

## Targeted, Individually Structured Special Education and Training Intervention Programs and Pedagogical Applications in Museum

Maria Drossinou-Korea

*University of Peloponnese, Kalamata, GREECE  
Faculty of Humanities and Cultural Studies*

Received: 6 June 2021 ▪ Accepted: 27 June 2021 ▪ Published Online: 28 June 2021

### *Abstract*

Anthropocentric museums are “an important place in public debate, creation and questioning ideas” because they can have a positive impact on the lives of underprivileged or marginalized people. They can also strengthen specific communities and contribute to the creation of fairer societies. The science of Museology together with the science of Special Education and Training (SET) support with the Targeted Individual Structured and Integrated Program for Students with Special Educational needs (TISIPfSEN), in children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SENDs). The purpose of this work was to study museology applications in accordance with the pedagogical tool TISIPfSEN. The main working hypothesis explored access to theatre and entertainment events, museums and archaeological sites of people with SENDs, which is not always an easy process given that they are a heterogeneous group due to their inherent or acquired specificity. The applications also drew pedagogical materials through the charm of the art of theatre and puppetry. In this context, performances were given free of charge through the Kalamata Experimental Stage to children and young people with SENDs, in the city of Kalamata and Sparta. This project led to voluntary application from students of department of history of University of Peloponnese. The results showed that people’s disability does not always mean impotence. Accessibility to museum programs and theatrical events in modern organized societies is possible. The learning process becomes accessible with the pedagogical tool TISIPfSEN to people with special needs. Necessary conditions, knowledge in the SET and the necessary training of all according to universal design. In conclusion, TISIPfSEN museum pedagogical programs facilitate different social groups in approaching, understanding the differential material culture, with alternative forms of communication and learning, given that heterogeneity in nature is a universal phenomenon.

**Keywords:** TISIPfSENs, pedagogical applications, museum.

### 1. Introduction

In Greece, in the context of the inclusive education policy for students with disabilities many researchers agree that effective inclusion occurs when teachers modify the curriculum to the needs of all students. The value of differentiated instruction in the inclusion of students with special educational needs and disabilities (SENDs) there are when teachers in mainstream schools (Strogilos, 2018) support pupils also with activities to the museums by the Targeted Individual

Structured and Integrated Program for Students with Special Educational needs (TISIPfSEN). According the science of Special Education and Training (SET) exists the limited knowledge about the types and the quality of modifications which understood and used by teachers in the Secondary Special Education. Implications for research and policy in special education teacher preparation are discussed with the reading instruction of teacher preparation and depend from the sense of preparedness and the education policy. According the research from the Department of Special Education, the University of Kansas, in the USA (Knackstedt, Leko & Siuty, 2018) and the findings from 577 secondary educators, in a large Midwestern state demonstrate the importance of effect on teachers' sense of preparedness, regarding their reading pre-service and in-service teacher preparation. The survey follows six models using multinomial logistic regression analyses. The importance of factors in preparing special educators who have a high sense of preparedness for teaching reading to adolescents with disabilities demonstrate between the results in above research. The practice-based pedagogical approaches used as opposed to passive lecture in the preservice coursework.

Also, international research has shown that the struggle to become inclusive education with the visits in the museums are still in progress and school and social services reform is a major challenge. The Council of Europe states that 'inclusion may be understood not just as adding on to existing structures, but as a process of transforming societies, communities and institutions such as schools to become diversity sensitive' (European Commission, 2009). The different understandings of inclusion and the way in which it can be implemented in practice of the special education and training (SET) by the pupils with SENDS in the museums. Two broad approaches give us a sense of the pedagogical tool as the Targeted Individual Structured and Integrated Program for Students with Special Educational needs (TISIPfSEN). First the radical restructuring of the education system and the second the implementation of additional special programs in the existing arrangements in mainstream settings as the SET for the museums. The situation estimated according the International Journal of Inclusive Education and the aspects of (Slee, 2013) about the inclusive education which happen as a political predisposition. In this is discussed the role of the irregular school and how it happens the inclusive education programs as the example the museums. Even within a mainstream setting employs several mechanisms such as the increased enrolment of students in SENDs.

The training intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum it is happen in the regular schools. A part from the special teachers who support the continuation of SET programs believe that is a service which needs to remain in mainstream settings and are best served in mainstream schools (Ferguson, 2008). Contrariwise, Zigmond and Kloo challenge the idea that special education and they argue "that special education will not survive to serve the special needs of students with disabilities if it loses its identity, and its unique special requirements" (Zigmond & Kloo, 2011).

### *1.1 The special educational needs and disabilities (SENDs): The intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum*

Even though, internationally, inclusive education is conceived as a broad reform that welcomes diversity among all learners (United Nations, 2006), in the South Peloponnese (Greece) it is mainly implemented as programmatic regularities which fail to initiate broad school reforms such as the interventions with the visit in museums. Because, the differentiated instruction provides a learning environment which takes into consideration the individual characteristics of all students (Strogilos, Tragoulia, Avramidis, Voulagka & Papanikolaou, 2017) and, as such, is a useful approach for the intervention programs and pedagogical applications in the museums. Thus, within mainstream education settings to a more blended practice through a process of eliminating the barriers to participation and learning experienced by students within the school

system present the Targeted, individually structured special education and training intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum.

Several factors have been identified in the literature of SET with regard to the absence or inconsistent pedagogical use of differentiated instruction. Among these factors are the lack of content knowledge of philologues necessary to extend and differentiate the core curriculum content areas in the museums. Also, the lack of time to adjust the curriculum for the students with SEN with the teachers' difficulty to locate and use effectively the appropriate resources such as the museums in the local city. So, another factor is even the perception of philologues that students differ in how they learn (Tomlinson, 2003).

With regard to the special educational needs and disabilities (SENs) and the intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum, the research studies in differentiated instruction report a lack of curriculum modifications in mainstream classrooms for these students (Strogilos, Tragoulia & Kaila, 2015). According to the literature review (Scruggs, Mastropieri, Kimberly & McDuffie, 2007), the education with the visits in the museums of students in general classrooms lacks appropriate teaching materials, differentiation in activities and opportunities for individualizing the curriculum. Also, the identified curriculum modifications for students with SEN in their descriptive observations in mainstream classrooms are limited.

The pedagogical applications in the museum use the differentiated instruction involves responding effectively to the learning differences that exist among learners in the classroom. According to the author (Christakis, 2013: 63-76), teachers differentiate when they reach out to an individual or small group by varying their teaching in order to create the best learning experience possible with interventions and adaptations required for the education of people with disabilities. The differentiated instruction with learning readiness activities is considered as one of the essential means to effective education for all students including those with SENs (Ministry of National Education and Religions – Pedagogical Institute, 2009). As we argued in the Special Education and Training (SET) with the “for” special education proposal for the children and young people with special needs (Drossinou Korea, 2017: 307-338), differentiation is not associated with the meaning “one teaching size for all”. But mainly with responsive Targeted Individual Structured and Integrated Program for Students with Special Educational needs (TISIPfSEN). Thus, when teachers differentiate the teaching objects, they ‘proactively plan varied pedagogical approaches such as with the exposition’s objects into the museums and they reflash what students need to learn, how they will learn it, and how they have learned effectively as possible. In addition, about supporting learning in inclusive classrooms, the experienced teachers create more simplified, functional and alternative curricular modifications such as with those visits into museums with the goal to improve the students’ on-task behavior and participation (Nind & Wearmouth, 2006). According the researchers (Morningstar, Shogren, Lee & Born, 2015) who referred identified reductions (51% of the observations) in the cognitive demands with the items, picture-based stories rather than written stories of work for the students with SEN in almost half of these classrooms. The most frequent modifications for these students were changes in how materials were presented, environmental adjustments, and response alternations.

This work uses Targeted, individually structured special education and training intervention programs (TISIPfSENs) (Figure 1). With emphasis the differential teaching of multiple sensory activities by the museums and is analyzed in five phases. The first and the second phases of the TISIPfSENs include the systemic empirical methodology of observations during which the teacher of special education studies the case of the student with SENs and according to his experience concludes in hetero-observations concerning the individual, family and school history as well as the diagnosis. So, the teacher who support the inclusion builds a first image for

the students learning profile. In addition, in the third, fourth and fifth phases of the TISIPfSENs include the methodology of intervention step by step.

## 2. Purpose

In this presentation, we will provide examples of differentiated activities for students with and without disabilities based on the principles of differentiated instruction. In addition, we will present the basic criteria with examples for planning and implementing individual adaptations for students with special needs / disabilities (SENs) (Drossinou-Korea, Matousi, Panopoulos & Paraskevopoulou, 2016). So, the purpose of this work is to study museology applications in accordance with the pedagogical tool TISIPfSEN (Figure 1).

The main working hypothesis explored access to theatre and entertainment events, museums and archaeological sites of people with SENs, which is not always an easy process given that they are a heterogeneous group due to their inherent or acquired specificity.

Also, we focus in the university courses of philologues with emphasis the use of pedagogical tool such as the Targeted, individually structured special education and training. In addition, the intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum put two research question.

Research Question 1: The philologues in the university courses could have preparation experiences to modifications the curriculum when they are visiting the museums with SEN students and adolescents in the secondary special education with activities learning of readiness?

Research Question 2: What pedagogical attributes and what level of preparedness of philologues need to support the teaching modifications the objects into the museums to students with disabilities and adolescents?

In the frame of the applications also we drew pedagogical materials through the charm of the art of theatre and puppetry. In the same context, e-performances were given free of charge through to children and young people with SENs, in the city of Kalamata and Sparta. This project led to voluntary application from students of department of history of University of Peloponnese.

Also, we work a lot by distance teaching in the period of pandemic Covid-19. The differentiated material was created jointly with the students with SEN individually focusing on the Acropolis Museum (Drossinou, 1999) and the National Archaeological Museum. The pedagogical applications in museum created with on the theoretical view of the anthropocentric model of SET (Christakis, 2013: 127-172). So, the museums were approached, which each time are “an important place in the public debate on equal education, the creation and challenge of ideas” without exclusions. The anthropocentric museums available are offered for skills with activities of learning readiness in oral speech, psychomotricity, mental abilities and emotional organization (Ministry of National Education and Religions – Pedagogical Institute, 2009). They also promote integration and are an important part of the public debate, about creating and challenging ideas around it and the students and the quality of school life. We also believe that these can strengthen specific school communities such as secondary schools and contribute to the creation of equal education in a critical period such as the pandemic. The science of museology is “mobilized” together with the science of SET in order to support the students and young people with SENs with the pedagogical tool such as the targeted, individual, structured and integrated intervention programs.

### 3. Methodology

The methodology of this study is mixed as it is made of quality and quantity data (Avramidis & Kalyva, 2006). The qualitative data of the research was extracted from the students' case studies. According the first phase of the TISIPfSENs includes the systemic empirical observation during which the philologue studies the case of the student with SENDS and according to his experience concludes in hetero-observations (Herr & Ed, 2012) concerning the individual, family and school history as well as the diagnosis. So, the philologue builds a first image for the students learning profile (Drossinou-Korea, 2017). The learning profile of the student will be completed with the second tool. According the second phase of the TISIPfSENs is utilized in the framework of the informal pedagogical evaluation and is suggested for the recording of the skill level of the student in different sectors through the completion of Checklists of control of basic skills (CBS) (Ministry of National Education and Religions – Pedagogical Institute, 2009).

The plan of the educational program to visiting the museums will be completed with the third tool. According the third phase of the TISIPfSENs is structured with the basic elements a teaching plan with modifications must have among others are: the time schedule of the teaching intervention, the educational goal and its' analysis in teaching steps (Task analysis) (Christakis, 2013). Finally, the philologue needs to define and record the pedagogical materials. Their choice is done based on the level of the SEND/s students' abilities, learning difficulties, learning readiness and skills.

The realization of the educational goal through direct teaching (one by one) using differential teaching methods to visit the museums will be completed with the fourth tool. According the Forth phase of the TISIPfSENs includes intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum and in the classroom. The place in which the educational intervention is going to take place and the time of visiting is defined in this phase (Drossinou Korea, 2020).

Finally, the evaluation with the pedagogical applications will be completed with the fifth tool in the museum. According the fifth phase of the TISIPfSENs includes use the differentiated instruction involves responding effectively to the learning differences and the evaluation of the student and the teaching modification program into the museum as well. The student undergoes an evaluation with similar activities of learning readiness with which he was taught and then he demonstrates whether he understood what he learned or not.

#### 3.1 Sample

The participants (N=103) were philologues from the School of Humanities and Cultural Studies, University of Peloponnese and they have very interest for the special education and training. The academic courses we planned to administer the web-based training modules during their pandemic covid-19 with the content the interventions into museums between March 2020 as April 2021. The philologues come from different regions of Greece and they had in their city a small experience from the local museum. Seventy - three from them completed the learning modules, which was a response rate of 86% for those on they have visit museums. From them we present e-modifications on the goal teaching intervention in the student in the secondary education with SENs. The philologues in the university courses have worked in the e-preparation teaching by distance and modificative the museums with activities learning of readiness. Also, with the participants we have discussed the pedagogical attributes and what level of preparedness of philologues need to support the teaching modifications the objects into the museums to students with disabilities and adolescents with the methodologies of observations and teaching interventions according the SET.

### *3.2 Research tools*

In the research tools, according the first phase of the TISIPfSENs, we used in the methodology the systematic empirical study of the student with special educational needs regarding the individual history, the family history and the culture brought by the family as well as the school history of the student in high school and his performance in both lessons and behavior. Even in the methodology remarks we used informal pedagogical evaluation with the basic skills checklists according the second phase of the TISIPfSENs and records in the particular protocols of SET such as the Checklists of basic skills (CBS). In the intervention methodology, we used the plan with the modifications on the teaching work of the differentiated program for the visit to the museum with the internet according to the third phase of the TISIPfSENs. Also, according to the fourth phase of the TISIPfSENs we still worked with the differentiated specific pedagogical materials we designed to our student in order to visit the museum using the "visual conceptual facilitators (VCF)" (Shurr & Taber-Doughty, 2017). In addition, according to the fifth phase of the TISIPfSENs we assessment the results from the teaching interventions by using the differentiated pedagogical material that we gave to the student we worked with him during the interventions together and records in the particular protocols of SET such as the Form of the Teaching Interaction (FTI). The FTI is the less standardized way of observation data collection and does not include predefined questions and answers (field notes). FTI is abstract data which can be written or recorded. This form includes the students' data, the teaching goal, the date of every teaching intervention and the recording of important crosstalk between teacher and student during the daily teaching intervention.

For the quantity data a special questionnaire was made based on the research questions. In the first part of the questionnaire were the questions which outline the social profile of the participants with emphasis the residents and their experience from the visit museums into their city who they come to university. The second part included questions designed to examine key points of teaching intervention to museum by internet in order to support language skills in students using TISIPfSENs. Questions were of Likert type in which the respondent was called to state the degree of agreement or disagreement in a scale of five points (1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree).

### *3.3 Methodology process of quality research*

The procedure of extraction of quantity research lasted 12 months and was as follows: Initially a bibliography review was made, then the goals were formulated, the research questions were written and then the research tool was designed. Afterwards despite the perceived importance of differentiated instruction, research has indicated the absence or inconsistent use of this strategy. Limited use of differentiated instruction has been noted for "typically developing" students as well as for students with special needs/ disabilities within mainstream classrooms. At the international level, even though the number of students with SEN in mainstream classrooms has increased, the type and the quality of education they receive remains a contentious issue. Several authors have urged for the necessary modifications to increase the quality of education provided to students with SEN through differentiated instruction (Morningstar, Shogren, Lee & Born, 2015). The language tour of the museum was taught at a distance and the exhibits from some museums were offered electronically while we were staying home. The skepticism on the basis of which the goal of the intervention was set concerned the utilization of free time. The time was marked by scheduled visits to some of the best museums in Greece, which offer us the possibility of digital browsing. With the help of technology, the pedagogical material was differentiated from top monuments and rich collections. The visual conceptual facilitators were the vehicle to make meaning accessible without haste and overcrowding, and to get to know our linguistic cultural heritage in an original and entertaining way. In our work it helped that the museums had online

browsing applications in their collections or in their exhibition spaces and in this way, they could promote the integration of students with SENDs.

#### 4. Results

The results of the present study were confirmed on the basis of the questions we had asked in the design of the research regarding the questions. Indeed, the museums and the modifications on the language teaching help them in the Pandemic. The modifications made to the curriculum are considered an essential inclusive strategy for the education of students with SEN in the general classroom. As Christakis (2013) indicate, modifications may be curricular, instructional or alternative. “Curricular” refer to what is being taught (i.e., content); “instructional” concern alterations of the way instruction takes place (i.e. method); and “alternative” involve altered goals, instruction and activities. According to (Scruggs, Mastropieri, Kimberly & McDuffie, 2007), differentiated instruction has the potential to increase the scores on high-test assessments for students with disabilities, students at-risk for school failure, typical students, and students labelled as gifted and talented in comparison to students in schools that promote ‘one size fits all’ instruction.

The first research was put in relation to the undergraduate studies and special education courses that the students who participated in language differences in museums and have been taught. It turned out that they can actually learn into the SET course and have been training in the pedagogical tool TISIPfSENs, using the phases in order to properly differentiate the material exhibited in museums with “visual conceptual facilitators (VCF)”. I refer to the example of the National Archaeological Museum which is the largest museum in Greece and one of the most important in the world. The e-visitor could see findings from excavations of the 19th century, mainly from Attica, but also from other parts of the country. The differentiations also, used pedagogical materials from all the enriched findings and from all over the Greek world. So, the philologues in the university courses could obtain preparation experiences to modificative the curriculum from a rich collection which offer the visitor student with SENDs in the secondary special education. Through, a panorama of ancient Greek culture from the beginning of prehistory to late antiquity they recover skills with activities learning of readiness in the oral speech, psychomotricity, mental abilities and emotional wellbeing.

The results of the second research question formulate the pedagogical characteristics and the level of readiness of the philologists who undertake differentiated interventions in the language through the content, the exhibits and the virtual visits to the museums. The level of readiness is determined by the training of teachers in the intervention phases with the pedagogical tool the TISIPfSENs (Figure 1).

In Table 1 in the appendix shows the possibilities of philologues to apply intervention programs in museum by using the phases of the pedagogical tool TISIPfSENs. The functionality of the pedagogical characteristics of philologists by designing and applying the identified differences that are needed to support the didactic modifications of the objects in the museums to students-adolescents with disabilities. The Acropolis Museum is an archaeological museum focused on the findings of the archaeological site of the Acropolis of Athens. The responses of philologues completed with the applied intervention programs in the Acropolis Museum. The new museum, which was built to house every object found on the sacred rock of the Acropolis and at its foot used with the “visual conceptual facilitators (VCF)”. The e-modifications of content are covering a wide period from the Mycenaean period to Roman and Early Christian Athens (Drossinou, 1999). Importantly, performances with a physical presence during the pandemic could not take place, so electronic museum tours helped to create pedagogical materials accessible to students. These materials were dolls, small everyday objects that were transformed into interactive roles in the teaching work. So, an empty roll of toilet paper turned into a museum hero

or a statue or a vase. The monuments of the Acropolis in the eyes of children with problems, recording of a curriculum for behavior modification publish in Greek to “The School and the Home” (Drossinou, 1999).

Also, the intervention programs in museum by using the phase of the TISIPfSEnSs according the quantity data which have collected with a special questionnaire show the results. Exercising several variables in the combined model, including courses on reading instruction, reading course component of observation, perceptions of “visual conceptual facilitators (VCF)”. Focus of variables such as courses on SET in the museum education and perceptions of teacher preparation also increased the likelihood of selecting agree or strongly agree as compared with neutral for using the phases of pedagogical tool TISIPfSEnSs with emphasis the e-visit into the museums. It appears the influence the variables had a greater impact on the likelihood of high teacher sense of preparedness; pre-service and in-service preparation remained influential individually but when combined, strengthened the likelihood of increasing teachers’ sense of preparedness to e-visit the museums. This finding further demonstrates the importance of pre-service and in-service preparation to develop high-quality, well-prepared special education teachers.

### 5. According to the conclusions

The results showed that people’s disability does not always mean impotence. Accessibility to museum programs and theatrical events in modern organized societies is possible. The TISIPfSEnSs is a useful pedagogical tool (Figure 1) for promoting student integration in mainstream schools (Drossinou-Korea, Matousi, Panopoulos & Paraskevopoulou, 2016). In the present study it functioned as an educational tool of teaching procedure that contributed effectively to the modification in the e-visits into museums. To this end, I will complete my presentation by indicating important prerequisites for the integration of differentiated instruction such as (a) policy makers to include differentiated instruction for the museums at the National Curriculum-Policy level; (b) universities to include relevant courses such as the SET on teachers’ pre-service and in-service training (Gargiulo & Bouck, 2017); and (c) philologues to be encouraged the development of differentiated instruction as the main approach/ practice for the inclusion of students with disabilities by using the Targeted, individually structured special education and training into their intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum. Ideally, these schools include all students, eliminate differences, support learning and respond to individual needs. However, in spite of “financial expenditure and optimistic talk, the exclusion (UNESCO, 1994) in the pandemic COVID-19 remains a real and present danger”. Evidence exists that the placement of pupils with disabilities at mainstream schools has not been followed by meaningful access to learning (Nind & Wearmouth, 2006). Even though there is emerging evidence that even students with significant social emotional and cognitive disabilities can benefit from access to the general education curriculum (Strogilos, Tragoulia & Kaila, 2015).

Referring to the differential material of e-visits into museums it is useful to say that the use of “visual conceptual facilitators (VCF)” pictures as a reading skill teaching technique, enforced the attention focus of the student and acted effectively in activities of sight words, decoding words and understanding of brief texts (like comics). The use of picture can enforce the reading skills of students with SENDs if they are used properly (Bouck & Bone, 2018) using the technique of “visual conceptual facilitators (VCF)” with appropriate teaching picture plus discussion (preliminary debate with photos connected to the text before reading. After this phase, and with the photos – “visual conceptual facilitators (VCF)” still in place, the researcher reads aloud to the student and finally, debates based in photos after text reading) showed that students with SENDs of secondary education responded satisfyingly in understanding text activities such as the museums. Furthermore, through this study was proven that a student with SENDs can



respond quite well in multiple reading skills having as a goal the acquirement of literacy in the context the museums which is the decoding and text understanding. This is confirmed from the researchers (Panopoulos & Drossinou-Korea, 2019) who studied how students with SENDs could ameliorate and transfer their reading skills in certain texts such as the context of museums.

#### List of Abbreviations

1. Framework Curriculum of Special Education (FCSE).
2. Target Individual Structured and Integrated Program for students with Special Educational Needs (TISIPfSEN).
3. Visual conceptual facilitators (VCF).
4. Special Education and Training (SET).
5. Informal pedagogical assessment (IPA).
6. Basic Skills Control Lists (BSCL).
7. Form of the Teaching Interactions (FTI).
8. Checklists of basic skills (CBS).
9. Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SENDs)
10. Special Educational Needs (SEN)

#### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all my students for participating in the study who are active in educational care and helped voluntarily in the present study.

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

The author declares no competing interests.

#### References

- Avramidis, E., & Kalyva, E. (2006). *Research methods in special education*. Athens: Papazisi.
- Bouck, E., & Bone, E. (2018). Interventions for students with intellectual disabilities. Στο *Viewpoints on interventions for learners with disabilities* (pp. 55-73). UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Christakis, K., (2013). Curriculum. In *Teaching Programs and Strategies: For People with Special Educational Needs and Serious Learning Disabilities* (pp. 127-172). Athens: Diadrasis.
- Christakis, K. (2013). Interventions and adaptations required for the education of people with disabilities. In *Teaching programs and strategies: For people with special educational needs and serious learning disabilities* (pp. 63-76). Athens: Diadrasis, in greek.
- Drossinou Korea, M. (2020). *Special education handbook and training narratives*. Patra: OPPORtUNA, (in greek).

- Drossinou, Korea M. (2017). Targeted Individually Structured Teaching Inclusion Programs of Special Education and Training Interventions (TISIPfSEN). In *Special Education and Training. The "for" special education proposal for the education of children and young people with special needs* (pp. 307-338). Patras: Opportuna, in hreek.
- Drossinou, M. (1999). The monuments of the Acropolis in the eyes of children with problems (recording of a curriculum for behavior modification). *The school and the home* (in Greek), 9(420), 433-437.
- Drossinou-Korea, M. (2017). *Special education and training. The "through" special education proposal for children with special features*. Patra: Opportuna.
- Drossinou-Korea, M., Matousi, D., Panopoulos, N., & Paraskevopoulou, A. (2016). School inclusion programmes (SIPs). *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 967-971.
- European Commission. (2009). Strategic framework for education and training. Brussels: European Commission. Retrived 20 May 2021, from [ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc28](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc28).
- Ferguson, D. L. (2008). International trends in inclusive education: The continuing challenge to teach each one and everyone. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 23(2), 109-120.
- Gargiulo, R., & Bouck, E. (2017). *Instructional strategies for students with mild, moderate and severe intellectual disability*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Herr, J., & Ed, D. (2012). Observing children: A tool for assessment. In *Working with young children* (7<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 52-67). Goodheart-Wilcox.
- Knackstedt, K. M., Leko, M .M. and Siuty M. B. (2018). Preparation, The Effects of Secondary Special Education in Reading: Research to Inform State Policy in a New Era. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 41(1), 70-85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417700960>
- Ministry of National Education and Religions - Pedagogical Institute (2009). In M. Drossinou (Ed.), *Learning readiness activities* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Athens: Organization for the Publication of Textbooks, in Greek.
- Morningstar, M. E., Shogren, K. A., Lee, H., & Born, K. (2015). Preliminary lessons about supporting participation and learning in inclusive classrooms. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40, 192-210.
- Nind, M., & Wearmouth, J. (2006). Including children with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms: implications for pedagogy from a systematic review. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 6(3), 116-124.
- Panopoulos, N. & Drossinou-Korea, M. (2019). Teaching Intervention to Support Reading Skills in Student with Intellectual Disability. *Open Journal for Studies in Linguistics*, 2(1), 19-34. <https://doi.org/10.32591/coas.ojsl.0201.03019p>
- Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., Kimberly, A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416.
- Shurr, J., & Taber-Doughty, T. (2017). The picture plus discussion intervention: Text access for high school students with moderate intellectual disability. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 32(3), 198-208.
- Slee, R. (2010). *The irregular school. Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*. London: Routhledge.
- Slee, R. (2013). How do we make inclusive education happen when exclusion is a political predisposition?. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(8), 895-907.
- Strogilos, V. (2018). The value of differentiated instruction in the inclusion of students with special needs/ disabilities in mainstream schools. *SHS Web of Conferences* 42, 00003, GC-TALE 2017, (pp. 1-7). <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200003>
- Strogilos, V., E. Tragoulia., & Kaila, M. (2015). Curriculum issues and benefits in supportive co-taught classes for students with intellectual disabilities. *International Journal of Developmental*

*Disabilities*, 61(1), 32-40.

- Strogilos, V., Tragoulia, E., Avramidis, E., Voulagka, A., & Papanikolaou, V. (2017). Understanding the development of differentiated instruction for students with and without disabilities in co-taught classrooms. *Disability & Society*. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09687599.2017.1352488>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2003). Differentiating instruction for academic diversity. In J. M. Cooper (Ed.), *Classroom teaching skills* (pp. 149-180). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special needs Education*. Retrived 2 June 2021, from: [http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA\\_E.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.pdf).
- United Nations (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- Zigmond, N., & Kloo, A. (2011). General and special education are (and should be different. In J. M. Kauffman (Ed.), *Handbook of Special Education* (pp. 544-556). London: Routledge.

## Appendix

Table 1. Intervention programs in museum by using the phase of the TISIPfSEns

### **Intervention programs in museum by using the first phase of the TISIPfSEns**

Number of Students	103
1= Strongly Agree	60
2= Agree	28
3= Undecided	15
4= Disagree	0
5 Strongly Disagree	0

### **Intervention programs in museum by using the second phase of the TISIPfSEns**

Number of Students	103
1= Strongly Agree	50
2= Agree	28
3= Undecided	22
4= Disagree	5
5 Strongly Disagree	0

### **Intervention programs in museum by using the third phase of the TISIPfSEns**

Number of Students	103
1= Strongly Agree	50
2= Agree	30
3= Undecided	15
4= Disagree	8
5 Strongly Disagree	0

### **Intervention programs in museum by using the fourth phase of the TISIPfSEns**

Number of Students	103
1= Strongly Agree	80
2= Agree	23
3= Undecided	0
4= Disagree	0
5 Strongly Disagree	0

### **Intervention programs in museum by using the fifth phase of the TISIPfSEns**

Number of Students	103
1= Strongly Agree	60
2= Agree	38
3= Undecided	5
4= Disagree	0
5 Strongly Disagree	0

Figure 1. Intervention programs and pedagogical applications in museum with pedagogical tool (TISIPfSEN)



