Research Guru
Online Journal of Multidisciplinary Subjects (ISSN : 2349-266X)
UGC Approved Journal No. 63726
Impact Factor:3.021 website: www.researchguru.net
Volume-12, Issue-2, September-2018

COMPETENCE OF LEARNING RESOURCES FOR CHILDREN WITH MULTIPLE DISABILITIES IN COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION BY SPECIAL TEACHERS

Smt.G.Ananthi
Assistant Professor in Special Education
NIEPMD, Chennai Mobile no:99526-54347
Mail id nanthigowrimuthupillai@gmail.com

Mr.P.Kamaraj
Head & Lecturer Department of Special Education NIEPMD, Govt. of India Chennai

ABSTRACT

The process of learning depends upon the different type of paraphernalia available in the modern learning milieu. There are many aids existing these days like, audio, visual and audio- visual aids. They are playing significant role in the learning process especially children with disabilities and multiple disabilities. A study on competence of learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education by special teachers was carried out with 30 samples. The samples were selected by using purposive sampling method from various educational institutions in Tamilnadu and the samples are special teachers who are working in differently abled sector. Survey method was followed for the conduct of the study. The main independent variables are gender, experience, and number of CRE attended. The dependent variable includes in the study is to assess the effectiveness of learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education through special teachers. Questionnaire tool is developed by the investigators in six aspects namely printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) resources which includes traditional as well as assistive technology. The main aim of the present research study is to assess the efficiency of learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in the inclusive environment by special teachers.

KEY WORDS: learning materials, resources, inclusion, multiple disabilities and special teachers.

INTRODUCTION

Children with multiple disabilities will have a combination of various disabilities that may include: speech, physical mobility, learning, mental retardation, visual, hearing, brain injury and possibly others. Along with multiple disabilities, they can also exhibit sensory losses and behavior and or social problems. Children with multiple disabilities - also referred to as multiple exceptionalities will vary in severity and characteristics. These students may exhibit weakness in auditory processing and

have speech limitations. Physical mobility will often be an area of need. These students may have difficulty attaining and remembering skills and or transferring these skills from one situation to another. Support is usually needed beyond the confines of the classroom. There are often medical implications with some of the more severe multiple disabilities which could include students with cerebral palsy and severe autism and brain injuries. There are many educational implications for this student. But determining an appropriate educational program for a student with multiple disabilities can be a daunting task due to the variety of pervasive supports needed by these students. The planning process should be a multidisciplinary process, including parents, special teachers, teachers, physical therapists, assistive technology teachers, and any number of additional support staff, of course, at the center of the planning process should be the student, and the strengths and desires of the student should guide the entire process. So the present study aims to assess the efficiency of learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in the inclusive environment by special teachers.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the present study are as follow:

1. To identify various learning materials for children with multiple disabilities.
2. To develop a checklist for assess the competence of learning resources for children with multiple disabilities.
3. To find out the competence level of learning resources for children with multiple disabilities
4. To motivate the special teachers to use various teaching resources for children with multiple disabilities.

NULL-HYPOTHESIS

The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. There is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to special teachers gender.

2. There is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to special teachers experience.

3. There is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple

disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to number of CRE attended by special teachers.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

In the modern era multiple disabilities are common in children, it means that a person has more than one disability. The reason for multiple disabilities often, no one knows. With some children, however, the cause is known. For example, Sharon's disabilities were caused by a lack of oxygen at birth. Other causes can include: chromosomal abnormalities, premature birth, difficulties after birth, poor development of the brain or spinal cord, infections, genetic disorders, injuries from accidents ect., Children with multiple disabilities are highly need empowerment, that can be done by proper education and rehabilitation. Special teachers play an eminent role in it. Research should investigate the usefulness of self-evaluation procedures for generalization programming of special teachers those who are handling children with multiple disabilities. This study is a part of it.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of the present study is as follows:

1. The tool used and its adaptations can be helpful to use the same on a wider scale among rehabilitation education and inclusive education.
2. The study can be replicated for other disability sector.
3. It is beneficial for the special teachers to aware and assesses their teaching strategies.
4. The study is also helpful for the professional to understand the various teaching strategies.
5. The study can be compared with other disabilities in inclusive education.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Fontenot (2005) examined the teaching attitudes of rural, suburban and urban public elementary school principals regarding the inclusion of students with multiple disabilities into the general education classrooms. A three point questionnaire, the "Modified Principles" and inclusion survey, was sent to 733 randomly selected principals, requesting information that could be used to evaluate attitudes toward inclusion of students into the general education classroom setting. There was no significant correlation found between age and attitudes, nor gender and attitudes of principals toward inclusion of students with disabilities. Brien (2006) evaluated the impact of video models on three levels – the extent to which the video models improve the ability for students with learning disabilities to learn the foundational information and rationale of a strategy with the sample of 196 students. This study made a connection between lines of research on video – based anchored instruction for students with learning disabilities and video anchors in teacher preparation. Nidhi

and Bora (2008) studied on Inclusive education practices for students with disabilities. This study is an exploration of inclusive educational practices for students with disabilities. Educational practices comprised of the environment in which education takes place, the activities in which teacher and student participate the interactions among teacher students with and without disabilities. The result of the study on the development and the use of the triptych environment activities interactions for learning disabled student.

METHODOLOGY

Survey method is followed for the conduct of the study, samples are chosen by purposive sampling method from various educational institutions in Tamilnadu and 30 special teachers handling children with multiple disabilities are made as sample. The main independent variables are gender, experience and number of CRE attended. The dependent variable includes in the study is to assess the effectiveness of learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education through special teachers. Questionnaire tool is developed by the investigators in six aspects namely printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) resources which includes traditional as well as assistive technology. Data collected are analyzed by using percentage analysis and tabulated. Individual percentages are also obtained.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

NULL-HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Null-Hypothesis (1)

There is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to special teachers gender.

Table no :1

Type of learning resources with respective to special teachers gender	Male		Female	
	No	Percentage	No	Percentage
Duplicated	15	21.12	15	27.54
Non-projected two-dimensional (2D)	15	7.51	15	9.34
Projected (still)	15	4.88	15	16.47
Audio	15	15.73	15	3.43
Non-projected three-dimensional (3D)	15	37.09	15	31.79
Audio-visual (with motion)	15	13.67	15	11.43

The above table reveals that female special teachers are highly dependent on duplicated materials for teaching at the same time male special teachers are highly dependent on non- projected three-dimensional (3D) materials. This might be due to the female special teachers' familial responsibilities and commitments. Thus the null hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to special teachers gender" is rejected.

Null-Hypothesis (2)

There is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to special teachers experience.

Table no: 2

Type of learning resources with respective to special teachers experience	Below 10 years		Above 10 years	
	No	Percentage	No	Percentage
Duplicated	15	36.07	15	39.44
Non-projected two-dimensional (2D)	15	6.46	15	17.74
Projected (still)	15	17.49	15	8.65
Audio	15	8.87	15	4.78
Non-projected three-dimensional (3D)	15	16.53	15	20.27
Audio-visual (with motion)	15	14.58	15	9.12

The above table reveals that special teachers those who have below 10 years experience are highly using the projected (still) material when comparing to the special teachers those who have more than 10 years experience. This might be due to their elevated exposure towards technology. Thus the null hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to special teachers experience" is rejected.

Null-Hypothesis (3)

There is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to number of CRE attended by special teachers.

Table no: 3

Type of learning resources with respective number of CRE attended	Below 5 CRE		Above 5 CRE	
	No	Percentage	No	Percentage
Duplicated	15	39.44	15	37.42
Non-projected two-dimensional (2D)	15	17.74	15	7.91
Projected (still)	15	8.65	15	9.74
Audio	15	20.27	15	12.25
Non-projected three-dimensional (3D)	15	9.12	15	26.36
Audio-visual (with motion)	15	4.78	15	6.32

The above table reveals that special teachers those who attended below five CREs are highly using audio materials at the same time special teachers those who attended above five CREs decidedly using non-projected three-dimensional (3D) materials. This might be because of the exposure and experience gained by the CRE programmes. Thus the null hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the competency between printed or duplicated, non-projected two-dimensional, audio, non-projected three-dimensional, projected (still) and audio-visual (with motion) learning resources for children with multiple disabilities in comprehensive education with respect to number of CRE attended by special teachers" is rejected.

CONCLUSION

Learning materials play an imperative role in comprehensive education, especially for children with multiple disabilities. The result of the present cram reveals that the male special teachers are highly depends on non-projected three-dimensional (3D) learning materials, special teachers those who have more than ten years experiences were highly depends on duplicated learning materials and special teachers those who attended above five CREs decidedly using non-projected three-dimensional (3D) materials are using minimum number of audio- visual (motion) materials.

REFERENCE

[1] Walther-Thomas, C., Korinek, L., McLaughlin, V. L., & Williams, B. (2000). *Collaboration for inclusive education: Developing successful programs.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

[2] Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed ability classrooms* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

[3] Bender, W. N. (2002). *Differentiating instruction for students with learning disabilities: Best practices for general and special educators.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

[4] Jewell,, Tim et al. (2004*). "Electronic Resource Management: Report of the DLF ERM Initiative"*. Digital Library Federation. Retrieved 2008-11-11.

[5] Feather, Celeste (2007). "*ERM Systems: What Are They and What Do They Do?*" Columbus Metropolitan Library, Columbus, OH: Ohio NET.

[6] Kirk, S., Anastasiow, N., (2008). "*Educating exceptional children"* (Florence, KY: Wadsworth, Hopkins, J. Assistive Technology: An Introductory Guide for K-12 Library Media Specialists. Worthington, Ohio: Linworth Publishing, 2004. ISBN 1586831380

WEB SOURCES

- http://www.pediatricapta.org/consumer-patient-information/pdfs/AssistiveTechnology.pdf
- http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/iris-resource-locator/
- http://www.lesley.edu/special-education-resources/
- http://www.educationworld.com/a_curr/curr139.shtml
- http://www.iii.com/products/sierra/eresource-management
- http://www.edutopia.org/assistive-technology-young-children-special-education