Analysis of Teaching Strategies for Teachers in Inclusive Classroom between Area and Advanced Study
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Introduction

To manage a wide variety and scope of students with disabilities for general and special education teachers has long been acknowledged as necessary ability for effective teaching and learning (Kaff, Zabel, & Milham, 2007). The questionnaire of this study is based on Wood’s questionnaire (Wood, 1991) and its structure made by behavior problems in the early years, (Papatheodorou, 2005). The teaching strategy is very important. Some of the researchers use it to explain strategic management of school environments (Tompkins & Tompkins-McGill, 1993) Indeed the management and instructional roles of teachers cannot be separated. Research of effective teaching suggests that a productive classroom environment reduces both frequency and magnitude of disruptive student’s behaviors.

This research analyzes the teaching strategies for teachers in inclusive classroom between area (city/county) and advanced study (yes/no). This topics focus on teaching strategy of inclusion classroom among different areas and teachers. Fifty primary school teachers participated this study.

Method:

Cross sectional study design was used. We invited 50 primary school teachers from the areas of Tainan City and Tainan County, as figure 1.
Eleven teachers were male and 39 teachers were female. 34 teachers were college/university graduates, and 16 teachers owned a master degree. 21 teachers worked in the resource class, 21 teachers work in regular class without students who had different disabilities, 8 teachers work in regular class with students with different disabilities. Thirteen teachers also had administration work. Thirty two teachers work in the city, and 18 teachers work in the county. This research analyzes the teaching strategies for teachers in inclusive classroom between area (city/county) and advanced study (yes/no). This topics focus on teaching strategy of inclusion classroom among different areas and teachers. Fifty primary school teachers participated this study.

Teacher's attitude and strategy about classroom management in inclusive classroom was measured using a modified teaching strategy questionnaire in Likert's method 5 point scale, as figure 3.
It was analyzed by SPSS software. This study follows working memory deficits in children with specific learning disorders (Schuchardt, Maehler, & Hasselhorn, 2008). Two-Way Data Analysis: Multivariate Curve Resolution - Noniterative Resolution Methods (Liang, 2009), Two-Way Data Analysis: Multivariate Curve Resolution - Error in Curve Resolution. (Tauler & Maeder, 2009). So, this study used statistic method included a 2 × 2 factorial (A: city vs. county; B: in-study vs. no studying) design as Table I below.

### Table I  2 × 2 factorial design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor A</th>
<th>Level I : In study</th>
<th>Level II: not in study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City x In study</td>
<td>City x Not in study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor B</td>
<td>Level I:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level II:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country x In study</td>
<td>Country x Not in study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. The teacher participant in this study
Results

There are twenty four items to discuss, and six items are significant: the scores compared using a 2 × 2 factorial (as figure 1 below) design. On item 1 (structure space) were entered into a two-way anova

The multi- variate main effect for factor A (in study), p=.003, was not significant. In contrast, the multivariate main effect for factor B (area), p =.624 proved to be significant, and the score of city (M=3.72) was greater than that of country (M=3.11).

On item 2 (structured course) were entered into a two-way anova. The multi- variate main effect for factor A, p=.824, was not significant. In contrast, the multivariate main effect for factor B (in study), p =.001 proved to be significant. and the score of city (M=3.97) was greater than that of country (M=3.22). The interaction of the two factors was not significant, p=.996 as figure 2.
On item 20 (group teaching) were entered into a two-way ANOVA. The multivariate main effect for factor A (in study), $p=0.0812$, was not significant. In contrast, the multivariate main effect for factor B (area), $p=0.008$ proved to be significant, and the score of city ($M=4.06$) was greater than that of country ($M=3.17$). The interaction of the two factors was not significant, $p=0.107$, as figure 3.

**Figure 2.** the analysis of structure course

**Figure 3.** the analysis of group teaching
On item 23 (organize and use token economy) were entered into a two-way anova. The multivariate main effect for factor A (in study), p=.862, was not significant. In contrast, the multivariate main effect for factor B (area), p=.023 proved to be significant, and the score of city (M=4.13) was greater than that of country (M=3.28). The interaction of the two factors was not significant, p=.749. (Figure 4)

On item 10 (always communicate with student) were entered into a two-way anova. The interaction of the two factors was significant, p=.038. Then, in factor A, under the level I (in study) was significant, the score of county (M=4.63) was better than that of city (M=4.00).

On item 15 (pay attention and reinforce positive behavior) was entered into a two-way anova. The interaction of the two factors was significant, p=.041. Then, in factor A, under the level II (not in study) was significant, the score of city (M=4.52) was better than that of county (M=4.00). Then, in factor B, under the level I (city) was significant, the score of not in study (M=4.52) was better than that in study (M=4.18), under the level II (county) was significant, the score of in study (M=4.38) was better than that of not in study (M=4.00).

On item 24 (reward group) was entered into a two-way anova. The interaction of the two factors was significant, p=.004. Then, in factor A, under the level I (in study) was significant, the score of county (M=4.63) was better than that of city (M=3.27).

**Discussion:**

This study focus on the integration of classroom teachers and special education teachers in the general teaching strategies. The teaching strategies used by general teachers and special education teachers are analyzed and discussed. This study provides inclusive classroom teachers how to adjust their teaching strategies and guides new teachers to
better develop their teaching strategies. This study could facilitate homeroom teachers to generate effective integration of classroom management and effective classroom teaching.
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