera (2014) articulated that special education teachers work within the general education classroom, such as co-teachers, team teachers, small group instructors, and one-on-one support teachers.

Despite numerous co-teaching models, it required mutual decisions for teachers to decide which approach or model to use, which varies with the duration of when to use it. The teachers can explore which one is effective. Scruggs and Mastropieri (2017) declared that despite the overall generally positive attitudes toward inclusion and co-teaching, and a degree of support for its effectiveness, specific problems remain that need to be addressed in any co-teaching arrangement. However, in favor of co-teaching practice in general education to support students with disabilities, Sims (2021) declared that the quality of instruction needs to benefit all students and the focus on teaching ability is intended to include a broad range of



skills, including instruction, classroom management, assessment, and lesson planning. The teachers must accommodate and modify students' individual or collaborative activities to be able to follow the course of study. Some students learn in small group grouping inside the general education classroom. Grouping for instruction is the most effective and efficient approach to teaching basic skills (Archer & Hughes, 2011). With a low teacher-student ratio, each student can practice more deeply and frequently and receive feedback that they need within the instructional moments (Stein, 2018).

The teachers need to work together to help create a positive and effective learning environment. Cook and Landrum (2019) postulate that integrating effective practices into co-teaching increases students' engagement in the general education classroom. Their article has mentioned various co-teaching models to increase educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Fuchs et al. (2014), whose study results favored specialized intervention over inclusive instruction, indicating the need to monitor the progress of these students systematically and, if an inadequate response is revealed, the need for specialized intervention should be administered.

### **Components of Co-Teaching**

Beninghof (2012), from whom the theoretical framework of this study was anchored, presented in her book "Co-Teaching That Works" the components of co-teaching that the general education and special education teacher must consider in the general education classroom. The author has listed five components, namely, 1.) *Roles and Responsibility* describes if both teachers are actively engaged in the teaching process and if both specialists integrate his/her unique teaching expertise into the lesson to meet the academic needs of the students. 2.) *Communication* that includes the teachers' responsibility for major decisions regarding the instructional cycles and time to plan together to discuss issues related to



instruction. 3.) *Professionalism* considers the students' view about both adults as “teachers” with equal authority if the interactions between two teachers show respect for each other and if the teachers feel equally responsible for what happens in the classroom. 4.) *Assessments* focus on the necessary modifications and accommodations, frequently monitoring the progress on IEP objectives, learning behavior, and grading as a shared task. 5.) *Instruction* that covers the various grouping arrangements used to facilitate learning, instructional strategies that enhance the understanding of struggling students if the instructional lead is shared, if students with IEP are included so that their participation is as regular as possible, and if the students’ works are differentiated as necessary to meet their needs. Murawski and Bernhardt (2016) featured practical principles and strategies for implementing co-teaching, such as providing professional development on inclusion, collaboration, co-teaching, establishing scheduling strategies, partnering with the right teachers, supervising and evaluating strategically, and increasing institutionalized co--teaching practices.

The five components mentioned above are interconnected with each other. One cannot just know his roles and responsibilities without actualizing them, which would unfold the professionalism component, and one cannot just utilize instruction without communication to plan first. Lastly, the learning outcome is a necessary determinant of the effectiveness of all the components through assessment. Scruggs & Mastropieri (2017) support these components by affirming that teachers must be able to listen to their co-teaching partner and communicate their views and suggestions, especially during planning time together. The general and special education teacher must also know the content being taught to understand how to evaluate learning problems concerning this content and to plan and implement instructional techniques to address these problems. Mastering content knowledge, especially across multiple content areas for those who co-teach various classes, takes time and intentional effort.





On the other hand, Scruggs and Mastropieri (2017) described that the general education teacher is primarily responsible for content and curriculum planning and instruction. In contrast, the special education teacher is primarily responsible for evaluating problems in classroom learning and social behavior and providing strategies and interventions for addressing these problems. Da Fonte and Barton-Arwood (2017) stated that collaboration skills take time to develop, with many potential barriers that can limit successful teamwork and be more responsive to teacher candidates' development.

## **Benefits of Co-Teaching to Students with and Without Disabilities**

### **Academics**

Murdock et al. (2016) stressed co-teaching as an instructional delivery model to reach every learner. He stated that students with disabilities work in small groups to learn with more focus and learning stability, like morning meetings, extension presentations, and community individualized learning activities. (Wilson & Michaels, 2007) presented a study about student participation in co-taught classes that contributed to self-reported improvements in literacy. Students believed their skills improved. The study of Wilson & Michaels (2007) described a sense of connectedness and a growth of personal confidence, suggesting that coteaching, when delivered and supported appropriately, can help general and special education students develop perceptions with the potential to encourage literacy achievement.

### **Social-Emotional and Functioning**

Murdock et al. (2016) stated that teachers' positive interactions in the class benefit students learning and social participation. Although some research finds that special education teachers are not lead teachers, reports show that co-teaching rapport dramatically helps the students. Co-teachers and their students reported parity aspects were evidenced in



the relationships between and among the co-teachers and students, even when the general educator led most of the instruction.

Gokbulut et al. (2019) asserted in their study that students felt happy, successful, and academically prepared during the co-teaching practices. They found the materials used by their teachers interesting, were willing to attend the class, and were pleased to be in the general education classroom environment. Parents stated that they had concerns before the co-teaching practices were implemented. However, they stated that the variety of materials and homework used during the practices and seeing their child's academic progress made parents feel at ease with the new approach. Alquirani and Gut (2012) reported that inclusion allows students with severe disabilities to build social skills to establish relationships with their typically developing peers.

Co-teaching is extra helpful and fun (Strogilos & King-Sears, 2020) after investigating the interview result with students with or without disabilities about their experiences in a co-taught classroom. The study received a positive outcome. It mentioned that co-teaching had given them extra help and emotional support to transition to a new lesson by providing more detailed information and specialized accommodations. Alquirani and Gut (2012) reported that the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education setting is a successful approach for ensuring that those students develop skills in many different areas of academic achievement, social development, and general communication. Gokbulut et al. (2019), in their study of the impact of co-teaching practices in all-inclusive environments, concluded that it positively affected students' academic development and social needs. Students enjoyed increased self-confidence and developed a positive attitude toward co-teaching. The study's findings also showed that the success of co-



teaching is related to obtaining the same level of efficiency in children with typical development in the same classroom.

### **Perception of Teachers about Co-Teaching**

According to Hedin and Conderman (2020), pairing two teachers to work collaboratively makes effective teaching by providing two licensed professionals in the classroom to share their expertise and differentiate instruction for a wide range of learners in a general education class. King-Sears et al. (2020), from the perspective of middle school algebra co-teachers and their students with and without disabilities, said co-teachers found it helpful to have a co-teacher in the mainstream classroom. Students benefit from having an outstanding educator in the school by helping or assisting them with questions that the general education teacher cannot accommodate.

In her study, Maye (2021) revealed that teachers perceived co-teaching impacts good student achievement in special and general education subgroups. Still, co-teaching is a highly interactive teaching model and requires fully open and honest communication for this teaching model to be effective (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017).

### **Issues or Challenges Faced by Teachers in Administering Co-Teaching**

Bouck (2007) and Rivera et al. (2014) declared that the relationship between general and special education teachers is crucial to co-teaching; both must view themselves as equal. Scruggs & Mastropier (2017) stated that effective co-teaching depends on co-teachers engaging in a true partnership, in which the special education teacher helps design and implement the validated strategies known to be effective with students with disabilities and other special educational needs. Scruggs et al. (2007) reiterated that the lack of standard planning time is one of the most significant barriers to successful co-teaching. Moreover, Rexroat and Scott (2019) mentioned that having a defined purpose and selecting the right



teacher to co-teach with will help render co-teaching. Similarly, communication and collaboration are skills the teachers are taught to interact with others. Additionally, administrative support is requisite to facilitate co-teaching. It can start by initiating practical training about collaborative teaching, providing expected standard planning time, and cultivating a culture of shared goals in supporting students with disabilities in the classroom (Rivera, 2014). Many teachers, especially new special education teachers, can benefit from important information about implementing co-teaching effectively (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017).

Austin (2001) investigated that general education teachers did the most in the inclusive classroom. In addition, there was a consensus among special education and general education co-teachers that they generally worked well together, solicited each other's feedback, and benefited from working together. Further, both groups agreed that co-teaching was a worthwhile experience that improved their teaching.

In working with students with disabilities in the general education classroom, teachers might encounter academic, behavioral, and emotional issues. Scruggs & Mastropieri (2017) reported target role areas of teachers involving students, namely study skills, demonstrating problems with the study of classroom content and materials and social behavior, denoting problems with classroom behavior or sustaining attention. Moreover, in her study, Maye (2021) revealed that researchers and educators predominantly focus on the psychosocial influences of inclusion. Very little attention is paid to the actual academic learning that transpires when students with disabilities attend mainstream classes.



## Historical and Legislative Background of Special Education, Inclusion, and Co-Teaching

Education For All Handicapped Children Act, commonly known as PL 94-142, is a landmark federal law of Special education passed in 1975. It was amended in 1990 and became the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). It was amended again in 1997 to add more details, but still in the same name. The last reauthorization of this law was in 2004 as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA). This federal law, recognized as IDEA, ensured that all children and youth with disabilities have a right to free and appropriate public education FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE). (Hallahan, 2019) (Peery, 2017)

These legislations and litigations have played significant roles in how students with disabilities are now identified and educated appropriately. Furthermore, to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities, the law requires including these students in the public education system (Hallahan, 2019). Although these legislations led to other related cases and issues, such as the closing of premier institutions for people with disabilities, they strengthened the movement of including students with disabilities in general education classrooms and public schools (Kritikos, 2010). Inclusion in education integrates students with special needs to learn with regular students in the general education classroom. Their IEP states that they are given appropriate service inside the classroom. Perry (2017) approximated co-teaching as effective in its ideal forms. Students with special needs placed in general education according to their LRE classes are primarily supported by specialists, the special education teachers.

As inclusion evolved, co-teaching became more pervasive and accurate. It is now widely used in most public and private institutions across the US. Research studies have



spread within the field of education, recommending inclusion and co-teaching as an instructional delivery model to address the needs of students with disabilities inside the general education classroom. At the same time, other students in the class could also benefit from the service provided. It is generally accepted that most students, regardless of their disability, race, ethnicity, and language fluency, deserve full access to the general curriculum and to learn with their non-disabled peers as determined in section 8 of their IEP. In their study, Ali et al. (2006) ruled out that inclusive education enhances student social interaction and inclusion. Thus, it minimizes negative stereotypes of students with special needs. The findings of their study also showed that collaboration between general and special education teachers is essential and that there should be clear guidelines for implementing inclusive education. The study's findings have significant implications for the school administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders directly and indirectly involved in implementing inclusive education.

### **Definition of Co-Teaching**

Co-teaching is “two or more professionals delivering substantive instruction to a diverse or blended group of students in a single physical space.” They expand the view to dig deeper into a co-teaching definition by describing three essential characteristics. (Friend & Cook, 2007, as cited by Beninghof (2012)

Co-Teaching is:

1. Two qualified teachers (i.e., a general education teacher and a special education teacher)
2. Both teachers have an active role in the instructional learning process.
3. A heterogeneous group of students (i.e., general education and students with disabilities) participates in learning in a shared space (i.e., classroom).



4. The collaboration consists of either temporary (a few hours per day, per week, etc.) or permanent (full-time, yearlong) co-teaching experiences (Friend & Cook, 2007, as cited in Beninghof, 2012)

## Synthesis

The previous research about the efficacy of co-teaching and its benefits to the academic, social-emotional, and functioning outcomes of students with disabilities predominantly relied on a transverse study without a defined and methodological outline or specification of the co-teaching efficiency and satisfaction. Beninghof's theory, where this study is based, laid out the five co-teaching components that contribute to the successful student outcome. However, the difference in some studies is that the other studies only focus on one-three components, which, when put together, will arrive at the same components as Beninghof's. The previous research also showed that co-taught teachers only embedded in their teaching practice co-teaching models they feel were adequate and appropriate despite the availability of other current arrangements and co-teaching models introduced over a decade ago by Friend and Bursuck (2009). Although the literature review reveals various perspectives of teachers toward co-teaching models, co-taught teachers apply one to three co-teaching models that they prefer. Teachers in inclusive classrooms involve individual or collaborative activities, yet there was no result on which type of grouping is the most effective. Regarding the issues or challenges teachers face in administering co-teaching as an instructional delivery model, the majority of the studies have investigated that teachers still encounter problems and challenges in administering co-teaching in the classroom due to many factors, such as lack of general insights about co-teaching and how to implement it, necessitating administration task initiatives. The previous research investigations indicated that some components are essential for successful collaboration in an inclusive classroom but



only considered a few factors. Most studies favored the relevance of co-teaching benefits as paramount to students' academic, social-emotional, and independent functioning needs. Co-teachers in the US have been made aware of co-teaching through an administrative initiative to integrate co-teaching in the general education classroom. However, in some other countries worldwide, where collaboration in special education has yet to be fully established, this topic appears contemporary.

The literature mentioned above supported the present study in digging into the definiteness of the components, the co-teaching models used, the effective collaborative groupings, and the issues or challenges that need to be considered and addressed. Since the previous research studies provided limited information on coteaching's effectiveness, research related to co-teaching as collaboration in special education needs to be gathered to ensure the student's success and the positive impact of its utilization in the general education classroom.

## Methodology

This chapter presented the research design, locale, study participants, sampling technique, research instrument, validity/reliability, data gathering procedure, data treatment, and the study's ethical considerations.

### Research Design

The researcher used a mixed methods design involving collecting, mixing, or integrating quantitative and qualitative data in this study. According to Creswell (2018), mixed methods design is an approach to an inquiry involving collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, integrating the two forms of data, and using distinct designs that may involve philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks.

The techniques involved in collecting data are survey questionnaires and interview questions. The survey was used to get the qualitative data by determining the teachers'





perception of the importance of co-teaching components in administering co-teaching and the relevance of each component to address the academics, social-emotional, and functioning needs of students with and without disabilities in the general education classroom. This design was used to answer statements of problems 1, 3, 4, and 5. On the other hand, the interview was used to gather the quantitative data by determining the participants' current practices in co-teaching as an instructional delivery model and the issues teachers face in administering co-teaching, and the challenges in working with students with disabilities. This design was used to answer statements of problems 2 and 6.

### **Research Locale**

The study was conducted primarily in the two schools in the District of Chicago Public Schools in Chicago, Illinois, USA, after securing permission to conduct the study. The two elementary schools were the Thomas J Waters Elementary School and James Monroe Elementary School. Thomas J Waters Elementary School is a level 1+ rated neighborhood elementary school with magnet cluster programs specializing in fine and performing arts, ecology, and technology. James Monroe Elementary School is a magnet school in the multicultural neighborhood of Logan Square that caters to programs such as a symphony orchestra & band program, computer coding, art courses, opera for all, Puerto Rican Arts Alliance, YMCA After School, STEM Lab, Monthly Family Nights, and Rigorous Common Core Instruction. These two schools cater special education programs and services in the resource room and general education classrooms, where support, accommodation, and modifications are provided.

The study was also conducted on a group of International Filipino Teachers sponsored by the Chicago Public Schools under its Exchange Visitor Program to work as Special Education Teachers in different elementary schools across the district. The permission to



conduct was secured through the responsible officer for the program. Since the study's findings aimed to serve as a reference for the special education system and support inclusion programs in the Philippines, the researcher thought that the perceptions and experiences of Filipino Special Education Teachers about co-teaching are valuable.

### Participants of the Study

The study's primary data sources were gathered from the twenty-one (21) Special Education Teachers and fifteen (15) General Education Teachers currently teaching in elementary schools of the District of Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, Illinois, USA. All the participants had at least two (2) years of co-teaching experience and with Professional Educator License (PEL) as a valid teaching license endorsed by the Illinois State Board of Education. Special education teachers also carry Learning Behavior Specialist Endorsement (LBS) as one of the qualifications to teach special education in the US. These teachers' qualifications and co-teaching experience made them the best participants for the current study. The distribution of participants is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Distribution of Participants (Survey Questionnaire)*

Schools/ Program	Special Education Teachers	Percentage	General Education Teachers	Percentage
Thomas J. Waters Elementary School	4	19%	13	87%
James Monroe Elementary School	4	19%	2	13%
Visiting International Filipino Teachers	13	62%		
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Table 2**

*Distribution of Participants (Interview)*

<b>Schools/Program</b>	<b>Special Education Teachers</b>	<b>General Education Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Thomas J. Waters Elementary School	0	3	50
Visiting International Filipino Teachers	3	0	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>

### **Sampling Technique**

The participant's data were taken using purposive sampling. The selected samples were based on the study's objectives regarding current co-teaching practices, the importance of co-teaching components, the relevance of co-teaching benefits, and issues and challenges the participants face in administering co-teaching. It also considered the population's characteristics, such as employment status, designation, educational attainment, and teaching experience. Thirty-six teachers, 15 general education teachers, and 21 special education teachers participated in the survey. Six (6) teachers, 3 General and 3 Special Education Teachers, selected from the same population, participated in the interview. Overall, 36 teachers were involved in the research. The study's data represented the participants' responses to the survey questionnaire and interview.

### **Research Instruments**

This research used survey questionnaires and interview guide questions to generate participant information. These are the most appropriate instruments to get the qualitative and quantitative data necessary to report the reliability and validity of the study. The survey questionnaire content was adapted from Anne M. Beninghof's book "Co-Teaching that



Works” about components of co-teaching for a successful collaboration. The author approved the instrument’s adaptation, and the proof of authorization was secured in the email. The researcher has added the relevance of co-teaching benefits to the students with disabilities in the survey instrument to see the correlation between the two variables.

On the other hand, the interview questions were researcher-made questionnaires to determine the teachers’ current practices regarding co-teaching and the issues and challenges teachers face in administering inclusion and working with students with disabilities.

The tools were written and answered in the English language. The survey form had an introduction stating the study's purpose and instructions on using the rating scales. The survey questionnaires were divided into three sections. The first section of the survey contained the professional profile of the teachers, such as their name, work email, educational attainment, designation, and years of teaching experience. The second section contained statements that measured the importance of components of co-teaching in the classroom. There were five co-teaching components, each with 2-5 sub-statements. The participants rated each statement using a four-point rating scale; namely, four (4) for very important, three (3) for moderately important, two (2) for slightly important, and one (1) for not at all important to indicate the importance of the co-teaching components. The third section contained statements that gauged the relevance of co-teaching benefits to the students with or without disabilities in the areas of academic, social-emotional, and executive functioning. Each of the areas had five sub statements. The participants rated each statement using a four-point rating scale; namely, four (4) very great extent, three (3) great extent, two (2) moderate extent, and one (1) least extent to indicate the degree of relevance of the co-teaching benefits. The section 2 and 3 questionnaires, being the focal point of the survey, had a total of 32 sub-statements. The



distribution of the weighted mean with the corresponding interpretations of the participants' responses is shown in the scoring guide below.

**Table 3**

*Table of Interpretation*

Rating Scale	Mean Score	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.50 - 4.00	Very Great Extent
3	2.50 - 3.49	Great Extent
2	1.50 - 2.49	Moderate Extent
1	1.00 - 1.49	Least Extent

On the other hand, the interview gathered information focused on the participants' current co-teaching practices and the issues or challenges faced by the participants. The first two questions answered the current practices of the participants regarding co-teaching, what models of co-teaching they are currently using, and examples of individual or collaborative activities the teachers employ. The following two questions answered the issues and challenges faced by the participants in administering co-teaching in the classroom and working with students with disabilities. There were four main interview questions in total. However, the researcher expressly provided follow-up questions during the interviews to support the focus questions.

### **Validity and Reliability of Instruments**

To ensure the appropriateness of the research instrument, the content of the survey questionnaire and interview guide questions was tested for validity and reliability by the following people who experts in the pedagogical approaches of co-teaching and experts in co-teaching supervision are. The group of validators consisted of the author of the book "Co-



Teaching that Works," where survey questionnaires were adapted, an Associate Professor of the Department of Special Education at Northeastern Illinois University, a Former District Supervisor under the Department of Education of the Philippines, and a Current Special Education Teacher at the New York District 27, a Chicago Public School Case Manager and Special Education Teacher, a Chicago Public School Case Manager and former General Education Teacher, and a Special Education Teacher at New York District 27.

A dry run or pilot testing of the survey questionnaires followed by the computation of Cronbach Alpha was done to determine the questionnaire's reliability. After the data from pilot testing was collected, Cronbach Alpha's coefficient was calculated for each factor separately. Pre-test administration was conducted on the same population of teachers. Five (5) special education teachers and five (5) general education teachers participated in Pilot Testing. The final checking of the study instrument ensured that no significant errors were present in the components and benefits of co-teaching as the basis of this study. On the other hand, the inter-rater was used to validate the interview guide questions.

The reliability test findings for the items from the questionnaire in the study include the case processing summary and reliability statistics. The case processing summary contained ten valid participants and included all the data. In the reliability statistics, the total number of items was 20, and the computed Cronbach's Alpha was 0.926, more significant than 0.70. Hence, the items in the scale have good internal consistency. Based on the reliability test result certified and corrected by a statistician, the researcher was recommended to administer the questionnaire.

### **Data Gathering Procedures**

The data were gathered following the procedures. First, the researcher obtained the study's approval from the Philippine Women's University Ethics Board and was provided



with a certification to proceed. Second, the researcher sought permission from the Chicago Public Schools Administration Representative to conduct the study on the two elementary schools and the visiting international teachers' program. Third, when the permission and recommendation letter were secured, the researcher contacted the two school principals and the visiting international teachers' program director to confirm permission and authorization to administer the survey and interview to the general and special education teachers. Fourth, when the principals and the program director approved, the researcher sent an electronic consent email to the general education and special education teachers of the two schools and the program. Upon receiving the consent email, the teachers could decline or accept participation. Thus, participation is voluntary at the discretion of the participants. Fifth, participants who agreed to participate received the Survey Questionnaire through a *Google Form*. The participants were then given two months to answer the survey at their convenience outside of school hours and did not impact the in-classroom duties or experiences of the teachers.

Simultaneously with the survey administration, the researcher facilitated the interview with the selected teachers from the same population of participants. The researcher sought the cooperation of the general education and special education teachers in setting up an interview schedule considering both parties' availability. Interview schedules were administered within the identified timeframe to avoid scheduling conflicts. The interviews were done in person or remotely through Google Meet, according to each teacher's preference. All interviews were recorded for reliability and transcribed with fidelity.

Finally, to ensure the one hundred percent retrieval of the survey forms, the researcher remotely and personally gave reminders and followed up on retrieving the participants' accomplished questionnaires through email and in-person visits. Once the participants had



done and submitted, the researcher received the result. All data were collected in two months from the start of the administration.

### **Treatment of Data**

After collecting all the data, the researcher collated, summarized, encoded, tabulated, and tallied the research participants' responses. The following statistical tools were used to arrive at the study's results.

For SOP 1 and 6, thematic analysis was used. This method was used for analyzing qualitative data. It is usually applied to texts, such as interview transcripts. The researcher closely examined the data to identify common themes – topics, ideas, and patterns of meaning that come up repeatedly.

For SOP 2 and 3, the mean score and standard deviation were utilized. The mean score was used in this research to determine if the participants' average score (mean value) where the data set is equal to the total of all the values in the data set (divided by the total number of values). Standard deviation was used in the study to quantify the amount of variation or dispersion of a group of data values. A standard deviation indicates how much the participants' data's importance differs from the average mean.

For SOP 4 and 5, the t-test was used. It determined the significant differences between the two participants' perceptions of co-teaching.

The Rating Scale was also utilized in close-ended questions, along with a set of categories as options for participants. It helped gain information on the qualitative and quantitative attributes.

### **Ethical Consideration**

The study's data gathering was pursued after the District of Chicago Public Schools representative approved permission to conduct the study. A recommendation letter was shared





with the principals, general and special education teachers, and Visiting International Teachers. The researcher respectfully requested the voluntary participation of general and special education teachers without harm or forceful action. The researcher included a disclosure agreement in the permission letter that all personal information and data will be protected against unlawful, unauthorized access and kept confidential. The information will only be used to respond to the request and to analyze the study.

All of the data gathered from the respondents were treated with utmost privacy and confidentiality and was solely for academic purposes only. The researcher upheld observance of the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

## Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the statistical data of the investigation results. This part of the study also includes data analysis and interpretation.

### 1. The Current Practices of the Participants with Regard to Co-Teaching

Table 4

#### *The Current Practices of the Participants with Regard to Co-Teaching*

Themes	Significant Statements
<b>Arrangement/Co-Teaching Models Commonly Used by General and Special Education Teachers in the Classroom</b>	“One teacher can work with the whole group, and the other can work with a small group of students needing more academic support. We use alternative teaching, where a special education teacher works with a small group, and the general education teacher works with a larger group or vice versa.” (Participant 1)
	“One, teach one assist. We use this model during phonics lessons, where one teacher is teaching while another is assisting. Another one is one teach; one observes model where either one of the teachers will be teaching. Then the other teacher will observe the students and how they respond to



	<p>any lesson or activity, specifically in math, where the class rotates between different groups of students and work with their differentiated activities during a new math skill that will be learned during the academic period.” (Participant 2)</p>
	<p>“Collaborative teaching where teachers randomly divide the class in half. Each teacher simultaneously teaches the same lesson to two groups. Both teachers plan the lessons, and in that joint lesson plan, there is a differentiation of activities and groupings of students they handle within the class.” (Participant 3)</p>
	<p>“We use station teaching. “It is when the class is divided into two groups. So then, they are given learning centers and rotate throughout those learning centers for the whole journey of the academic period.”</p> <p>“Another one is one teach, one assist model. It is when the general education teacher is doing whole group instruction, and the special education teacher assists those students who need support, usually during independent work, where students benefit from feedback, redirections, and accommodations.” (Participant 4)</p>
	<p>“We use a model where one teacher is with one team of students, another is with another team of students, which works out and can be used across all subjects. It is helpful for students when working through a specific topic or a subject, and it is a better time for students to have questions and dig deeper into the topic.”</p> <p>“Station teaching is where students rotate through different stations and do different lesson practices, which helps students gain a little independence to learn with some of the time they have during that class period. And then it also allows teachers to</p>



	<p>meet with a small group during that time. Both teachers work with different groups while students go to the different stations.” (Participant 5).</p>
	<p>“One of my favorites that I did when we worked together to assist our diverse learners was the team-teaching model “team teaching is when both teachers plan and teach lessons simultaneously. This way, teachers can use their expertise and bring unique special talents to the room. Teachers can take turns in instruction and supporting students. So, the students can learn in many ways because teachers can accommodate different learning styles. For example, there might be a situation when the general education teacher teaches a concept that students, especially those with disabilities, do not necessarily understand. Then the special education teacher can explain it using her expertise. Both teachers provide support at the same time.” (Participant 6)</p>
<p><b>Specific Examples of Individual or Collaborative Activities Using Any Co-Teaching Model</b></p>	<p>“Aside from providing individual and collaborative activities in a small or whole group, they use various accommodations, which are very helpful in supporting learning.”</p> <p>“Since students with disabilities and some of the students without disabilities who need extra support have diverse needs, the teacher also provides modifications by making the lesson simple, extending more time to finish work, lessening items in their worksheets, providing more visuals and modeling, more hands-on activity, providing various graphic organizers, and scaffolded instruction, ensure good learning outcomes and high student engagement.” (Participant 1)</p> <p>“We use a small group as an instructional practice to provide individual and collaborative activities to our students. For example, we use the Foundations Reading Program to teach reading</p>



	<p>foundation skills. This program has good phonics strategies and multisensory approaches, such as a tapping procedure to sound out individual phonemes of the word. We also use large, sound, graphic cards to help students master the letter-keyword-sound correspondence. We provide magnetic letter tiles, gel word boards, dry-erase writing tablets, student notebooks for level, a composition book, a writing and drawing pad, a foundations journal, play dough, beans, sand, etc., visual posters, and Promethean board access to reinforce students’ engagement in either individual or collaborative activities. Students are more engaged when these multisensory resources are incorporated into activities.” (Participant 2)</p>
	<p>“When students are in small groups, especially those who need more help transitioning between activities and remaining on task, they use a timer, visual schedules, a First-Then chart, 2- clock breaks, and an emotion chart. For the whole group, putting picture schedules help them know where to go without the teachers telling them daily.” (Participant 3)</p>
	<p>“We also use differentiated strategies during math. We provide math manipulatives, such as unifix cubes, counters, and other tactile materials.” (Participant 4)</p>
	<p>“In the classroom, we utilize co-teaching models activities, such as peer mentoring by helping classmates who need help with a lesson, read-to-self using EPIC online books, read-to-someone, IXL for math and reading skill practice, guided reading with the teacher, group works, group share, and more.” (Participant 5)</p>
	<p>“Alongside providing resources, accommodations, and modifications in individual and collaborative</p>



	activities, teachers should also consider the grade-level content standards to incorporate into activities. We should ensure that the lesson modification aligns with the grade-level standards or IEP goals of those students with disabilities, which also aligns with their grade-level performance.” (Participant 6)
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### **Theme 1: Arrangement/Co-Teaching Models Commonly Used by General and Special Education Teachers in the Classroom**

It is imperative to consider different co-teaching models in collaborative teaching to primarily support students with disabilities inside the general education classroom, where students without disabilities could also benefit. Co-taught teachers in the US have been using all six co-teaching models inside the general education classroom, conjecturing that good co-teaching models or arrangements benefit all students. The participants of this study shared some co-teaching models they are currently using in their classrooms.

As mentioned by Participant 1, “One teacher can work with the whole group, and the other can work with a small group of students needing more academic support.” This statement exemplifies alternative teaching, where a special education teacher works with a small group, and the general education teacher works with a larger group or vice versa. In such a manner, a special education teacher or general education teacher can have an opportunity to deliver the lessons again in a small group of 3-5 students with or without disabilities who need explicit, scaffolded instruction to understand the lesson’s content. Participant 5 also agreed to alternative teaching, which she explained profoundly and described as “helpful for students when working through a specific topic or a subject.” Another example similar to this model, according to Participant 4, is station teaching. “It is when the class is divided into 3-5 small groups. They are given learning centers and rotate



throughout those learning centers for the whole journey of the academic period.” Participant 5 also used station teaching and elucidated, “Station teaching is where students rotate through different stations and do different lesson practices.” Another model with a grouping method that is sometimes used in the classroom is parallel teaching. Participant 3 expounded it as “collaborative teaching where teachers randomly divide the class in half. Each teacher simultaneously teaches the same lesson to two groups.” Moreover, Participant 6 believes that team teaching is an effective co-teaching model in the classroom. Participant 6 elaborated on “team teaching as both teachers plan and teach lessons simultaneously.”

The co-teaching models mentioned above relate to the study of Rivera (2014), who declares that special education teachers work within the general education classroom in various roles, such as co-teachers, team teachers, small group instructors, and one-on-one support teachers.

Meanwhile, participants 2 and 4, who happened to be co-teachers in the classroom, used the *One Teach, One Assist Model*. Participant 4 described it as when the general education teacher is doing whole group instruction, and the special education teacher assists those students who need support, usually during independent work, where students benefit from feedback, redirections, and accommodations. Participant 2 also appended the *One Teach, One Observes Model*, which is where either one of the teachers will be teaching. Then the other teacher will observe the students and how they respond to any lesson or activity and work with their differentiated activities during the academic period.

The above statement explains that students can benefit from two teachers simultaneously by providing their unique expertise to increase students’ educational outcomes. Cook and Landrum (2019) postulate that integrating effective practices into co-teaching increases students’ engagement in the general education classroom.



This differs from Scruggs and Mastropieri's (2017) research, which declared that despite the overall generally positive attitudes toward inclusion and co-teaching and a degree of support for its effectiveness, specific problems must be addressed in any co-teaching arrangement.

## **Theme 2: Specific Examples of Individual or Collaborative Activities Using Any Co-Teaching Model**

Teachers in a co-taught classroom provide different individual and collaborative activities using any co-teaching model according to the student's preferred learning styles to produce good academic outcomes. This is an excellent opportunity for teachers to help students reach their full potential by ensuring that they are engaged in the activity and can ultimately explain the concepts learned at the end of the lesson.

Participants 2 and 4, co-teachers in one school, mentioned, “We use a small group as an instructional practice to provide individual and collaborative activities to our students in all subjects. Participant 2 added, “We also use differentiated strategies during the lesson. Participant 5 affixed other individual and collaborative activities using co-teaching models, such as peer mentoring by helping classmates who need help with a lesson, read-to-self using EPIC online books, read-to-someone, IXL for math and reading skill practice, guided reading with the teacher, group works, group share, and more.

On the other hand, Participants 1 and 3 brought up that aside from providing individual and collaborative activities in a small or whole group, they use various accommodations, which are very helpful in supporting learning. Participant 3 exemplified that they allow students to use various resources in small and whole groups. Participant 1 shared that “since students with disabilities and some of the students without disabilities bra support, have diverse needs, the teacher also provides modifications in the lesson.



All the above perception of teachers exemplifies reasonable individual and collaborative activities using various strategies, resources, accommodations, and modifications that will meet all students' learning styles. Further, it can be assumed that students with and without disabilities can be engaged in learning given proper support from two teachers. The statement relates to the study of Sims (2021), which declares that the quality of instruction needs to benefit all students. The focus on teaching ability is intended to include a broad range of skills, including instruction, classroom management, assessment, and lesson planning. The teachers must accommodate and modify students' individual or collaborative activities following the course of study. The teachers need to work together to help create a positive and effective learning environment.

Meanwhile, Participant 6 believes that alongside providing resources, accommodations, and modifications in individual and collaborative activities, teachers should also consider the grade-level content standards to incorporate into activities. We should ensure that the lesson modification aligns with the grade-level standards or IEP goals of those students with disabilities.

The statement of the participants above explains that when the teachers have enough excellent resources to use in the classroom for individual or collaborative activities, through groupings for instruction, and provided with accommodations and modifications, students with or without disabilities can thrive and explore their learning abilities according to their preferred learning styles. Grouping for instruction is the most effective and efficient approach to teaching basic skills (Archer & Hughes, 2011). With a low teacher-student ratio, each student can practice more deeply and frequently and receive feedback that they need within the instructional moments (Stein, 2018).





This is different from the research of Fuchs et al. (2014), whose study results favored specialized intervention over inclusive instruction, indicating the need to monitor the progress of these students systematically and, if an inadequate response is revealed, the need for specialized intervention should be administered.

## 2.Participants’ Assessment of the Importance of Co-Teaching Components Based on Their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classrooms

### 2.1 Roles and Responsibilities

**Table 5**

*Participants’ Assessment of the Importance of Co-Teaching Components Based on Their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classroom in Terms of Roles and Responsibilities*

Roles and Responsibilities	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.
2.1.1 Actively engage in the teaching/ learning process for 95% of the lessons	3.600	0.507	VI	3.761	0.538	VI	3.694	0.525	VI
2.1.2 Integrate my unique teaching expertise into the lesson to support students with or without disabilities	4.000	0.000	VI	3.904	0.300	VI	3.944	0.232	VI
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.800</b>	<b>0.407</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.833</b>	<b>0.437</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.819</b>	<b>0.422</b>	<b>VI</b>



Table 5 presents the first component of co-teaching: the roles and responsibilities of the general and special education teachers inside the general education classroom. It shows the participants' assessment of the importance of Roles and Responsibilities as a co-teaching component based on their personal experience in a co-taught setting.

The assessment of general education teachers for subcomponent “2.1.2 Integrate my unique teaching expertise into the lesson to support students with or without disabilities”, has a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent “2.1.1 Actively engage in the teaching/ learning process for 95% of the lessons”, has a mean of 3.600 and a standard deviation of 0.507, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important” as well. The overall mean of the two subcomponents is 3.800, and the overall standard deviation is 0.407, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

The assessment of special education teachers for subcomponent “2.1.2 Integrate my unique teaching expertise into the lesson to support students with or without disabilities”, has a mean of 3.904 and a standard deviation of 0.3000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent 2.1.1 Actively engage in the teaching/ learning process for 95% of the lessons” has a mean of 3.761 and a standard deviation of 0.538, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the two subcomponents is 3.833 with an overall standard deviation of 0.437, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subcomponent 2.1.2 has a mean of 3.944 and a standard deviation of 0.232, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent 2.1.1 has a mean of 3.694 and a standard deviation of 0.525, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall



mean of the two subcomponents is 3.819, and the overall standard deviation is 0.422, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

This negates the study of Scruggs and Mastropieri (2017), who described that the general education teacher is primarily responsible for content and curriculum planning and instruction. In contrast, the special education teacher is mostly responsible for evaluating problems in classroom learning and social behavior and providing strategies and interventions for addressing these problems

## 2.2 Professionalism

**Table 6**

*Participants’ Assessment of the Importance of Co-Teaching Components Based on their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classroom in Terms of Professionalism*

Professionalism	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	VI	Mean	SD	VI	Mean	SD	VI
2.2.1 Viewed by my students as a teacher with equal authority as the other teacher.	4.000	0.000	VI	3.952	0.218	VI	3.972	0.167	VI
2.2.2 Interact with another teacher with respect	4.000	0.000	VI	3.952	0.218	VI	3.972	0.167	VI
2.2.3 Equally responsible as my co-teacher for what happens in the classroom.	3.667	0.617	VI	3.952	0.218	VI	3.833	0.447	VI
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.889</b>	<b>0.383</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.952</b>	<b>0.215</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.926</b>	<b>0.297</b>	<b>VI</b>



Table 6 indicates the second component of co-teaching: the Professionalism of the general and special education teachers inside the general education classroom. It illustrates the participants' assessment of the importance of professionalism as a co-teaching component based on their personal experience in a co-taught classroom setting.

The assessment of general education teachers for subcomponent “2.2.1, Viewed by my students as a teacher with equal authority as the other teacher”, has a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important.” Meanwhile, the subcomponent “2.2.2 Interact with another teacher with respect” has a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important while the subcomponent “2.2.3 Equally responsible as my co-teacher for what happens in the classroom,” has a mean of 3.667 with a standard deviation of 0.617 interpreted as “Very Important.” The overall mean of the three subcomponents is 3.889 with an overall standard deviation is 0.383 verbally interpreted as “Very Important.”

The assessment of general education teachers for the three subcomponents “2.2.1 Viewed by my students as a teacher with equal authority as the other teacher, “2.2.2 Interact with another teacher with respect,” and “2.2.3 Equally responsible as my co-teacher for what happens in the classroom,” all have a mean of 3.952 and a standard deviation of 0.218, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important.” The overall mean of the three subcomponents is 3.952 with an overall standard deviation of 0.215 verbally interpreted as “Very Important.”

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subcomponents 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 has a mean of 3.972 with a standard deviation of 0.167 verbally interpreted as “Very Important.” The subcomponent 2.2.3 has a mean of 3.833 and a standard deviation of 0.447, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important.” The overall



mean of the three subcomponents is 3.926 with an overall standard deviation of 0.297

verbally interpreted as “Very Important.”

Da Fonte and Barton-Arwood (2017) stated that collaboration skills take time to develop, with many potential barriers that can limit successful teamwork and be more responsive to teacher candidates’ development.

### 2.3 Communication and Planning

**Table 7**

*Participants’ Assessment of the Importance of Co-Teaching Components Based on their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classroom in Terms of Communication and Planning*

Communication and Planning	General Education Teachers (n= 15)			Special Education Teachers (n= 21)			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	V. I.	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.
2.3.1 Share responsibility for major decisions regarding the instructional cycle that will meet the needs of our students with or without disabilities	3.733	0.457	VI	3.904	0.300	VI	3.833	0.378	VI



2.3.2 Have time to meet with my co-teacher to plan lessons and discuss issues related to instruction, modification, accommodation, and IEP goals of our students with disabilities.	3.867	0.351	VI	3.952	0.218	VI	3.917	0.280	VI
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.800</b>	<b>0.407</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.929</b>	<b>0.261</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.875</b>	<b>0.333</b>	<b>VI</b>

Table 7 reveals the first component of co-teaching: the Communication and Planning of the general and special education teachers inside the general education classroom. It manifests the participants’ assessment of the importance of communication and planning as a co-teaching component based on their personal experience in a co-taught setting.

The assessment of general education teachers for subcomponent “2.3.2 Have time to meet with my co-teacher to plan lessons and discuss issues related to instruction, modification, accommodation, and IEP goals of our students with disabilities” has a mean of 3.867 and a standard deviation of 0.351, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important.” The subcomponent “2.3.1 Share responsibility for major decisions regarding the instructional cycle that will meet the needs of our students with or without disabilities” has a mean of 3.733 and a standard deviation of 0.457, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the two subcomponents is 3.800, and the overall standard deviation is 0.407, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

The assessment of special education teachers for subcomponent “2.3.2 Have time to meet with my co-teacher to plan lessons and discuss issues related to instruction, modification, accommodation, and IEP goals of our students with disabilities” have a mean of



3.952 and a standard deviation of 0.218, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponent “2.3.1 Share responsibility for major decisions regarding the instructional cycle that will meet the needs of our students with or without disabilities”, has a mean of 3.904 and a standard deviation of 0.300, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the two subcomponents is 3.929, and the overall standard deviation is 0.261, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subcomponent 2.3.2 has a mean of 3.917 and a standard deviation of 0.280, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponent 2.3.1 has a mean of 3.833 and a standard deviation of 0.378, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the two subcomponents is 3.875, and the overall standard deviation is 0.333, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

The study by Scruggs and Mastropieri (2017) supports these components by affirming that teachers must be able to listen to their co-teaching partners and communicate their views and suggestions, especially during planning time together. The general and special education teacher must also know the content being taught to understand how to evaluate learning problems to this content and to plan and implement instructional techniques to address these problems. Mastering content knowledge, especially across multiple content areas for those who co-teach various classes, takes time and intentional effort.

#### **2.4 Assessment of the Academic Outcomes of Students with Disabilities**

Table 8 illustrates the fourth component of co-teaching: the Assessment of the Academic Outcomes of Students with Disabilities inside the general education classroom. It shows the participants’ assessment of the importance of assessment of the academic outcomes



of students with disabilities as a co-teaching component based on their personal experience in a co-taught setting.

**Table 8**

*Participants' Assessment of the Importance of Co-Teaching Components Based on their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classroom in Terms of Assessment of the Academic Outcomes of Students with Disabilities*

Assessment of the Academic Outcomes of Students with Disabilities	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.
2.4.1 Modify or accommodate assessment as stated in the IEP of students with disabilities	4.000	0.000	VI	4.000	0.000	VI	4.000	0.000	VI
2.4.2 Aware of the IEP goals and objectives of our students with disabilities	4.000	0.000	VI	3.952	0.218	VI	3.972	0.167	VI
2.4.3 Monitor the progress on IEP objectives frequently.	3.867	0.352	VI	3.905	0.301	VI	3.889	0.319	VI
2.4.4 Monitor the learning behavior of our students with or without disabilities.	3.867	0.352	VI	3.905	0.301	VI	3.889	0.319	VI





2.4.5 Take part with my co-teacher in grading our students with or without disabilities.	3.467	0.743	VI	3.524	0.749	VI	3.500	0.737	VI
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.840</b>	<b>0.436</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.857</b>	<b>0.426</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.850</b>	<b>0.429</b>	<b>VI</b>

The assessment of general education teachers for subcomponents “2.4.1 Modify or accommodate assessment as stated in the IEP of students with disabilities”, and “2.4.2 Aware of the IEP goals and objectives of our students with disabilities” both have a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

Subcomponents “2.4.3 Monitor the progress on IEP objectives frequently”, and “2.4.4 Monitor the learning behavior of our students with or without disabilities” have a mean of 3.867 and a standard deviation of 0.352, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

Subcomponent “2.4.5 Take part with my co-teacher in grading our students with or without disabilities”, has a mean of 3.467 and a standard deviation of 0.743, with a verbal interpretation of “Very important.” The overall mean of the five subcomponents is 3.840, and the overall standard deviation is 0.436, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important.”

The assessment of special education teachers for subcomponent “2.4.1 Modify or accommodate assessment as stated in the IEP of students with disabilities” has a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important.” The subcomponent “2.4.2 Aware of the IEP goals and objectives of our students with disabilities” has a mean of 3.952 and a standard deviation of 0.218, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important.” The subcomponents “2.4.3 Monitor the progress on IEP objectives frequently”, and “2.4.4 Monitor the learning behavior of our students with or without disabilities”, have a



mean of 3.905 and a standard deviation of 0.301, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent “2.4.5 Take part with my co-teacher in grading our students with or without disabilities”, has a mean of 3.524 and a standard deviation of 0.749, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important.” The overall mean of the five subcomponents is 3.857, and the overall standard deviation is 0.426, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important.”

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subcomponent 2.4.1 has a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponent 2.4.2 has a mean of 3.972 and a standard deviation of 0.167, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponents 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 have a mean of 3.889 and a standard deviation of 0.319, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent 2.4.5 has a mean of 3.500 and a standard deviation of 0.737, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the five subcomponents is 3.850, and the overall standard deviation is 0.429, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

Gokbulut et al. (2019), in their study including the parents’ opinion about co-teaching outcomes, affirmed that the variety of materials and homework used during the practices and seeing their child's academic progress made parents feel at ease with the new approach. The parents stated that their children's reading skills had improved, and their willingness to read and their writing skills had improved.

## 2.5 Instruction

### Table 9

*Participants’ Assessment of the Importance of Co-Teaching Components Based on their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classroom in Terms of Instruction*



Instruction	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.
2.5.1 Facilitate learning using various grouping arrangements.	3.800	0.410	VI	3.857	0.359	VI	3.833	0.378	VI
2.5.2 Utilize instructional strategies that enhance the learning of struggling students.	4.000	0.000	VI	3.952	0.218	VI	3.972	0.167	VI
2.5.3 Share instruction depending on the needs of our students in the classroom.	3.933	0.258	VI	3.905	0.301	VI	3.917	0.280	VI



2.5.4 Include the students with disabilities in the classroom activities so that their participation is as normal as possible.	3.933	0.258	VI	3.952	0.218	VI	3.944	0.232	VI
2.5.5 Use differentiated instruction if necessary to meet the needs of students with or without disabilities	4.000	0.000	VI	4.000	0.000	VI	4.000	0.000	VI
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.933</b>	<b>0.251</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.933</b>	<b>0.251</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>3.933</b>	<b>0.251</b>	<b>VI</b>

Table 9 demonstrates the last component of co-teaching: the Instruction of general and special education teachers inside the general education classroom. It depicts the participants' assessment of the importance of instruction as a co-teaching component based on their personal experience in a co-taught setting.

The assessment of general education teachers for subcomponents “2.5.5 Use differentiated instruction if necessary to meet the needs of students with or without disabilities” and “2.5.2 Utilize instructional strategies that enhance the learning of struggling students”, have a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal



interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponents “2.5.4 Include the students with disabilities in the classroom activities so that their participation is as normal as possible”; and “2.5.3 Share instruction depending on the needs of our students in the classroom have a mean of 3.933 and a standard deviation of 0.258, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponent “2.5.1 Facilitate learning using various grouping arrangements” has a mean of 3.800 and a standard deviation of 0.410, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the five subcomponents is 3.933, and the overall standard deviation is 0.251, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

The assessment of special education teachers for subcomponent “2.5.5 Use differentiated instruction if necessary to meet the needs of students with or without disabilities” has a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponents “2.5.4 Include the students with disabilities in the classroom activities so that their participation is as normal as possible”; and “2.5.2 Utilize instructional strategies that enhance the learning of struggling students”, have a mean of 3.952 and a standard deviation of 0.218, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponent “2.5.3 Share instruction depending on the needs of our students in the classroom”, has a mean of 3.905 and a standard deviation of 0.301, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. Subcomponent “2.5.1 Facilitate learning using various grouping arrangements” has a mean of 3.857 and a standard deviation of 0.359, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the five subcomponents is 3.933, with an overall standard deviation of 0.251, with the verbal interpretation of “Very Important”.

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subcomponent 2.5.5 has a mean of 4.000 and a standard deviation of 0.000, with a verbal



interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent 2.5.2 has a mean of 3.972 and a standard deviation of 0.167, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent 2.5.4 has a mean of 3.944 and a standard deviation of 0.232, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent 2.5.3 has a mean of 3.917 and a standard deviation of 0.280, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The subcomponent 2.5.1 has a mean of 3.833 and a standard deviation of 0.378, with a verbal interpretation of “Very Important”. The overall mean of the five subcomponents is 3.933 with an overall standard deviation of 0.251, with the verbal interpretation of “Very important”.

Scruggs and Mastropieri (2017) clearly postulated that mastering content knowledge, especially across multiple content areas for those who co-teach various classes, takes time and intentional effort. The special education teacher must also know the content being taught in order to understand how to evaluate learning problems concerning this content and to plan and implement instructional techniques to address these problems.

**Table 10**

*Summary of Respondents’ Assessment of the Importance of Co-Teaching Components Based on Their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classroom*

Co-Teaching Components	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Roles and responsibilities	3.800	0.407	VI	3.833	0.437	Very Important	3.819	0.422	VI
Professionalism	3.889	0.383	VI	3.952	0.215	Very Important	3.926	0.297	VI
Communication and Planning	3.800	0.407	VI	3.929	0.261	Very Important	3.875	0.333	VI



Assessment	3.84 0	0.43 6	VI	3.85 7	0.42 6	Very Importa nt	3.85 0	0.42 9	VI
Instruction	3.93 3	0.25 1	VI	3.93 3	0.25 1	Very Importa nt	3.93 3	0.25 1	VI

Table 10 depicts the summary of participants' assessment of the importance of co-teaching components based on their personal experience in an inclusive classroom. As seen therein, all the components garnered verbal interpretation of "Very Important."

Based on the data obtained from a sample of 15 general education teachers and 21 special education teachers, several key findings can be observed regarding co-teaching.

Firstly, in terms of roles and responsibilities, both general education teachers and special education teachers rated them as "Very Important," with mean scores of 3.800 and 3.833 respectively. This indicates that both groups recognize the significance of clearly defined roles and responsibilities in the co-teaching process.

Secondly, professionalism was also deemed very important by both groups, with general education teachers reporting a mean of 3.889 and special education teachers reporting a slightly higher mean of 3.952. This suggests that professionalism is valued and expected from both types of educators in the co-teaching environment.

Thirdly, communication and planning were rated as very important by both groups, with mean scores of 3.800 for general education teachers and 3.929 for special education teachers respectively. This highlights the significance of effective communication and collaborative planning between general and special education teachers to ensure a successful co-teaching experience.



Furthermore, the assessment was considered very important by both groups, with mean scores of 3.840 for general education teachers and 3.857 for special education teachers accordingly. This indicates that both types of educators recognize the importance of assessing student progress and adjusting instruction accordingly in the co-teaching setting.

Lastly, instruction was consistently rated as “Very Important” by both general education and special education teachers, with a mean of 3.933 for both groups. This underscores the significance of high-quality instruction delivered by both educators in co-teaching partnerships.

Overall, the data suggest that both general education and special education teachers perceive various components of co-teaching, including roles and responsibilities, professionalism, communication and planning, assessment, and instruction, as very important. These findings emphasize the shared understanding and recognition of key factors that contribute to effective co-teaching practices among educators from both backgrounds.

### **3. Extent of How the Participants Consider the Relevance of Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with or without Disabilities**

#### **3.1 Academics**

Table 11 shows the extent how the participants consider the relevance of co-teaching benefits to the students with or without disabilities in academics. The assessment of general education teachers for sub-areas “3.1.2 Increase engagement in all classroom activities (small group, whole group, by peer)” and “3.1.4 Apply learned strategies and knowledge” have a mean of 3.800 and a standard deviation of 0.414, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent”. Meanwhile, “3.1.5 Develop good study skills” has a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.488, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subcomponent “3.1.3 Demonstrate mastery of the lesson” has a mean of 3.267 and a standard deviation of 0.799,





interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The indicator “3.1.1 Improve students’ academic performance on the state/district test” garnered a mean of 3.067 with a standard deviation of 0.799, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.653 with an overall standard deviation of 0.581, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”

**Table 11**

*Extent of How the Participants Consider the Relevance of Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with and without Disabilities in the Area of Academics*

Academic	General Education Teachers (n= 15)			Special Education Teachers (n= 21)			TOTAL		
	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.	Mean	SD	V.I.
3.1.1 Improve students’ academic performance on the state/district test.	3.067	0.799	To a very great extent	3.191	0.873	To a very great extent	3.139	0.833	To a very great extent
3.1.2 Increase engagement in all classroom activities (small group, whole group, by peer).	3.800	0.414	To a very great extent	3.809	0.402	To a very great extent	3.806	0.401	To a very great extent
3.1.3 Demonstrate mastery of the lesson.	3.267	0.799	To a very great extent	3.809	0.402	To a very great extent	3.583	0.649	To a very great extent



3.1.4 Apply learned strategies and knowledge.	3.800	0.414	To a very great extent	3.857	0.358	To a very great extent	3.833	0.378	To a very great extent
3.1.5 Develop good study skills.	3.667	0.488	To a very great extent	3.667	0.577	To a very great extent	3.667	0.535	To a very great extent
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.653</b>	<b>0.581</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>	<b>3.695</b>	<b>0.590</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>	<b>3.678</b>	<b>0.585</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>

Regarding the assessment of special education teachers, it was found that the subarea “3.1.4 Applies learned strategies and knowledge,” it has a mean of 3.857 with a standard deviation of 0.358, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subareas “3.1.2 Increase engagement in all classroom activities (small group, whole group, by peer) and “3.1.3 Demonstrate mastery of the lesson have a mean of 3.809” with a standard deviation of 0.402, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.1.5 Develop good study skills” has a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.577, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.1.1 Improve students’ academic performance on the state/district test” has a mean of 3.191 and a standard deviation of 0.873, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.695 with an overall standard deviation is 0.590, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subarea “3.1.4 Apply learned strategies and knowledge” has a mean of 3.833 and a standard deviation of 0.378, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.1.2 Increase engagement in all classroom activities (small group, whole group, by peer) has a mean of 3.806 with a standard deviation of 0.401, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”



The subarea “3.1.5 Develop good study skills” has a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.535, interpreted to as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.1.3 Demonstrate mastery of the lesson” has a mean of 3.583 and a standard deviation of 0.649, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.1.1 Improve students’ academic performance on the state/district test” has a mean of 3.139 with a standard deviation of 0.833, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.678 with an overall standard deviation of 0.585, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”

The findings relate to the study of Murdock et al. (2016) which stated that students with disabilities work in small groups to learn with more focus and learning stability, like morning meetings, extension presentations, and community individualized learning activities. Wilson and Michaels (2007) also presented a study about student participation in co-taught classes that contributed to self-reported improvements in literacy. Students believed their skills improved. The study of Wilson and Michaels (2007) described a sense of connectedness and a growth of personal confidence, suggesting that coteaching, when delivered and supported appropriately, can help general and special education students develop perceptions with the potential to encourage literacy achievement.

### 3.2 Social-Emotional

Table 12 exhibits the extent how the participants consider the relevance of co-teaching benefits to the students with or without disabilities in the area of social-emotional. The assessment of general education teachers for sub-areas “3.2.1 Exhibit self-confidence and self-esteem, 3.2.4 Develop appropriate social skills, 3.2.5 Exhibit a more positive attitude towards peers and teachers” all have a mean of 3.933 and a standard deviation of 0.258, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.2.2 Decrease impulsive



behavior, aggressiveness, and non-compliant behavior” has a mean of 3.800 and a standard deviation of 0.560, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”

**Table 12**

*Extent of How the Participants Consider the Relevance of Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with and without Disabilities in the Area of Social-Emotional*

Social-Emotional	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
3.2.1 Exhibit self-confidence and self-esteem.	3.933	0.258	To a very great extent	3.762	0.625	To a very great extent	3.833	0.507	To a very great extent
3.2.2 Decrease impulsive behavior, aggressiveness, and non-compliant behavior.	3.800	0.560	To a very great extent	3.571	0.746	To a very great extent	3.667	0.676	To a very great extent
3.2.3. Increase interaction initiated with their peers.	3.800	0.414	To a very great extent	3.667	0.577	To a very great extent	3.722	0.513	To a very great extent
3.2.4 Develop appropriate social skills.	3.933	0.258	To a very great extent	3.762	0.539	To a very great extent	3.833	0.447	To a very great extent
3.2.5 Exhibit a more positive attitude towards peers and teachers.	3.933	0.258	To a very great extent	3.762	0.539	To a very great extent	3.833	0.447	To a very great extent
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.880</b>	<b>0.366</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>	<b>3.705</b>	<b>0.603</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>	<b>3.778</b>	<b>0.524</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>



Meanwhile, the subarea “3.2.3 Increase interaction initiated with their peers” has a mean of 3.800 and a standard deviation of 0.414, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.880 with an overall standard deviation of 0.366, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great extent.”

The assessment of special education teachers for subareas “3.2.4 Develop appropriate social skills,” and “3.2.5 Exhibit a more positive attitude towards peers and teachers,” has a mean of 3.762 and a standard deviation of 0.539, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.2.1 Exhibit self-confidence and self-esteem” has a mean of 3.762 with a standard deviation of 0.625, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.2.3 Increase interaction initiated with their peers” has a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.577, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.2.2 Decrease impulsive behavior, aggressiveness, and non-compliant behavior” has a mean of 3.571 and a standard deviation of 0.746, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.705 with an overall standard of 0.603, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great extent.”

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subareas “3.2.4 Develop appropriate social skills, and 3.2.5 Exhibit a more positive attitude towards peers and teachers have a mean of 3.833 and a standard deviation of 0.447, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.2.1 Exhibit self-confidence and self-esteem” has a mean of 3.833 and a standard deviation of 0.507, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.2.3. Increase interaction initiated with their peers” has a mean of 3.722 and a standard deviation of 0.513, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.2.2 Decrease impulsive behavior, aggressiveness, and non-compliant behavior” has a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.676, interpreted as relevant to a



“Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.778, and the overall standard deviation is 0.524, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” This matches with the study of Gokbulut et al. (2019) whose study result shows that students felt happy, successful, and academically prepared during the co-teaching practices. They found the materials used by their teachers interesting, they were willing to attend the class, and they were pleased to be in the general education classroom environment.

### 3.3 Independent Functioning

**Table 13**

*Extent of How the Participants Consider the Relevance of Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with and without Disabilities in the Area of Independent Functioning*

Independent Functioning	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
3.3.1 Remain on task and work independently.	3.667	0.488	To a very great extent	3.571	0.746	To a very great extent	3.611	0.645	To a very great extent
3.3.2. Students can advocate for his/her needs.	3.733	0.458	To a very great extent	3.667	0.577	To a very great extent	3.694	0.525	To a very great extent
3.3.3 Organize materials on his/her desk.	3.667	0.488	To a very great extent	3.476	0.750	To a very great extent	3.556	0.652	To a very great extent
3.3.4 Navigate assignments independently.	3.467	0.639	To a very great extent	3.524	0.680	To a very great extent	3.500	0.655	To a very great extent



3.3.5 Start the given task without a need to follow up.	3.400	0.737	To a very great extent	3.571	0.676	To a very great extent	3.500	0.696	To a very great extent
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.550</b>	<b>0.649</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>	<b>3.581</b>	<b>0.632</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>	<b>3.570</b>	<b>0.637</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>

Table 13 shows the extent how the participants consider the relevance of co-teaching benefits to students with and without disabilities in the area of independent functioning.

The assessment of general education teachers for subarea “3.3.2. Students can advocate for his/her needs has a mean of 3.733 and a standard deviation of 0.458, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subareas “3.3.1 Remain on task and work independently, and 3.3.3 Organize materials on his/her desk” have a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.488, interpreted as relevant to as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.4 Navigate assignments independently has a mean of 3.467 and a standard deviation of 0.639, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.5 Start the given task without a need to follow up” has a mean of 3.400 and a standard deviation of 0.737, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.550, and the overall standard deviation is 0.649, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”

The assessment of special education teachers for subarea “3.3.2. Students can advocate for his/her needs” has a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.577, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.1 Remain on task and work independently” has a mean of 3.571 and a standard deviation of 0.746, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent” while the subarea “3.3.5 Start the given task without a need to



follow up” has a mean of 3.571 and a standard deviation of 0.676, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.4 Navigate assignments independently” has a mean of 3.524 and a standard deviation of 0.680, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.3 Organize materials on his/her desk” has a mean of 3.476 and a standard deviation of 0.750, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.581, and the overall standard deviation is 0.632, with the verbal interpretation of relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”

The combined assessment of the general and special education teachers for subarea “3.3.2. Students can advocate for his/her needs” has a mean of 3.694 and a standard deviation of 0.525, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.1 Remain on task and work independently” has a mean of 3.611 and a standard deviation of 0.645, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.3 Organize materials on his/her desk” has a mean of 3.556 and a standard deviation of 0.652, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.5 Start the given task without a need to follow up” has a mean of 3.500 and a standard deviation of 0.696, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The subarea “3.3.4 Navigate assignments independently” has a mean of 3.500 and a standard deviation of 0.655, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.” The overall mean of the five subareas is 3.570, and the overall standard deviation is 0.637, interpreted as relevant to a “Very Great Extent.”

The results are similar to Strogilos and King-Sears's (2020) investigation of the students with and without disabilities about their experiences in a co-taught classroom, which received a positive outcome that co-teaching had given students extra help and emotional support to transition to a new lesson by providing more detailed information and specialized accommodations.





**Table 14**

*Summary Table of the Extent of How the Participants Consider the Relevance of Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with and without Disabilities in all Areas*

Area	General Education Teachers			Special Education Teachers			TOTAL		
	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.	Mean	S.D.	V.I.
Academic	3.653	0.581	To a very great extent	3.695	0.590	To a very great extent	<b>3.678</b>	<b>0.585</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>
Social-Emotional	3.880	0.366	To a very great extent	3.705	0.603	To a very great extent	<b>3.778</b>	<b>0.524</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>
Independent Functioning	3.550	0.649	To a very great extent	3.581	0.632	To a very great extent	<b>3.570</b>	<b>0.637</b>	<b>To a very great extent</b>

Table 14 presents the summary of the extent how the participants consider the relevance of co-teaching benefits to students with and without disabilities in all areas. As seen therein, all the areas garnered verbal interpretation of “Very Important.”

Based on the data obtained from both general education and special education teachers, it is evident that they consider the relevance of co-teaching benefits to students with and without disabilities to a very great extent across all areas.

In terms of the academic area, both groups of teachers rated the extent of relevance as “Very High”, with general education teachers reporting a mean of 3.653 and special education teachers reporting a slightly higher mean of 3.695. This indicates that both types of



educators recognize the significant impact that co-teaching can have on the academic progress and success of students with and without disabilities.

Similarly, in the social-emotional area, both general education teachers and special education teachers recorded a high level of relevance, with mean scores of 3.880 and 3.705, respectively. This suggests that both groups acknowledge the positive influence of co-teaching on students' social and emotional development, emphasizing the importance of fostering a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

Furthermore, independent functioning was also rated as “Highly Relevant” by both groups, with mean ratings of 3.550 for general education teachers and 3.581 for special education teachers. This highlights the recognition of the role of co-teaching in promoting students' independence and autonomy, regardless of their disability status.

Overall, the data denote that both general education and special education teachers perceive the benefits of co-teaching to students with and without disabilities to a very great extent in all areas examined, including academic, social-emotional, and independent functioning. These findings demonstrate a shared understanding and belief in the potential of co-teaching to positively impact students' overall development and success, highlighting the importance of collaborative and inclusive instructional practices in the classroom.

#### **4. Comparison of the Assessment of the Respondents Regarding the Importance of the Co-Teaching Components Based on their Personal Experience in a Co-Taught Inclusive Classroom**

**Table 15**

*Comparison of the Assessment of the Two Groups of Participants Regarding the Importance of the Co-Teaching Components Based on their Personal Experience in Inclusive Classrooms*

<b>Co-Teaching Components</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t-value</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Sig</b>	<b>Decision on H<sub>0</sub></b>
-------------------------------	---------------	-------------	-----------	----------------	----------------	------------	----------------------------------



Roles and Responsibilities	General Education Teacher	3.800	0.407	-3.28	P = 0.744 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
	Special Education Teacher	3.833	0.437				
Professionalism	General Education Teacher	3.899	0.383	-1.098	P = 0.275 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
	Special Education Teacher	3.952	0.215				
Communication and Planning	General Education Teacher	3.800	0.407	-1.634	P = 0.107 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
	Special Education Teacher	3.929	0.261				
Assessment of the Academic Outcomes of Students with Disabilities	General Education Teacher	3.840	0.436	-0.264	P = 0.792 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
	Special Education Teacher	3.857	0.426				
Instruction	General Education Teacher	3.933	0.251	0.000	P = 1.000 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
	Special Education Teacher	3.933	0.251				

Table 15 reveals the comparison of the assessment of the two groups of participants regarding the importance of the co-teaching components, namely roles and responsibilities,



professionalism, communication and planning, assessment, and instruction, based on their personal experience in a co-taught classroom.

In the roles and responsibilities component, the group of general education teachers has an overall mean of 3.800 and a standard deviation of 0.407. The group of special education teachers has a mean of 3.833 and a standard deviation of 0.437. This indicates a t-value of -3.28 and a p-value of 0.744 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant difference between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

In the professionalism component, the group of general education teachers has an overall mean of 3.899 and a standard deviation of 0.383. The group of special education teachers has a mean of 3.952 and a standard deviation of 0.215. This indicates a t-value of -1.098 and a p-value of 0.275 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant difference between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

In communication and planning, the group of general education teachers has an overall mean of 3.800 and a standard deviation of 0.047. The group of special education teachers has a mean of 3.929 and a standard deviation of 0.261. This indicates a t-value of -1.634 and a p-value of 0.107 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant difference between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

In assessing the academic outcomes of students with disabilities, the group of general education teachers has an overall mean of 3.840 and a standard deviation of 0.436. The group of special education teachers has a mean of 3.857 and a standard deviation of 0.426. This indicates a t-value of -0.264 and a p-value of 0.792 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant



differences between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

In the instruction component, both the group of general education teachers and special education teachers have an overall mean of 3.933 and a standard deviation of 0.251. This indicates a t-value of -0.000 and a p-value of 1.000 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant difference between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

This concurred with Hedin and Conderman's (2020) study, which acknowledged that pairing two teachers to work collaboratively makes effective teaching by providing two licensed professionals in the classroom to share their expertise and differentiate instruction for a wide range of learners in a general education class. King-Sears et al. (2020), from the perspective of middle school algebra co-teachers and their students with and without disabilities, also said that co-teachers found it helpful to have a co-teacher in the mainstream classroom.

### 5. Comparison of the Assessment of the Two Groups of Participants Concerning the Relevance of the Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with and without Disabilities in the General Education Classroom

**Table 16**

*Comparison of the Assessment of the Two Groups of Participants Concerning the Relevance of the Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with and without Disabilities in Inclusive Classrooms*

Co-Teaching Benefits to Students with and without Disabilities	Groups	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Sig	Decision on H <sub>0</sub>
Academic	General Education Teacher	3.578	0.657	-0.446	P = 0.656 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>



	Special Education Teacher	3.634	0.655				
Social Emotional	General Education Teacher	3.844	0.424	1.610	P = 0.110 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
	Special Education Teacher	3.667	0.648				
Independent Functioning	General Education Teacher	3.689	0.468	0.991	P = 0.324 > 0.05	NS	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
	Special Education Teacher	3.571	0.689				

Table 16 depicts the comparison of the assessment of the two groups of participants concerning the relevance of the co-teaching benefits to students with disabilities in the general education classroom in the areas of academics, social-emotional and executive functioning.

In the area of academics, the group of general education teachers has an overall mean of 3.578 and a standard deviation of 0.657. The group of special education teachers has a mean of 3.634 and a standard deviation of 0.655. This indicates a t-value of -0.446 and a p-value of 0.656 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant difference between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Regarding social-emotional, the group of general education teachers has an overall mean of 3.844 and a standard deviation of 0.424. The group of special education teachers has a mean of 3.667 and a standard deviation of 0.648. This indicates a t-value of 1.610 and a p-



value of 0.110 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant difference between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

In the area of independent functioning, the group of general education teachers has an overall mean of 3.689 and a standard deviation of 0.468. The group of special education teachers has a mean of 3.571 and a standard deviation of 0.689. This indicates a t-value of 0.991 and a p-value of 0.324 greater than 0.05, bearing no significant difference between the assessment of the two groups of participants. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

This finding is similar to Gokbulut et al. (2019) study of the impact of co-teaching practices in all-inclusive environments that positively affected students' academic development and social needs. Students enjoyed increased self-confidence and developed a positive attitude toward co-teaching.

## 6. Issues or Challenges Faced by the Participants in the Use of Co-Teaching Models to Address the Needs of Students with Disabilities in the Classroom

**Table 17**

*Issues or Challenges Faced by the Participants in the Use of Co-Teaching Models to Address the Needs of Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Classrooms*

Themes	Significant Statements
<b>Common Issues the Participants Experience in Administering Co-Teaching in Inclusive Classroom</b>	“It is imperative to consider that the general and special education teachers are open about co-teaching, so both teachers can collaborate, plan lessons, monitor students and discuss assessments to be implemented in the class, and also avoid miscommunication and misconception of their roles.” (Participant 1)
	“It is amazing when both teachers collaborate harmoniously in the classroom. It is an amazing experience because you have two minds working together to service the kids and share different expertise and strategies to meet the student’s needs.”(Participant 2)



	<p>“In my experience, it is difficult when you are in a co-teaching situation or setup and do not work well with the general education teacher. Without collaboration and a deep understanding of each other’s role, I believe that would be challenging and could ruin the co-teaching purpose.” (Participant 3)</p>
	<p>“The disparity between special education and general education teachers, as perceived by the administration, other colleagues, parents, and students, is also an obstacle to co-teaching collaboration. Providing the systems for collaboration without a clear and common understanding of the purpose of special education and its related services in the classroom could create a biased perception of roles and responsibilities between teachers about the special education objectives.” (Participant 4)</p>
	<p>“Sometimes the time to plan and meet with a co-teacher is a little bit challenging just with a schedule where special education teachers have limited time to work with students in the general education classroom as they need to meet other students in different classes too. Their caseload is too dispersed, affecting classroom time planning and dynamics.” (Participant 5)</p>
	<p>“Lack of training and information about co-teaching for general education teachers about special education services and accommodations as well as co-teaching ideas and objectives.”</p> <p>“Shortage of special education teachers is one main reason the service time of special education teachers is limited. There is a lack of special education teachers, so some service minutes students with disabilities should receive, as stated in their IEP, are not being complied with. Moreover, although this is an administrative case, it shows that services for students with disabilities are scarce.” (Participant 6)</p>
<p><b>Challenges (Academic, Behavioral, Functioning Encountered by the Participants in Working with Students with Disabilities in an Inclusive Classroom</b></p>	<p>“I need to consider their functioning and behavior because they often need more support in their tasks. For example, they need help and assistance to work independently, remain on-task, gather materials, organize folders, initiate help, and self-advocate when needed. Sometimes, it takes time for them to reach that independence. However, with the right accommodations, some students are redirected themselves, then staff or teachers can gradually fade that support until they are independent.” (Participant 1)</p>





	<p>“I think one of the most difficult things is behavior in terms of staying focused on an activity. So, a student might be working on an activity and spontaneously just jumping up and running around the room. For example, impulsive-aggressive behavior is not necessarily that students are doing anything wrong or that they even recognize that they are doing anything wrong. It is just one of the characteristics of their disabilities that are hard for them to tame. (Participant 2)</p>
	<p>“I have experienced behavioral and emotional challenges with students, and when behavior or emotional outburst arise, the teacher can use strategies to help students to alleviate the outpouring of impulsive, aggressive behavior and uncontrolled emotions.” (Participant 3)</p>
	<p>“More than the academic, behavior, emotional, and independent functioning challenges, I have seen a huge gap in academics between minorities, for students of color from a low-income background, than our white students.” (Participant 4)</p>
	<p>“Some students have some behavioral or emotional challenges. They may need more behavioral or emotional breaks or just time to step away from the lesson or the area where the instruction is being done. So, I think it is a challenge as a teacher. It also interrupts other students learning and bringing that child back into the learning is difficult, especially when emotions have escalated due to triggers to the point that even the accommodations support is not helping anymore. (Participant 5)</p>
	<p>“Unfortunately, not any fault of the students with disabilities, but because of their diverse needs, they are struggling and hindering themselves and other students from learning and you as a teacher from teaching. So, I feel like all these layers can add to it, becoming challenging as a teacher to get a lesson done and that child to learn.” (Participant 6)</p>

## **Theme 1: Common Issues Participants Experience in Administering Co-Teaching in Inclusive Classrooms**

This theme explains the issues participants experience in administering co-teaching in the general education classroom.



As mentioned by Participant 1, “It is imperative to consider that the general and special education teachers are open about co-teaching so that both teachers can collaborate and plan. Participant 2 said, “It is an amazing experience because you have two minds working together to service the kids and share different expertise and strategies to meet the student’s needs.” This statement exemplifies professionalism, where both teachers know the shared goal of co-teaching. Hence, they take their responsibilities with fidelity, treat each other with respect and kindness and perform their roles equally. Participant 4 disclosed, “In my experience, it is difficult when you are in a co-teaching situation or setup and do not work well with the general education teacher. Therefore, it can be assumed that unhealthy relationships with co-teachers can be a problem in co-teaching administration. Rexroat and Scott (2019) mentioned that having a defined purpose and selecting the right teacher will help render co-teaching.

The participants' statements above relate to the study of Bouck (2007) and Rivera et al. (2014), which declares that the relationship between general and special education teachers is crucial to co-teaching; both must view themselves as equal. Miscommunication may result in the ineffectiveness of collaboration. Austin (2001) also investigated that special education and general education co-teachers who generally worked well together solicited each other’s feedback and benefited from working together. Further, both groups agreed that co-teaching is a worthwhile experience when the two teachers consider various components of co-teaching and treat each other as equals.

Meanwhile, Participant 3 believes that the disparity between special education and general education teachers, as perceived by the administration, other colleagues, parents, and students, are also an obstacle to co-teaching collaboration. Providing the systems for collaboration without a clear and shared understanding of the purpose of special education



and its related services in the classroom could create a biased perception of roles and responsibilities between teachers about the special education objectives. Participant 6 elucidated that this situation also arises due to a lack of training and information for general education teachers about special education services, accommodations, and co-teaching ideas and objectives. This statement explains that administrative support is requisite to facilitate co-teaching. It can start by initiating practical training about collaborative teaching, providing common standard planning time, and cultivating a culture of shared goals supporting students with disabilities in the classroom (Rivera, 2014). Many teachers, especially new special education teachers, can benefit from important information about effectively implementing co-teaching (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017).

Another issue Participants 5 and 6 shared is the need for more time and the incoherent schedules of special education teachers. Participant 5 described, “I think sometimes the time to plan and meet with a special education teacher. Their caseload is too dispersed, affecting classroom time planning and dynamics.” Participant 6 perceived, according to her experience, “Shortage of special education teachers is one main reason the service time of special education teachers is limited. Some service minutes students with disabilities should receive, as stated in their IEP, are not being complied with. Furthermore, although this is an administrative case, it shows that services for students with disabilities are scarce.”

This agreed with Scruggs & Mastropieri (2017) study, which stated that effective co-teaching depends on co-teachers engaging in a true partnership, in which the special education teacher helps design and implement the validated strategies known to be effective with students with disabilities and other special educational needs. Scruggs et al. (2007) reiterated that the lack of common planning time is one of the most significant barriers to successful co-teaching.



## **Theme 2: Challenges (Academic, Behavioral, Functioning) Encountered in Working with Students with Disabilities in the General Classroom.**

This theme reports the challenges the participants experience working with students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

As mentioned by Participant 2, “I think one of the most difficult things is behavior in terms of staying focused on an activity. Their impulsive-aggressive behavior is not necessarily that students are doing anything wrong or that they even recognize that they are doing anything wrong. It is just one of the characteristics of their disabilities that are hard for them to tame.” Participant 5 added, “Some students have some emotional challenges. It also interrupts other students learning and bringing that child back into the learning is difficult, especially when emotions have escalated due to triggers to the point that even the accommodations support is not helping anymore. Participant 3, who also experienced behavioral and emotional challenges with students, declared that when behavior or emotional outburst arise, the teacher can use strategies to help students to alleviate the outpouring of impulsive, aggressive behavior and uncontrolled emotions. Further, it can be assumed that the behavior and emotional factors of students with disabilities are a huge challenge for general and special education teachers, over which students have no control.

Participant 1 adjoined, “I need to consider their functioning and behavior because they often need more support in doing their task. However, with the right accommodations, some students have redirected themselves, then staff or teachers can gradually fade that support until they are independent. The above statements relate to the study of Scruggs & Mastropieri (2017), which declares that study skills and social behavior are some problems that need to be targeted by teachers. Meanwhile, Participant 4 believes that there is a huge academic gap exists between minorities and white students.” The statement explains that



other factors can critically affect students' performance. Disproportionate representation of ethnicity and linguistically diverse students in special education continues (Rhodes et al., 2005).

This is different from the research of Maye (2021), which For learners with disabilities, however, researchers and educators predominantly focus on the psychosocial influences of inclusion, and very little attention is paid to the actual academic learning that transpires when learners with disabilities attend mainstream classes.

## 7. Proposed Training Program

The researcher is a special education teacher currently working with students with disabilities, categorically those with high-incidence disabilities. High-incidence disabilities refer to students with autism spectrum disorders, communication disorders, intellectual disabilities, specific learning disabilities, emotional or behavioral disorders, and physical and sensory needs that affect their educational opportunities. Students with high-incidence disabilities can join the regular education class, provided with appropriate support, resources, accommodations, and modifications. The researcher believes in equality and equity in education, where students with high-incidence disabilities can receive the same educational resources and opportunities regardless of their disability category.

The researcher advocates for the rights of students with disabilities, including their right to receive the same standard of education as their peers in the least restrictive environment. The study's findings gave the researcher an excellent result regarding the benefits of co-teaching collaboration for students with disabilities. The study has investigated whether students with or without disabilities can benefit from co-teaching, which is the current instructional approach of teachers to support students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Furthermore, with the result that co-teaching components are essential



in teachers' collaboration, and its benefits to students with or without disabilities are relevant to a great extent, the researcher deemed it valuable to share this study through a training program.

### ***Rationale***

This training seeks to provide in-depth knowledge and understanding to the target participants about co-teaching as an instructional delivery model in an inclusive classroom and create awareness of collaboration in special education, which aims to magnify inclusion as an educational approach premised on the study's findings of its benefits to students' academic, social-emotional and independent functioning in the general education classroom.

### ***Specific Objectives***

At the end of the training, the participants will be able to:

- Accept inclusion as an educational approach to creating an inclusive school environment.
- Understand and acknowledge co-teaching as an instructional delivery model.
- Realize the importance of co-teaching components for successful collaboration in the general education classroom.
- Recognize the benefits of co-teaching to the academic, social-emotional, and independent functioning of students with or without disabilities inside the general education classroom.
- Contemplate the legal, professional, and moral imperatives of including students.

### ***Target Beneficiaries***

The program's beneficiaries include undergraduate and post-graduate students at Philippine Women's University who are currently studying Special Education as their primary course or specialization. Additionally, undergraduate and post-graduate students from



universities across the Philippines who are pursuing Special Education as a primary course or specialization will also benefit from the program. Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers at the integrated elementary school of Philippine Women's University, who are currently working with students with identified disabilities, are also part of the target group. Lastly, Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers in public or private elementary schools throughout the Philippines will benefit from the program.

**Table 18**

*Proposed Training Program for Special Education Undergraduate and Graduate Students, General and Special Education Teachers*

<b>KRA</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Persons Involved</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>
Current Co-Teaching Models and Arrangement Used in an Inclusive Classroom	To develop a shared understanding among stakeholders regarding the concepts of inclusion and co-teaching, including their principles, benefits, and effective implementation strategies, in order to foster a collaborative and inclusive educational environment for all students.	One effective way to attain the objective of developing a shared understanding among stakeholders regarding the concepts of inclusion and co-teaching is to organize a series of professional development workshops. These workshops will provide a platform for educators, administrators, parents, and other relevant stakeholders to come together	Php 10,000	Special Education Teachers  General Education Teachers  Undergraduate and Post-graduate students currently taking special education courses or specialization	Increased acceptance of collaboration in special education



		and engage in meaningful discussions and collaborative activities. The workshops will be designed to explore the principles and foundations of inclusion and co-teaching, highlighting their importance and benefits in creating an inclusive educational environment for all students. Participants will have the opportunity to learn about effective implementation strategies, share their experiences and insights, and engage in practical exercises to deepen their understanding. Facilitated discussions, case studies, and interactive presentations will be utilized to promote active participation			
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--





		and knowledge exchange. By the end of the workshops, stakeholders will have gained a shared understanding of inclusion and co-teaching, equipped with the knowledge and strategies necessary to foster a collaborative and inclusive educational environment that meets the diverse needs of all students.			
The Five Components and Importance of Co-Teaching	To examine and evaluate the five components of co-teaching (roles and responsibilities, professionalism, communication, assessment, and instruction) and their importance in promoting effective collaboration between special education and general education	To attain the objective of examining and evaluating the five components of co-teaching and their importance in promoting effective collaboration between special education and general education teachers, a comprehensive professional development	Php 75,000	Special Education Teachers  General Education Teachers  Undergraduate and Post-graduate students  currently taking special education courses or specialization	Application of any of the co-teaching models in a co-taught classroom



	teachers, ultimately enhancing the quality of instruction and support provided to students in inclusive classrooms.	program can be implemented. This program will involve workshops, training sessions, and collaborative activities that focus on each component of co-teaching. Through these activities, teachers will have the opportunity to explore their roles and responsibilities within a co-teaching framework, enhance their professionalism through reflective practices, develop effective communication strategies to facilitate collaboration, gain knowledge and skills in conducting assessments in inclusive classrooms, and refine their instructional practices to meet the			
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--



		<p>diverse needs of students. The program will incorporate case studies, group discussions, and interactive exercises to allow teachers to critically analyze and evaluate their current co-teaching practices and identify areas for improvement. By engaging in this professional development program, teachers will deepen their understanding of the five components of co-teaching and their significance in creating inclusive classrooms.</p>			
<p>Relevance of Co-Teaching Benefits To Students with And Without Disabilities</p>	<p>To assess and establish the relevance of co-teaching benefits for students with and without disabilities in</p>	<p>There should be a mixed-method research study to be conducted. The study will involve</p>	<p>Php 75,000</p>	<p>Special Education Teachers  General Education Teachers</p>	<p>Improved awareness of co-teaching benefits to the student’s academic, social-emotional,</p>



	<p>inclusive education settings.</p>	<p>collecting quantitative data through surveys and qualitative data through interviews or focus group discussions. The participants will include students with and without disabilities, as well as their parents, teachers, and other relevant stakeholders. The surveys will assess the perceptions and experiences of the participants regarding the benefits of co-teaching in terms of academic achievement, social-emotional development, and overall inclusive classroom experience. The interviews or focus group discussions will provide in-depth insights into the</p>	<p>Undergraduate and Post-graduate students  currently taking special education courses or specialization</p>	<p>independent functioning outcomes</p>
--	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------



		<p>specific ways in which co-teaching has contributed to the students' learning and well-being. The data collected will be analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques for the quantitative data and thematic analysis for the qualitative data. The findings will help to establish the relevance of co-teaching benefits for students with and without disabilities, identify any variations or challenges in their experiences, and provide valuable insights for improving co-teaching practices in inclusive education settings. Ultimately, this research will</p>			
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--



		contribute to the body of knowledge on co-teaching and its impact on student outcomes in inclusive classrooms.			
Issues and challenges in Co-teaching	To identify and analyze the key issues and challenges faced in co-teaching practices within inclusive education settings, with a focus on the collaboration between special education and general education teachers.	A mixed-methods approach can be employed. The study will involve collecting both quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources. Surveys or questionnaires can be administered to special education and general education teachers to gather quantitative data on their perceptions and experiences regarding co-teaching challenges. In-depth interviews or focus group discussions can be conducted	Php 75,000	Special Education Teachers  General Education Teachers  Undergraduate and Post-graduate students  currently taking special education courses or specialization	Objective integration of co-teaching



		<p>with teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders to gather qualitative data, allowing for a deeper exploration of the issues and challenges faced in co-teaching. The collected data will then be analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques for the quantitative data and thematic analysis for the qualitative data. By systematically examining the data, patterns and themes related to the challenges and issues in co-teaching practices will be identified. The findings will contribute to a better understanding of the barriers and obstacles that hinder effective collaboration between</p>			
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--



		special education and general education teachers in inclusive education settings. This information can inform the development of targeted interventions, professional development programs, and support mechanisms to address these challenges and enhance the implementation of co-teaching practices in inclusive classrooms. Ultimately, this research will contribute to the improvement of collaborative efforts between special education and general education teachers and promote the success of co-teaching in inclusive education.			
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--





## Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter presents the summary and conclusions derived from the conduct of the study which aims to explore the perception of teachers and parents or guardians on the effectiveness of co-teaching. It also provides recommendations that can be pursued by teachers in schools to optimize co-teaching practices.

### Summary of Findings

The results of this study from the data collected from the questionnaire and interview results are as follows:

1. The result of the study conveyed that most teachers, based on their experience, use all six co-teaching models, depending on the effectuality of a model, to meet the diverse needs of students in the general education classroom. The most used co-teaching models are alternative teaching and station teaching, team teaching, and parallel teaching. Very few participants used the models *One Teach, One Assist, And One Teacher, One Observe*. Most co-taught teachers use co-teaching models embedded with grouping activities such as small group instruction to provide productive individual and collaborative activities.
2. The investigation result indicates all the co-teaching components: roles and responsibilities, professionalism, communication and planning, assessment, and instruction, are important to consider when administering a co-teaching approach in a general education classroom.
3. The participants considered the relevance of co-teaching benefits to students with disabilities in the area of academics, social-emotional and executive functioning to a very great extent. This result signifies that co-teaching collaboration and the accommodations provided help students improve their academic performance, develop social-emotional stability, and increase independent functioning.



4. There is no significant difference in the assessment of the two groups of participants regarding the importance of all the five co-teaching components, namely roles and responsibilities, professionalism, communication and planning, assessment, and instruction. Hence, the null hypothesis for all components was accepted.

5. The study investigated that there is no significant difference in the assessment of the two groups of participants concerning the relevance of the co-teaching benefits to students with disabilities in the general education classroom in the area of academics, social-emotional and independent functioning. This concludes that the null hypothesis for all components was accepted.

6. The study's outcome denotes that participant faced five main issues in administering co-teaching in the education classroom, namely unprofessionalism, lack of standard planning time, disparity between general and special education teachers, insufficient training, and shortage of special education teachers. The investigation also concludes that behavioral and emotional are the most challenging factor encountered by the participants in working with students with disabilities. Next is the independent functioning and academic outcome of students in the classroom.

## Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. All six co-teaching models are used in inclusive classrooms.
2. Co-teaching components are significant to consider in co-teaching collaboration.
3. The relevance of co-teaching benefits to students with and without disabilities is to a very great extent.
4. Both groups of participants agree that the five co-teaching components are important in administering co-teaching.



5. Both groups of participants agree that the co-teaching components benefit the students' performance.

6. There are still issues and challenges in co-teaching.

7. Training program is the best recommendation.

### **Recommendations**

The study revealed that co-teaching collaboration effectively supports students with disabilities inside the general education classroom. Therefore, the following recommendations are presented:

1. Conduct a good training program for undergraduate and postgraduate students taking special education courses with comprehensive knowledge about co-teaching and inclusion.

2. Train general and special education teachers and related service providers with co-teaching to increase awareness and collaboration and use appropriate instructional practices to support students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

3. Encourage education policymakers to implement the co-teaching model as an instructional delivery model in a co-taught classroom.

4. Design dynamic guidance for special education stakeholders and advocates to ignite their desire to extend assistance and support to the co-teaching model in an inclusive classroom.

5. Adapt the co-teaching practice to inclusive classrooms in the Department of Education of the Philippines.

6. Allocate funding for special education services to accommodate students with disabilities in the general education classroom.



## References

- Ali, M., Mustapha, R., & Jelas, Z. (2006). An empirical study on teachers' perception towards inclusive education in Malaysia. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21(3).
- Alquraini, T., & Gut, D. (2012). Critical components of successful inclusion of students with severe disabilities: Literature review. *International Journal of Special Education*, 27(1), 42-59.
- Austin, V. (2001). Teachers' belief about co-teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(4).
- Archer, A., & Hughes, C. (2011). Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching. *Guilford Press*.
- Beninghof, A. (2012). Co-teaching that works: Structures and strategies for maximizing student learning. *Jossey-Bass*.
- Bouck, E. (2007). Co-teaching... Not just a textbook term: Implications for practice. *Preventing School Failure. Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 51(2), 46-51. DOI: 10.3200/PSFL.51.2.46-51
- Cook, S., & McDuffie-Landrum, K. (2020). Integrating effective practices into co-teaching: Increasing outcomes for students with disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 55(4), 221–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451219855739>
- Creswell, J., & Creswell D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach (5th ed.). *Sage Publications Inc*.
- Gokbulut, O., Akcamete, G., & Guneyli, A. (2020). Impact of co-teaching approach in inclusive education settings on the development of reading skills. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1), 1-17.  
<https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2020.81.1.17>



- Da Fonte, M. A., & Barton-Arwood, S. M. (2017). Collaboration of general and special education teachers: Perspectives and strategies. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 53(2), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451217693370>
- Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., Compton, D., Wehby, J., Schumacher, R., Gersten, R., & Jordan, N. (2015). Inclusion versus specialized intervention for very-low-performing students: What does access mean in an era of academic challenge? *Exceptional Children*, 81(2), 134-157. DOI: 10.1177/0014402914551743
- Friend, M. P., & Bursuck, W. D. (2019). Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers. *Pearson*.
- Friend, M. P., & Cook, L. (2007). Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals. *Pearson A and B*.
- Hallahan, D., Kauffman, J., & Pullen, P. (2019). Exceptional learners: An introduction to special education (14th ed.). *Pearson*.
- Hedin, L., & Conderman, G. (2019). Pairing teachers for effective co-teaching teams. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 55(4), 169-173. DOI: 10.1080/00228958.2019.1659063
- King-Sears, M. E., Jenkins, M. C., & Brawand, A. (2020). Co-teaching perspectives from middle school algebra co-teachers and their students with and without disabilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(4), 427–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1465134>
- Jortveit, M., & Kovač, V. (2022). Co-teaching that works: Special and general educators' perspectives on collaboration. *Teaching Education*, 33(3), 286-300. DOI: 10.1080/10476210.2021.1895105
- Kritikos, E. (2010). Special education assessment: Issues and strategies affecting today's classroom. *Pearson Education Inc*.



Maye, T. (2021). To examine teachers' perceptions of co-teaching and student achievement.

*Alabama Journal of Educational Leadership*, pp. 8, 53–60. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Murawski, W. W., & Bernhardt, P. (2016). An administrator's guide to co-teaching.

*Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 30-34.

Murdock, L., Finneran, D., & Theve, K. (2016). Co-teaching to reach every learner.

*Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 42–47.

Perry, A. (2017). A brief history of co-teaching. *Cult of Pedagogy*.

Rexroat-Frazier, N., & Chamberlin, S. (2019). Best practices in co-teaching mathematics with special needs students. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19(3), 173-183.

Rivera, E., McMahon, S., & Keys, C. (2014). Collaborative teaching: School implementation and connections with outcomes among students with disabilities. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 42(1), 72–85. DOI: 10.1080/10852352.2014.855067

Rhodes, R., Ochoa, S., & Ortiz, S. (2005). Assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students: A practical guide. *Guilford Press*.

Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2021). What are the characteristics of teacher professional development that increase pupil achievement? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *London: Education Endowment Foundation*. Retrieved from <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/teacher-professional-development-characteristics>



Scruggs, T., & Mastropieri, M. (2017). Making inclusion work with co-teaching. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 49(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059916685065>

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A meta-synthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290707300401>

Stein, E. (2018). Two teachers in the room: Strategies for co-teaching success. *Routledge*.

Strogilos, V., & King-Sears, M. E. (2019). Co-teaching is extra help and fun: Perspectives on co-teaching from middle school students and co-teachers. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19(2), 92-102.

Wilson, G., & Michaels, C. (2006). General and special education students' perceptions of co-teaching: Implications for secondary-level literacy instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 22(3), 205–225. DOI: 10.1080/10573560500455695

Rivera, E., McMahon, S., & Keys, C. (2014). Collaborative teaching: School implementation and connections with outcomes among students with disabilities. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 42(1), 72–85. DOI: 10.1080/10852352.2014.855067



## Acknowledgment

This endeavor would not have been possible without the researcher's adviser, **DR. ALVIN S. SICAT**, for his inimitable patience and incessant guidance throughout her thesis writing journey. The knowledge, time and expertise he imparted to the researcher have contributed to her paper's rigorous yet worthwhile venture.

Likewise, the researcher is greatly indebted to **MS. ANNE BENINGHOF**, the author of the book "Co-Teaching That Works," for her tangible support extended to the researcher by allowing her to adopt her co-teaching theory in the study.

Moreover, the researcher could not have undertaken this journey without her Panel of Oral Examiners led by **DR. REYNALDO S. PINEDA, JR.**, the Chairman together with the highly-esteemed members, **DR. CARMINA G. JOSON** and **DR. JUZY L. SAGUIL** for their constructive feedback and meaningful suggestions that certainly aided the writing process hence the researcher was able to come up with a purposeful output.

Words cannot express the researcher's gratitude to **DR. SHIRLEY A. PADUA**, the Dean of the PWU School of Education, who encouraged the researcher to continue and finish the master's degree after stopping for a year and commencing a new life in a different country. The researcher is incredibly grateful to the Philippine Women's University Graduate School of Education for the opportunity to finish her remaining credit units online. The warmth of the university administration's support and love for their students is felt despite the distance.

The researcher would like to acknowledge as well the validators for sharing their expertise in validating survey questionnaires and interview guide questions. Additionally, the researcher is indebted to the participants for their willingness to participate in the study and





share their invaluable perceptions and knowledge about co-teaching in the inclusive classroom.

In addition, the researcher would like to thank **MR. DAVID BOWIE U. MONTALES**, the statistician for imparting his expertise in data processing prior to analysis and interpretation.

Likewise, the researcher would like to express her gratitude to **MR. JORICK G. CLEMENTE**, for assisting her in the refinement of the language and format of the manuscript;

Also, the researcher would like to mention her husband, who inspired her to keep going. In particular, her husband's irreplaceable emotional support and practical wisdom are essential to her well-being as a wife who works and studies full-time. Thus, she lovingly dedicates the success of this study to him.

Finally, more than anything else, the researcher recognizes and acknowledges the guidance and power of the Highest God, the source of the researcher's spiritual strength, consistent in her life. All the glory and recognition this paper may acquire are offered to HIM. Praise the Lord.

Give thanks to the Lord, for he is good;

his love endures forever.

*Psalm 106:1*

**L.F.**

