

Table Of Content

Journal Cover	2
Author[s] Statement	3
Editorial Team	4
Article information	5
Check this article update (crossmark)	5
Check this article impact	5
Cite this article	5
Title page	6
Article Title	6
Author information	6
Abstract	6
Article content	7

ISSN 2598-991X (ONLINE)

IJEMD



**INDONESIAN
JOURNAL OF
EDUCATION
METHODS
DEVELOPMENT**

UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SIDOARJO

Originality Statement

The author[s] declare that this article is their own work and to the best of their knowledge it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for the published of any other published materials, except where due acknowledgement is made in the article. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom author[s] have work, is explicitly acknowledged in the article.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author[s] declare that this article was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright Statement

Copyright © Author(s). This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>

EDITORIAL TEAM

Complete list of editorial team ([link](#))

Complete list of indexing services for this journal ([link](#))

How to submit to this journal ([link](#))

Article information

Check this article update (crossmark)



Check this article impact ^(*)



Save this article to Mendeley



^(*) Time for indexing process is various, depends on indexing database platform

The composition of practice teaching in special education: A preliminary study

Shamsul Rizal Khalil, Rizal_shamsul@yahoo.com, (1)

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

Abdul Rahim Razalli, Rizal_shamsul@yahoo.com, (0)

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

Mohd Faiz Mohd Yaakob, Rizal_shamsul@yahoo.com, (0)

Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

⁽¹⁾ Corresponding author

Abstract

Teaching composition of the practice teaching among teachers is important. Indeed, strategic teaching is a way of making decisions about a course, an individual class, or even an entire curriculum, beginning with an analysis of key variables in the teaching situation. This study, a preliminary study about teaching composition among special education teachers. The strategic composition namely as Quality of Instruction; The Appropriate Level of Instruction, Incentive; Time; and Lesson Plans. The findings showed Quality of Instruction is the highest level and the lowest variable is Time. Discussions and recommendations are stated for authorities and academic contribution.

Published date: 2019-02-18 00:00:00

Introduction

These variables include the characteristics of the learners, the learning objectives, and the instructional preferences of the teacher. Once these variables have been analyzed, informed decisions can be made about course content, structure, methods of assessment, and other key components. The need to provide the best and inclusive education has drawn up an educational research study. Strategic composition for teaching is important as teachers need to propose the right composition for their teaching. Furthermore in the context of special education, the development and progress of research on teaching are the result of research on correlation process products, involving the effective teaching of teachers with less effective teachers by controlling and identifying inputs from students (Brophy and Good 1986). Undertaking a strategic teaching analysis — by which we mean analyzing several key variables related to the course and making decisions based upon that analysis — increases the likelihood that the course objectives will be met. Beginning the process of planning a course by doing a strategic analysis is advantageous for another reason: It makes the work that much easier. By consciously identifying the unique characteristics of the course, you create criteria by which you can make informed decisions about how the class should be organized and taught.

Literature Review

Quality Of Instruction

When discussing the quality of teaching, we need to focus on the standards set. In this regard, the quality of teaching refers to and act on activities we think about teaching: lectures, discussions, and calls to students, and so forth. It also includes curriculum and books, software, or other materials. When the instructions are understood and of high quality, the information given deserves to the students, attracts them, is easy to remember and apply. As such, the most important aspect of teaching quality is the extent to which the lessons are reasonable, understood and applied by the students. For example, the teacher should provide information and knowledge in an organized way (Kallison 1986), paying attention to new topics (Smith and Cotton 1980), using language that is clear and easy to understand by the learners (Land, 1987) images and examples (Hiebert et al. 1991, Mayer & Gallini 1990), and often state the essential principles (Maddox and Hoole 1975). This standard makes the quality of teaching at the proper level.

The Appropriate Levels of Instruction

There is indeed a problem in determining the level of teaching that should be given to students. This problem also involves schools and organizations to provide teaching and learning resources for students with different levels of knowledge and different levels of learning. Actually, there are various ways to convey instructions to various student needs, but each method has weaknesses that may make the method productive. Hence, various forms of ability groupings strive to reduce heterogeneity in the teaching group. In that context, in the context of Special Education, it is a form of special abilities designed to provide special resources to accelerate student achievement with learning disabilities. However, the ability to gather between class competencies, such as detection, is capable of creating a low level of teaching where teachers have low expectations and maintain a slow pace of teaching, and many teachers do not like to teach (Good and Marshall 1984; Oakes 1985; 1987; Rowan and Miracle 1983; Slavin 1987b; 1990a). The same problem makes the class benefit students with learning disabilities (Leinhardt and Bickel 1987; Leinhardt and Pallay 1982; Madden and Slavin 1983). Classroom acquisition capabilities, such as the use of reading and math groups, create problems managing multiple groups in the classroom, thereby reducing direct instruction to each student, and forcing teachers to provide many unattended seats to keep students engaged while teachers are working with reading groups or math (Anderson, Evertson, and Brophy 1979; Barr 1992).

Incentive

Learning is a work and is not to say that learning must be a hard work to do, but in the same sense, students should strive to pay attention, learn, and perform the duties assigned to them carefully, and they must be motivated in do these things. This motivation comes from the intrinsic value of the learned material, or it may also be through the use of extrinsic incentives, such as praise, grades, stars, and so forth (Stipek 1993). Meanwhile, teachers can make intrinsic interest in the material to be taught by raising the curiosity of students, for example by using staggering demonstrations, by linking topics to student's personal life, or by facilitating students to find out information (Brophy 1987; Malone and Lepper 1988).

However, not all subjects can be intrinsically and appealing to every student at all times. Most students require some extrinsic incentives to carry out sufficient levels of work on most school work. For example, studies on graduated college courses as opposed to passing courses failed to achieve a higher grade in Grades (Gold, Reilly, Silberman, and Lehr 1971; Hales, Bain, and Rand 1971). In addition, student motivation to maintain and maximize their efforts will be influenced by their perceptions of the difference between their probability of success if they are self-employed and their likely success if they are not (Atkinson and Birch 1978; Slavin 1977; 1994).

Time

Every lesson takes time. Therefore, more time spent teaching subjects is not always translated into additional learning, but if the quality of teaching, the suitability of teaching, and the incentives for learning are high, then more time for instruction

may be paid in higher learning.

The amount of time available for learning depends on two main factors: The allocated time and the time involved. The time allocated is the time scheduled by the teacher to teach a particular subject or subject and then be used for teaching activities. The time allocated is mostly under direct supervision of schools and teachers. Meanwhile, the time involved, or the time of work, is largely of the quality of teaching, student motivation, and the time allocated. Therefore, the allocated time is a teaching element that can be changed (such as quality, suitability, and incentives), but the time consumed is an intermediate variable that links variables that can be changed with student achievement. Although the allocated time must be an essential element in each classroom organization model, research on this variable has found some consistent effects on student achievement. (Frederick and Walberg 1980; Karweit 1989).

Lesson Plans

In the context of teaching in Malaysia, the provision of teaching is a daily plan provided by the teacher for one teaching time. It contains information about students, goals to be achieved, content to be delivered and goal achievement determination. Teaching preparations are a plan of action provided by teachers to use when dealing with classes. While there are various teaching preparation formats, there is equality in terms of the components found in teaching preparations. The lesson preparation section can be divided into three sections namely preparation, presentation and closing. Students' existing knowledge should also be considered before beginning a teaching session. In addition, the application of knowledge and the application of noble values to students such as co-operation, creativity, courage and trust is important as everyone can enhance their knowledge and give new experiences to the students as well as form the praiseworthy character they can practice in everyday life.

In addition, teachers also need to assess. There are two types of assessments that are formative and summative evaluations. Formative assessment is used to measure learning outcomes after the learning unit or at the end of the chapter in textbooks. While summative assessments are carried out at the end of the course. Assessment of teaching topics can also be done at the closing stage which is the last part of the learning process. Determination of the type of assessment that is appropriate with the goals and the teaching steps is based on the Bloom, Krathowl and Simpson Taxonomy. The purpose of the assessment is to track the mastery, progress and level of student achievement. The formulation of activities can be made by the students and then the teacher gives a view to summarizing the entire teaching process that was implemented that day briefly conveying the explanation. These assessment scores should be written in their lesson plan books (Mak Sok Sang).

Method

Design

This study using cross sectional survey design (Fah & Hoon, 2015). This survey research design collects data from samples that can represent the population at any given time (Fah & Hoon, 2015). Quantitative data is a major aspect in data collection by using questionnaires.

Sample and Population

The population of the study was 1007 special education teachers in Selangor. While the minimum sample size is 297. Researchers only get 195 teachers just as they want to do a preliminary study. According to Cohen, Manion & Marrison (2007), the sample size of 30 and above is appropriate to use statistical analysis. The schools involved are comprised of primary schools and secondary schools have been identified and sources of information are obtained from special education data books (2016).

Reliability

The results from the study showed that the value of reliability is between 0.788 to 0,904 as shown as [Table 1](#). This finding demonstrates the reliability of Cronbach Alpha above 0.70 and is appropriate for research purposes (Nunally, 1978).

Table 1.

Composition	Cronbach's Alpha
Quality of Instruction	0.904
The Appropriate Level of Instruction	0.891
Incentive	0.850
Time	0.830
Lesson Plans	0.788

Table 1. Reliability of Composition

Findings And Discussion

The findings show that Quality of Instruction is the highest with 3.64. Meanwhile, followed by The Appropriate Levels of Instruction with a value of 3.61, Incentive 3.59, Lesson Plans is at 3.51 and Time is at 3.47 as shown as [Table 2](#)

Table 2.

Strategic Composition	Mean	Std. Deviation
Quality of Instruction	3.64	0.413
The Appropriate Level of Instruction	3.61	0.430
Incentive	3.59	0.430
Time	3.47	0.463
Lesson Plans	3.51	0.486
Valid N (listwise)		

Table 2. *Mean of Composition*

Firstly, the findings found that the quality of teaching was at its highest level. Quality of teaching plays an important role in teaching. The quality of the lesson is related to student background knowledge, using tools such as advocates (Pressley et al 1992), Spirit of teachers (Abrami, Leventhal, and Perry 1982) and humor (Kaplan and Pascoe 1977) can also contribute to the quality of teaching, such as the use of media and other visual representations (Hiebert, Wearne, and Taber 1991; Kozma 1991). Clearly the specification by designing the appropriate teaching objectives for the students and the significant correlation between what was taught and what was evaluated (Cooley and Leinhardt 1980) contributed to the quality of teaching. However, teaching is part of the quality of teaching and the other is an appropriate instruction instruction. Accordingly, content coverage is closely related to student achievement and achievement (Dunkin 1978; Barr and Dreeben 1983). Hence, rapid teaching can contribute to the quality of teaching. However, there is clearly something too fast and fast in teaching (Leighton and Slavin 1988). This study found that teaching quality precedes other companions in teaching composition. Secondly, the appropriate level of teaching is important in teaching composition. Additionally, research on the level of students' and grade-level abilities finds that this practice can improve student achievement, especially when the number of groups used is small and management techniques designed to ensure a smooth transition and high time task (Slavin 1987).

Third, Incentives become an important composition in teaching special education. In addition, a questionable strategy that delivers high expectations to students, such as waiting for them to respond (Rowe 1974) and following up with students who did not respond in full (Brophy and Evertson 1974) have been linked with high achievements (Good 1987). Thus, some methods of providing official incentives for learning have been found to be effective instruction. A practical and effective way to reward students for learning-oriented behaviours are home based reinforcement (Barth 1979), preparing daily or weekly reports to parents about student behaviour. In this regard, this incentive system encourages students to encourage and help each other.

Fourth, the Lesson Plan is a number of important teaching preparations in teaching planning. Among them is to enable teachers to determine the teaching objectives that are appropriate to the syllabus and the ability of the students. In addition, teachers can also define the approaches, strategies, methods and techniques that are appropriate to the teaching objectives and to help teachers to select appropriate materials, resources and activities. Teachers can also ensure that lesson content is communicated to students well. In addition, teaching preparation can ensure teachers do not deviate in teaching. This opinion is supported by Atan, L. (1993) which states that with the preparation of teaching, teachers will think clearly or objectively, selection of important content, selection, and method of teaching methods, activity planning and assessment preparation.

In addition, teaching preparations are important in providing confidence to teachers, especially new teachers as well as ensuring more systematic and effective teaching in classroom control, mutual interaction and absorption. The above views are supported by Mok, S. S. (2002), where he has prepared several preparatory preparations including allowing teachers to teach with greater confidence.

Conclusion

Finally teaching takes time. On the other hand, research on the time involved found positive relationships between time and task students (Karweit 1989). Teaching by improving student time on task is generally under the title of the classroom management research. The study of the products (Brophy and Good 1986) has stated that the use of effective management strategies of teachers is associated with high student achievement. However, some experimental studies focused on increasing the task when it was found that it was possible to improve the training time and still had no significant effect on student achievement (Emmer and Aussiker 1990; Slavin 1986; Stallings and Krasavage 1986).

Acknowledgement

We hereby say thankyou to Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris for supporting our research.

References

1. Abrami, P.C., L. Leventhal, and R.P. Perry. 1982. Educational seduction. *Review of Educational Research* 52(3): 446-462.
2. Anderson, L.M., C. Everson, and J. Brophy. 1979. An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading-groups. *Elementary School Journal* 79(3): 193-223.
3. Atkinson, J.W., and D. Birch. 1978. *Introduction to Motivation* (2nd Edition). New York: Van Nostrand.
4. Barr, R. 1992. Teachers, materials, and group composition in literacy instruction. In *Elementary school literacy: Critical issues*, ed. M.J. Dreher and W.H. Slater, 19-33. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon..
5. Barth, R. 1979. Home-based reinforcement of school behavior: A review and analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 49(3): 436-458.
6. Brophy, J. 1987. Synthesis of research on strategies for motivating students to learn. *Educational Leadership* 5 (Oct.): 40-48.
7. Brophy, J.E. and T.L. Good. 1986. Teacher behavior and student achievement. In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Third Edition, ed. M.C. Wittrock, 328-357. New York: MacMillan.
8. Brophy, J.E. and T.L. Good. 1986. Teacher behavior and student achievement. In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Third Edition, ed. M.C. Wittrock, 328-357. New York: MacMillan.
9. Brophy, J.E., and C.M. Everston. 1974. (Research Report No. 74-4). Austin: Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.
10. Cohen L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007) *Research Methods in Education* (6th edition) London: Routledge-Falmer
11. Cooley, W.W., and G. Leinhardt. 1980. The instructional dimensions study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 2(1): 7-35.
12. Dunkin, M. 1978. Student characteristics, classroom processes, and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 70(6): 998-1009.
13. Emmer, E.T., and A. Aussiker. 1990. School and classroom discipline programs: How well do they work? In *Student discipline strategies*, ed. O.C. Moles, 111-136. Albany: State University of New York Press.
14. Fah, L. Y., & Hoon, K. C. (2015). *Pengenalan Kepada Pendekatan Kuantitatif Dalam Penyelidikan Pendidikan* (Edisi ke-4). Penerbit Universiti Malaysia Sabah. Ahli Majlis Penerbitan Ilmiah Malaysia (MAPIM)
15. Frederick, W., and H. Walberg. 1980. Learning as a function of time. *Journal of Educational Research* 73: 183-194.
16. Gold, R.M., A. Reilly, R. Silberman, and R. Lehr. 1971. Academic achievement declines under pass-fail grading. *Journal of Experimental Education* 39(1): 17-21.
17. Good, T. 1987. Teacher expectations. In *Talks to Teachers*, ed. D. Berliner and B. Rosenshine, 159-200. New York: Random House.
18. Good, T., and S. Marshall. 1984. Do students learn more in heterogeneous or homogeneous groups? In *The social context of instruction: Group organization and group processes*, ed. P. Peterson, L.C. Wilkinson, and M. Hallinan, 15-38. New York: Academic Press.
19. Hales, L.W., P.T. Bain, and L.P. Rand. 1971. An investigation of some aspects of the pass-fail grading system. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, February 17, New York..
20. Hiebert, J., D. Wearne, and S. Taber. 1991. Fourth graders' gradual construction of decimal fractions during instruction using different physical representations. *Elementary School Journal* 91: 321-341.
21. Hiebert, J., D. Wearne, and S. Taber. 1991. Fourth graders' gradual construction of decimal fractions during instruction using different physical representations. *Elementary School Journal* 91: 321-341.
22. How We Can Help You. (n.d.). Retrieved June 28, 2018, from <https://tll.mit.edu/help/what-strategic-teaching>.
23. Kallison, J.M. 1986. Effects of lesson organization on achievement. *American Educational Research Journal* 23(2): 337-347.
24. Kaplan, R.M., and G.C. Pascoe. 1977. Humorous lectures and humorous examples: Some effects upon comprehension and retention. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 69(1): 61-65.
25. Karweit, N.L. 1989. Time and learning: A review. In *School and Classroom Organization*, ed. R.E. Slavin, 69-95. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
26. Karweit, N.L. 1989. Time and learning: A review. In *School and Classroom Organization*, ed. R.E. Slavin, 69-95. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
27. Kozma, R. 1991. Learning with media. *Review of Educational Research* 61(2): 179-211.
28. Land, M.L. 1987. Vagueness and clarity. In *International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education*, ed. M.J. Dunkin. New York: Pergamon.
29. Leighton, M.S., and R.E. Slavin. 1988. Achievement effects of instructional pace and systematic instruction in elementary mathematics. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, March, New Orleans.
30. Leinhardt, G., and A. Pally. 1982. Restrictive educational settings: Exile or haven? *Review of Educational Research* 52: 557-578. *Teacher of Mathematics*, Chicago.
31. Leinhardt, G., and W. Bickel. 1987. Instruction's the thing wherein to catch the mind that falls behind. *Educational Psychologist* 22: 177-207.

32. Madden, N.A., and R.E. Slavin. 1983. Mainstreaming students with mild academic handicaps: Academic and social outcomes. *Review of Educational Research* 84: 131-138.
33. Maddox, H., and E. Hoole. 1975. Performance decrement in the lecture. *Educational Review* 28: 17-30.
34. Malone, T., and M. Lepper. 1988. Making learning fun: A taxonomy of intrinsic motivation for learning. In *Aptitude Learning and Instruction, Vol. III: Cognitive and Affective Process Analysis*, ed. R. Snow and M. Farr, 70-81. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
35. Mayer, R.E., and J.K. Gallini. 1990. When is an illustration worth ten thousand words? *Journal of Educational Psychology* 82: 715-726.
36. Melton, R.F. 1978. Resolution of conflicting claims concerning the effect of behavioral objectives on student learning. *Review of Educational Research* 48: 291-302.
37. Mok Soon Sang(2002). *Psikologi Pendidikan untuk Kursus Diploma Perguruan Semester 3*. Subang Jaya: Kumpulan Budiman.
38. Mok Soon Sang, (2009). *Murid dan Alam Belajar*. Ipoh: CIPTA Printing & Publishing (M) Sdn Bhd
39. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
40. Oakes, J. 1985. Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Oakes, J. 1987. Tracking in secondary schools: A contextual perspective. *Educational Psychologist* 22: 129-153.
41. Pressley, M., E. Wood, V.E. Woloshyn, V Martin, A, King, and D. Menke. 1992. Encouraging mindful use of prior knowledge: Attempting to construct explanatory answers facilitates learning. *Educational Psychologist* 27: 91-109.
42. Rowan, B., and A. Miracle. 1983. Systems of ability grouping and the stratification of achievement in elementary schools. *Sociology of Education* 56: 133-144.
43. Rowe, M.B. 1974. Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic, and fate control. Part one: wait-time. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 11: 81-94.
44. Slavin, R.E. 1977. A new model of classroom motivation. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, April, New York.
45. Slavin, R.E. 1986. The Napa evaluation of Madeline Hunter's ITIP: Lessons learned. *Elementary School Journal* 87: 165-171.
46. Slavin, R.E. 1987. Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research* 57: 347-350.
47. Slavin, R.E. 1987b. Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research* 57: 347-350.
48. Slavin, R.E. 1990. Achievement effects of ability grouping in secondary schools: A best evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research* 60(3): 471-499.
49. Slavin, R.E. 1994. *Educational psychology: Theory into practice* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
50. Smith, L.R., and M.L. Cotton. 1980. Effect of lesson vagueness and discontinuity on student achievement and attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 72: 670-675.
51. Stallings, J., and E.M. Krasavage. 1986. Program implementation and student achievement in a four-year Madeline Hunter Follow Through Project. *Elementary School Journal* 87: 117- 138.
52. Stipek, D.J. 1993. *Motivation to learn: From theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.