TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TO
STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN KOREA

A Thesis
Presented
to the Faculty of
California State University, Chico

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Teaching International Languages

by
Hwa-Su Chung
Spring 2011
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TO
STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN KOREA

A Thesis

by

Hwa-Su Chung

Spring 2011

APPROVED BY THE DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES
AND VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH:

______________________________
Katie Milo, Ed.D.

APPROVED BY THE GRADUATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

______________________________
Hilda Hernández, Ph.D.
Graduate Coordinator

______________________________
Hilda Hernández, Ph.D., Chair

______________________________
Maris Thompson, Ph.D.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am especially grateful to my parents, Suk-Keun Chung and Ji-Young Park. Many thanks to them for their tolerance and unending support during the past several years. You are my rock and I always love you.

I wish to convey my profound gratitude and appreciation to my role model, Dr. Hilda Hernandez, Chairman of my committee. She has been encouraging and inspiring for me to grow as a professional in this field. Thank you for leading me to a right place, the time working with you was always wonderful and delightful.

I am also indebted to Dr. young-Chul Lee for informing me the present situation of Korea in English education for students with special needs. I would also like to recognize Dae-Hee Lee for providing valuable resources from Korea. It is my intention in this work to contribute, in small way, to the task of educators in Korea to teach students with special needs languages.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Acknowledgements | iii |
| List of Figures | vi |
| Abstract | vii |

## CHAPTER

### I. Introduction

- Background ........................................................................ 1
- Statement of Problem .................................................. 7
- Statement of Need ......................................................... 9
- Purpose of Study ............................................................. 9
- Research Questions ..................................................... 10
- Limitations ..................................................................... 10
- Definition of Terms ..................................................... 11
- Overview of Chapters .................................................. 12

### II. The Issues Relevant to English Language Learners with Special Needs

- Background ........................................................................ 14
- Misidentification and Response to Intervention ............... 15
- The Features of Effective Instruction for English Language Learners (ELLs) with Special Needs ........................................ 20
- Instruction Bridges Students’ Knowledge to the Real World .......... 26
- Building an Interactive Learning Environment ..................... 29
- Summary ........................................................................ 34

### III. English Language Education for Students with Special Educational Needs (SEENS) in Korea

- Background ........................................................................ 36
- Language Curricula for Students with Special Educational Needs ................................................................. 38
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Education in Practical Classes in Korea</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusions</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References Cited</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definitions for the Major Categories of Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Features of Effective Instructional Strategies for English Language Learners with Special Needs</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TO STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN KOREA

by

Hwa-Su Chung

Master of Arts in Teaching International Languages

California State University, Chico

Spring 2011

The desire to educate students in English is very strong in Korea. English proficiency is not only a language skill, but also a compulsory element to live as an independent citizen in Korea. Through analyzing of research studies, this study points out identification, the Response to Intervention model, and building an interactive learning environment. These concepts are required for teaching a foreign language, English as a second language, or English as a foreign language to students with special needs. This study also reveals that English education for students with special needs in Korea focuses on fostering communicative competence. Further, it is revealed that most of Korean students with special needs are in physically inclusive settings, but not in instructionally inclusive settings for English education. In this study, recommendations are provide for general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators to teach students with special needs English as a foreign language.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

As the concept of the global community has been accepted throughout the world, the importance of English proficiency for people in modern Korean society is growing. English proficiency is not only the English that global citizens should possess; it has become a compulsory element to live as an independent citizen in Korea. As people are surrounded by information in English, most high level education institutions require English proficiency to enter and graduate. Employers also demand that their employees have a higher score on English proficiency tests. There is a strong desire for all citizens to learn English.

Unfortunately, students with special needs in Korea have been excluded from the opportunity to participate in English language education. Researchers, administrators, parents, even educators in Korea believe that second language acquisition for students with special needs is almost impossible because of the difficulties they face in the educational system. Their difficulty in first language acquisition is one of the reasons given as an excuse for the lack of English language education. First language capacity is a major part of foreign language acquisition. Students who are weak in their primary language achieve lower levels of foreign language competency than students who are strong in their first language (Sparks, 2008, p.180).
Children with sensory impairments or physical disabilities have language and communication difficulties, caused by their primary disabilities. These include limited visual cognition, auditory nerve impairments, and the lack of control over muscles responsible for carrying out speech. Hearing impaired children could have lexical difficulties, like using fewer cohesive markers or fewer lexical devices to signal cohesion (Alberini & Schley, 2003, p. 130). Visually impaired children might have lexical difficulties caused by their limited learning experiences. Physically disabled children without any cognitive impairment might have phonetic problems caused by impairments in muscle control (Nam, 2008, p. 11).

The types and severity of the disabilities are also obstacles. The language difficulties sometimes exist in isolation from other disabilities, but are linked to primary health problems like sensory impairments, physical disabilities, and cognitive disorders (Tommerdahl, 2009, p. 20). This makes for complicated and complex difficulties in language. Even though most English language educators in special education schools might agree on the need to teach English to their students in order to help them improve their quality of life, it is often considered too difficult. Students with special needs in English face additional difficulties because their language and communication needs are different and various.

The difficulties of students with cognitive disorders, like autism spectrum disorders, learning disabilities, emotional and behavioral disorders, and mental retardation, are more complex. Their language difficulties are grouped in various ways, like the kinds of primary difficulties or types of cognitive disorders they have. Snowling, Bishop, Stothard, Chipchase, and Kaplan (2006) argue that “the group with attention
problems showed a profile of specific expressive language difficulties; the group with social difficulties had receptive and expressive language difficulties; and the group with both attention and social difficulties was of low IQ with global language difficulties” (p. 759). Geuts and Embrechts (2008) suggest that autism spectrum disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder groups involve practical activities more than structural language aspects (p. 1931).

Abrams (2008) synthesizes researchers’ reports about the instructional difficulties of students with learning disabilities as follows:

Learning disabilities specific to L2 learning include problems with receptive (decoding: listening and speaking) or productive (encoding: speaking and writing) processing (Arries, 1999; Norrix, Plante, & Vance, 2005; see Appendix A for details). These learning disabilities may lead to lower accuracy in “auditory processing, phonological decoding or sound–symbol translation” (Norrix et al., 2005, pp. 22–23) and are often interrelated with memory functions, such as those that aid vocabulary acquisition. (Jarrold, Baddeley, Hewes, Leeke, & Phillips, 2004, p. 145)

The types of disabilities are not the only factors which generate difficulties in foreign (or second) language acquisition. The degree of severity of students’ disabilities, motivation, and intelligence capacity also affect learning, not only language acquisition.

The educational complexity of the issue also overwhelms the stakeholders. Teaching English in special education is not only the integration of foreign (or second) language education and special education. It is a complex subject, one that involves several educational issues as described by Artiles and Ortiz (2002) as follows:

To improve educational programs and services for English language learners with disabilities, educators need to overcome barriers embedded in the bilingual and special education fields and in current educational reform movements. They also need to improve links among different programs serving English language learners with special educational needs. (p. 15)
Teaching English as a foreign or second language to students with disabilities is a complicated issue. In spite of difficulties in teaching English to students with special needs, voices of advocates for English language education has been rising in Korea. The increased value of English education is related to changes in how students with special needs are viewed in the field of special education. The medical model, which looks at students with special needs as objects to be treated, aided, and healed, dominated the special education field in Korea for a long time. More recently, Korean special education has shifted its focus to providing sufficient special education services to whoever needs them, for all types of disabilities. The Act on Special Education for Disabled Persons, Etc. (2010) of Korea defines students with special needs using the term, Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENs), as follows:

The school superintendent or the superintendent of the office of education shall select a person, who is diagnosed and evaluated as a person requiring special education, among those who fall under any of the following subparagraphs, as a person subject to special education.
1. Visual disability;
2. Hearing impairment;
3. Mental retardation;
4. Physically handicapped;
5. Emotional disturbance, Behavioral disorder;
6. Autistic disorder (including the handicap related to this disorder);
7. Communication disorder;
8. Learning disorder;
9. Health impairment;
10. Developmental retardation; and
11. Other disabilities determined by the Presidential Decree. (Article 15)

According to this act, a student whose disabilities are identified by the Act on Special Education for Disabled Persons, Etc might not be a SSEN unless she or he needs special education services, like students with health disabilities. On the other hand, a student with the disabilities identified by The Act on Special Education for Disabled
Persons, Etc, not the Individuals with Disabilities Act (장애인 복지법), like learning disabilities, have the right to receive special education services. Furthermore, by including students with developmental disabilities within the preview of SSENs, the act supports the legal basis for providing special education services to “at risk students”. This view of the Act on Special Education for Disabled Persons, Etc. reflects on the change from a view of students with special needs focusing on their disabilities toward the view of Students with Special Educational Needs focusing on providing sufficient education services to whoever needs it. This view has inspired Korean stakeholders in special education to consider what educational services students with special needs require and to include English language education as an educational service for students with special needs.

The basis for the rights of students with special needs to receive proper English language education is ensured by policy and law. Article 31 of the Constitution of Korea in 1987 states that “all citizens have an equal right to receive an education corresponding to their abilities” (p. 9). This article is a core idea in support of educational rights for students with special needs. The Framework Act on Education of Korea (2008) also protects their educational rights for them by stating that “every citizen shall have a right to learn through life and to receive education according to his or her abilities and aptitudes” (Article 3). This indicates that equal educational opportunities should be provided according to students’ abilities. In the act, students are encouraged to make the utmost display of their abilities through Article 12; “content of education, educational methods, educational materials and educational facilities shall be provided to develop
learners’ maximum abilities with respect for their personalities and emphasis on their individualities”. These are the basis of educational rights for all students, including students with special needs. This is strong evidence that children with special needs should not be excluded from English language education.

Based on these political supports, a strong movement to integrate English language education into the curricula for special education has begun. An alternative English language curriculum for students with sensory impairments was first included in the 7th edited National Basic Common Curricula (NBCCs) in 1997. The NBCCs consist of two curricula, one for general education and another for special education. The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology aims to educate all Korean students from the elementary level to the secondary level in the NBCCs. The NBCC for special education is based on the NBCC for general education. The NBCC for special education builds on the NBCC for general education with supplemental educational purposes that consider the individual features of each student’s disabilities. Formation and time assigned, as well as guidelines for organization and management, also are in the NBCC for special education in order to respond to individual needs. Considering students’ special needs, the alternative English language curriculum in the NBCC for special education is also founded on the English language curriculum in the NBCC for general education. Since the 7th NBCC for special education included the alternative English language curriculum, English education for students with sensory impairments has legal force.

However, many students with special needs in Korea are still excluded from English language education. A number of students with special needs fall on the general
education boundary, according to the paradigm of full inclusion, which dominates the special education field in Korea. Even though the students in general education settings have a desire to learn English, teachers face difficulties because the NBCC for special education refers to the alternative English language curriculum only for students with sensory impairments, and the English language curriculum in the NBCC for general education does not cover students with the other disabilities. The lack of the alternative English language curriculum and studies for students with other disabilities denies them opportunities to receive English education. Moreover, even students with sensory impairments might be excluded from English education in general education classes due to general education teachers’ unfamiliarity with the alternative English language curriculum. The curriculum does not deal with how to involve students with special needs in English language classes within general education. Regardless of the disabilities students have and where they are placed, the lack of English language education strips them of the right to be educated in an appropriate way and to transfer into society as independent individuals.

Statement of Problem

The lack of consideration of English education for students with special needs in Korea aggravates the situation of inadequate English education. The NBCC for general education provides English education to students in general education classrooms from elementary level to secondary school level. The sequence of English education moves from third grade in elementary school to middle school. Thus, the lack of sufficient English education for students in the special education sequence, except the alternative
English education for students with sensory impairments, produces an inadequate learning experience in English language learning. This has become a stumbling block to higher levels of education and has denied learners the opportunity to be educated fully in inclusive classrooms. Moreover, English competence is not only a foreign language in Korea, but a means to independent citizenship. High level education institutions, employers, and the broader society require people to demonstrate high English competence. The lack of English education for students with special needs becomes an obstacle to achieving independent citizenship (Cho, Kim, & Ahn, 2003, p. 149).

Another problem related to English language education for students with special needs is that there are no guidelines for general education teachers. As a result, general education teachers shift their responsibility onto special education teachers in general education schools. According to the study by Kim, Kim, Roh, Park, and Lee (2008), 68.2% of the students with special needs who are in regular elementary schools are placed in special education classes to learn English language (p. 189). These numbers show that many students with special needs are excluded from inclusive instruction, even in physically inclusive settings. Even though the rest of the students are sitting in full inclusion classrooms, the lack of sufficient studies on English education for these students has resulted in some general education teachers tacitly excluding them from English language education in general education classes. They are not significantly included. Full inclusion becomes possible when students with special needs participate in access to learning content, not just physical inclusion.
Statement of Need

Despite the fact that the issue of teaching English to students with special needs is complex, most special education stakeholders have a desire to teach them English. The scarcity of studies on teaching English to these students makes it difficult for them to do so. This thesis will serve as a resource for general education and special education teachers to approach the issue, and move toward the ultimate purpose of English education for all students. It will also be useful for curriculum developers, administrators and parents who are interested in teaching English to students with special needs in both general and special education.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the issues that Korea faces in teaching English to students with special needs and how to address these challenges based upon research findings in teaching a foreign language, English language as a second language, or English as a foreign language. The goal is to develop an inclusive program for children with special needs. What does the research reveal about teaching foreign languages, English as a second language, or English as a foreign language to students with special needs? What does the research reveal about teaching English as a foreign language to students with special needs in Korea? The results will be helpful in planning and implementing English education for students with special needs in Korea.

Based on a synthesis of findings from previous research, recommendations will be developed for special education stakeholders, such as general and special education teachers, curriculum developers, and parents.
Research Questions

This study addresses three main questions:

1) What does research reveal about teaching a foreign language, English language as a second language, or English as a foreign language to students with special needs?

2) What does the research reveal about teaching English as a foreign language to students with special needs in Korea? What is working and what is not working? Why?

3) Based on a synthesis of research findings, what are the recommendations for general and special education teachers, administrators, and parents for teaching English as a foreign language to students with special needs in Korea?

Limitations

Since the researcher currently resides in the U.S., the resources related to Korea in this study have been collected outside of Korea and might be different from data collected in Korea. As only a limited number of studies deal with this issue, this study may not include a wider view of the issues involved. Especially, the number of the studies dealing with features of effective instruction for English language learners with special needs. The findings from the studies should not be generalized beyond the features described in these nine studies: Baca and de Valenzuela (1994); Carrasquillo and Bonilla (1990); Gersten, Baker, and Marks (1998); Hoover and Patton (2005); Ortiz (2001); Santamaria, Fletcher, and Bos, (2002); Tharp (1997); Thurlow, Shyyan, Barrera, and Liu (2008); Yates and Ortiz (2004).
Definition of Terms

**Basic Curriculum (BC)**

The curricula designed by Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology of Korea for special education. Basic Curriculum education is usually used for students with autism, behavioral disabilities, and severe disorders, who cannot receive National Basic Common Curricula because their disabilities.

**English Language Learners (ELLs) with Special Needs**

Students who learn English as a second or foreign language and, simultaneously, require special education services.

**National Basic Common Curricula (NBCC)**

The curricula designed by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology of Korea for students from 1st grade to 10th grade. This term is used for both special education and general education. National Basic Common Curriculum for special education is usually used for students with sensory impairments, physical disabilities, and mild mental disorders.

**Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENs)**

Students with special needs identified by the Special Education for Individuals with Disabilities Act (2010) of Korea. There are students who have disabilities and also require special education services because of their disabilities.
Students with Special Needs

Students with difficulties “who need instructional accommodation, curricular adaptations, and/or related services to be successful in school and prepared for either further education or the workforce” (Churchill, Mulholland, & Cepello, 2008, p. 4).

Overview of Chapters

Chapter I provides an overview of the teaching challenges and the needs of students in English education. Chapter II attention is focused on teaching English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), and Foreign Language (FL) to students with special needs in other countries other than Korea. In chapters I and II, there is an analysis of research studies written after 2000. Unless studies written before 2000 are considered very important, they are not included. In chapter II, studies which deal with teaching ESL, EFL, and FL to students with special needs, especially in view of early intervention, instruction, and cooperation at schools are analyzed. Studies relevant to teaching English as a first language to students with special needs or to issues which cannot be dealt with in schools or classes, e.g., political issues, are not included. Chapter III provides a survey of research on teaching language to students in special education in Korea. This encompasses studies which investigate issues related to teaching language, including Korean and English, to all students including students with special needs. The analysis emphasizes the Korean English education curricula authorized by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology in 2008, and the results of a national survey on practical special education authorized by the Korea National Institute for Special Education. These documents indicate how students with special needs are educated in
English. They are valuable because there are only a few studies which address teaching EFL to students with special needs in Korea. In chapter IV, there is a summary and synthesis of the findings and recommendations on teaching English to students with special needs in Korea for general and special education teachers, administrators, and parents. Finally, the chapter closes with conclusions and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II

THE ISSUES RELEVANT TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Background

As English is now a global language, teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) has become increasingly important. For example, in the U.S, teaching English as a second language has become an essential responsibility of schools as the population of ELLs from various cultures has grown. With this growing population, issues related to ELLs with special needs have also been illuminated. According to the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services of the U.S. (2002), 9 percent of all ELLs in U.S. public schools qualified as requiring special education services in grades K-12 in the school year 2000-2001 (as cited in McCardle, Mele-McCarthy, Cutting, Leos, & D’Emilio, 2005, p. 2). This population requires attention from the fields of teaching English as a second language and special education.

However, in spite of the growing population, few studies examine how these students are taught. ELLs with special needs receive lower scores on standards-based content assessments than both ELLs and students with special needs (Albus, Thurlow, & Liu, 2009, p. 18). The difficulties of ELLs with special needs have produced greater awareness of what happens and how they are educated in schools. The issues relevant to
teaching ELLs with special needs are highlighted in this study: misidentification and Response to Intervention (RTI), the features of effective instruction for ELLs with special needs, and building interactive learning environments. Misidentification is a significant issue. ELLs with special needs are easily misidentified and misplaced. The RTI model is used to prevent misidentification. In the classroom, the issue of how to teach this population receives more attention. Teachers need to be aware of the features of effective instruction for ELLs with special needs. To deliver effective instruction, the professionals involved, including parents, need to cooperate based on active interaction. The literature and discussion presented herein is intended to inform these issues.

Misidentification and Response to Intervention

The biggest issue relevant to English Language Learners (ELLs) with special needs is identification. Identification of ELLs with special needs is largely significant as the first step which directly affects the instruction, assessment, and accommodation for these students (Abedi, 2009, p. 5). ELLs, who are inappropriately identified as having special needs because of their limited English proficiency, might not receive the proper instruction, assessment, and accommodation. However, it is not easy to distinguish whether the students’ difficulties are from limited English proficiency or disabilities. The difficulties students with special needs and ELLs have are very similar in terms of pronunciation, syntax, and semantics (Case & Taylor, 2005, p. 128). These similarities make the process of identification of ELLs with special needs difficult and complicated. In the following excerpt, Liu, Thurlow, Koo, and Barrera (2008) interviewed a teacher who described the challenge of distinguishing where the difficulties originate:
I think most of ESL kids with disabilities are there mainly because of the language issues. I have seen new students, once they got here, they don’t know the language so they are easily misunderstood as having some learning disabilities by the mainstream teachers. But in reality, they just could not communicate in the classroom with their teachers or other kids. They just sit there just silent. (p. 30)

Like this teacher, teachers are sometimes confused about whether students’ difficulties are from limited language proficiency or learning disabilities. This misunderstanding frequently occurs within teaching English as a second language and special education. If ELLs do not show meaningful achievement in their classes due to their limited English proficiency, they are sometimes identified as having disabilities. Identification should be implemented thoroughly since educational services from placement to assessment are decided and provided based on identification. Misidentification has not happened only with ELLs, but also ELLs with special needs. The disabilities of ELLs with special needs have been hidden by their supposed limited English proficiency. It denies ELLs with special needs opportunities to receive special education services. Whether in the case of ELLs without disabilities in special education or ELLs with disabilities out of special education, ELLs are easily misidentified and misplaced. Misidentification and misplacement are evidenced by the disproportionate representation of ELLs in special education.

McCardle, Mele-McCarthy, Cutting, Leos, and D’Emilio (2005) reveal that ELLs tend to be “underrepresented overall in special education”, but “overrepresented in certain special education categories: speech language impairment, mental retardation, and emotional disturbances” (p. 2). Studies Samson and Lesaux (2009) and Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, and Higareda (2005) reveal interesting patterns. These studies examine the representation of ELLs in special education across grades. Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, and
Higareda indicate that ELLs are underrepresented in special education from kindergarten to fourth grade, and overrepresented after fourth grade in comparison with English proficient students. The data collected by the authors did not present clear reasons for this finding (p. 296).

Samson and Lesaux (2009) also examine ELLs in special education across grades with similar results by Artilles, Rueda, Salazar, and Higareda. According to this study, “language minority learners are underrepresented in special education in kindergarten and first grade, and overrepresented in third grade relative to their representation in the total population” (p. 158). Samson and Lesaux describe the possible reasons: “teachers are reluctant to refer LM students (Language Minority) for special education services until English proficiency is established, and teachers lack confidence in identifying disabilities in LM learners” (p. 159). These two studies indicate that there might be a population of ELLs with special needs in lower grades who do not receive special education services, as well as, a population of ELLs who are misidentified as having special needs and misplaced in special education in higher grades.

For these populations, it is more valuable to provide intensive and appropriate education services before identification. The RTI model focuses on providing intensive and appropriate education services before identification, reducing the number of students unnecessarily referred to special education. The RTI model was originally designed for students with learning disabilities, raising questions about the discrepancy model, which waits for students to fail in order to prove the discordance between their ability and achievement. Differing from the discrepancy model, the point of the RTI model is that it provides proper instruction based on what students can do rather than waiting until they
fail. The RTI model focuses more on prevention, successful academic outcomes, and academic programming than identification (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2007, p. 14). Batsche, Elliott, Graden, Grimes, Kovaleski, Prasse, Reschely, Schrang, and Tilly III (2007) identify core principles of the RTI model: “Teach all children effectively; Intervene early; Use a multi-ties model of service delivery; and Adopt a problem solving methodology” (slide 9). These practices reduce the achievement gap between students with learning difficulties and their peers and improve literacy rates (Haager, 2007, p.213) by providing appropriate services without waiting to be identified as having disabilities. By reducing the gap between them, general teachers can deliver educational services to students with special needs, not referring them to special education carelessly. This is a very meaningful point for general education teachers to prevent struggling students from academic failure and being inappropriately referred to special education.

The point of providing appropriate services before identification makes the model valuable for all students, including ELLs with special needs. This is consistent with the three tiers of the model: “universal screening and research based instruction, intervention and progress monitoring, and special education and progress monitoring” (Johnson, Smith, & Harris, 2009, p. 2). In Tier 1, which occurs in general education classrooms, high quality classroom instruction is provided to all students. Teachers access and address what their students need (p. 67). When ELLs are involved in Tier 1, teachers need to monitor “the match between demand of the curriculum and the ELLs’ current level of proficiency in the language of instruction” (Brown & Doolittle, 2008, p. 68). Oral and academic language proficiency needs to be addressed in Tier 1, based on curriculum based-assessments (Rinaldi & Samson, 2008, p.7). Despite instructional
modification adjusted to ELLs’ proficiency in Tier 1, if the ELLs don’t show significant progress, they might need to be referred to Tier 2. In Tier 2, more intensive support is provided. Intensive instruction, which is more specific than instructionally modified general education, is implemented for small groups. Brown and Doolittle (2008) comment that instructional intervention in Tier 2 should satisfy students’ linguistic and cultural needs (p. 70). If a student doesn’t show meaningful progress in the class, he or she is referred to Tier 3. Tier 3 is the step which provides intensive individual instruction. Rinaldi and Samson (2008) acknowledge the role of Tier 3: “One to one and progress monitoring; the multi-disciplinary team evaluation (individualized assessment plan); and eligibility to receive special education and Individualized Education Programs which include plans for oral English proficiency and academic language proficiency, monthly progress monitoring, and strategy interventions” (p. 7). Students who don’t produce meaningful performance through Tier 1 and 2 are provided intensive and individual intervention. Assessment to ensure the students’ eligibility to receive special education is ongoing through Tier 1 and Tier 2.

As the three tiers show, the teacher’s attention moves from all students to individuals who have difficulties across these three tiers. Instruction for all students in Tier 1 becomes more intensive and individualized; they become very concentrated and appropriate for individuals in Tier 3. Teachers focus on providing more effective and valuable instruction for all students, not on identifying students’ difficulties. This emphasis on instruction and progress monitoring facilitates successful outcomes for each student, including ELLs with special needs (Linan-Thompson, Cirino, & Vaughn, 2007, p. 187). Focusing on individual support makes the RTI model valuable for language
For ELLs with special needs, there are numerous factors that identify their educational needs, like types of disabilities, severity of disabilities, level of first and second language proficiency, cultural background, and so on. Through the RTI framework which continuously monitors and considers appropriate instruction to satisfy each student’s educational needs, ELLs with special needs can perform successfully in the class. These benefits of the RTI model promote inclusive education for ELLs with special needs. General education teachers can prevent their ELLs from being unnecessarily referred to special education, and they can provide proper and effective educational help to all students including ELLs in general education classes, whether they have special needs or not.

The Features of Effective Instruction for English Language Learners (ELLs) with Special Needs

For a long time, researchers have been trying to find effective instructional strategies. Two instructional strategies have been dominant for many years: lecture and discussion (Powell & Caseau, 2004, p. 189). More recently, alternative instructional strategies have been used to help learners learn more effectively. Book (1999) describes how students can learn more effectively when they “(a) actively participate in the learning, (b) have knowledge (or specified feedback of the results of learning), (c) know what they are expected to learn, (d) know the purpose of what they are learning, and (e) find the learning to be meaningful to them” (p. 333). Based on these basic understandings
about learners, effective instructional strategies differ according to the features of the learner. In regards to the features of successful instructional strategies for ELLs, Jacobson (2010) makes two points. One is to provide comprehensible input to access the core content in English and the other is to teach English as a language “along with a distinctive set of literary and cultural texts and traditions” (p. 37). Effective instructional strategies for students with special needs demand additional considerations. In special education, these focus on “development of consistent objectives and sequencing of skills, appropriate materials and instructional procedures, and specific decision making system and evaluation procedures” (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2002, p. 39). Hypothesizing from studies by Jacobson and Mastropieri and Scruggs, effective instructional strategies for ELLs focus on building background knowledge for comprehension and practice. For students with special needs, these emphasize consistent and specific instruction.

The instructional strategies considered effective for ELLs with special needs are also unique due to the complexity of the issues involved. Figure 1 highlights key features of effective instruction for ELLs with special needs. These were indentified in nine studies: Baca and de Valenzuela (1994); Carrasquillo and Bonilla (1990); Gersten, Baker, and Marks (1998); Hoover and Patton (2005); Ortiz (2001); Santamaria, Fletcher, and Bos (2002); Tharp (1997); Thurlow, Shyyan, Barrera, and Liu (2008); and Yates and Ortiz (2004).

All nine studies identify features of effective instruction for teaching language to ELLs with special needs. They focus specifically on instructional strategies for ELLs with special needs. They were the only studies identified in a search of online resources and books specific to ELLs with special needs. Studies dealing only with ELLs or
students with special needs were not included in this research (e.g., Jacobson, 2010, or Mastropieri and Scruggs, 2002). Studies conducted after 1990 were also excluded. Additionally, this research includes features of effective language instruction, but not other academic areas. For example, the study by Thurlow, Shyyan, Berrena and Liu (2008) addressed features of effective reading, mathematics, and science instruction for ELLs with special needs. Only the features specific to effective reading instruction were included in this study.

Eight key features of effective instructional strategies emerged from the lists of features in these studies: active learning; collaboration between students; comprehensible input; contextualized instruction; high cognitive demand; interaction; modification; and teaching language across the curriculum. Additional strategies identified in only one of the studies are listed under “other strategies” in Figure 1.

Of these features, active learning, interaction, and contextualized instruction are worth noting. These strategies are highly regarded as effective strategies that produce meaningful language learning experiences in Korea. Active learning is cited in four of the nine studies. Unlike traditional strategies, which often deliver only fragmentary knowledge, active learning, in which students enthusiastically participate in order to produce outcomes, fosters real learning experiences. Active learning also enables students with special needs to participate in learning. In classes using traditional instructional strategies, students with special needs are sometimes excluded from activities. Active learning stimulates them to learning outcomes through participation. In
### Educational Strategies

**Active learning:** Students produce actual learning through learner-oriented class activities, like questioning aloud and inquiry-based tasks.

**Additional comprehensible input:** Teachers provide supplementary or alternative forms of content and materials to facilitate student understanding, like visuals.

**Collaboration between students:** Students work with their peers in class activities.

**Contextualized instruction:** Instruction is connected to the social situations of students’ real lives, including their background knowledge, prior experiences and skills, language, culture, and environment.

**High cognitive demand:** Teachers teach cognitive and meta-cognitive skills to help students succeed in class activities. The definitions of cognitive and meta-cognitive skills are adapted from Oxford (1990). Cognitive skills include higher thinking skills, like “practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output” (p. 19). Meta-cognitive skills include skills that manage learning, like “centering, arranging and planning, and evaluating learning” (p. 20).

**Interaction:** Students have plenty of opportunities to communicate orally with the teacher and other students.

**Teaching language across the curriculum:** The target language is continuously and persistently practiced across subject areas.

**Modification:** Instruction should be enriched and adjusted according to the educational needs of the students.

**Other strategies:** The following instructional strategies were only cited in one study as indicated. In effective instruction, teachers provide:

- **Collaboration with parents:** Teachers build a strong home-school connection and facilitate parental involvement in their children’s education;
- **Teaching four areas of language:** Teachers design instruction based on a balance of listening, speaking, reading, and writing;
- **Teaching literacy skills:** Teachers teach reading and writing for communication and comprehension;
- **Using various techniques:** Teachers use manifold instructional strategies, like problem solving, role playing, and storytelling (Carrasquillo & Bonilla, 1990, p. 84);
- **Modeling:** Teachers provide examples that students can refer to;
- **Using consistent language:** The language used to describe complex ideas does not change;
- **Acceptance of errors:** Teachers consider students’ mistakes as a natural part of language acquisition and provide appropriate feedback;
- **High expectations in diversity:** Teachers should respect students’ cultural backgrounds;
- **Individual approach:** Teachers design instruction and services which meet each student’s personal needs;
- **Collaboration with students:** Teachers and students work together as a team to achieve class activities; and
- **Pre-reading activities:** Teachers help students develop a schema for a text before they read the text.

---

**Figure 1.** Definitions for the major categories of instructional strategies.


other words, students with special needs can have meaningful learning experiences through active learning. Real language learning experiences are also provided when instruction is based on interaction. Four of the nine studies emphasize use of this strategy. Language instruction is sometimes dominated by drills and repetition. Although drills and repetition are good strategies for students with low levels of proficiency or special needs, they lose their effectiveness when they are not used for conversation and interaction. Language education can be more meaningful when the language is used in real situations. Lastly, contextualized instruction provides meaningful learning experiences, as evidenced in six of the nine studies. Instruction related to students’ prior knowledge and experience is useful in comprehending input. Instruction should also consider students’ real world needs since knowledge and experience are gained in cultural and social contexts in the real world. Doing so enables students to acquire communicative competence and more easily utilize what they learn in real world situations. Contextualized instruction is discussed further after Figure 1 and Figure 2.

As indicated in Figure 2, the concept of contextualized instruction was discussed in six studies. The meaning of context is defined in many different ways. At one level, context refers to the connections which make meaning between sentences. However, meaning can be used more broadly to encompass “the situation within which the communicative interaction takes place” (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p. 11). In language teaching, “context refers to the degree to which meaning and situations from the world outside the classroom are present in an instructional approach, method, or classroom activity” (Shrum & Glisan, 2005, p. 41). Many researchers and teachers have insisted on the importance of providing instruction related to the real world in language
**Figure 1** strategies:

(a) **Collaboration with parents**: Teachers build a strong home-school connection and facilitate parental involvement in their children’s education;

(b) **Teaching four areas of language**: Teachers design instruction based on a balance of listening, speaking, reading, and writing;

(c) **Teaching literacy skills**: Teachers teach reading and writing for communication and comprehension;

(d) **Using various techniques**: Teachers use manifold instructional strategies, like problem solving, role playing, and storytelling (Carrasquillo & Bonilla, 1990, p. 84);

(e) **Modeling**: Teachers provide examples that students can refer to;

(f) **Using consistent language**: The language used to describe complex ideas does not change;

(g) **Acceptance of errors**: Teachers consider students’ mistakes as a natural part of language acquisition and provide appropriate feedback;

(h) **High expectations in diversity**: Teachers should respect students’ cultural backgrounds;

(i) **Individual approach**: Teachers design instruction and services which meet each student’s personal needs;

(j) **Collaboration with students**: Teachers and students work together as a team to achieve class activities;


**Figure 2**. The features of effective instructional strategies for English Language Learners with special needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active learning</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comprehensible input</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between students</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized instruction</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cognitive demand</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching language across the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other strategies identified in Figure 1</td>
<td>(a), (b), (c), &amp; (d)</td>
<td>(e), (f), &amp; (g)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(i), (j)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Figure 1 strategies:

(a) **Collaboration with parents**: Teachers build a strong home-school connection and facilitate parental involvement in their children’s education;

(b) **Teaching four areas of language**: Teachers design instruction based on a balance of listening, speaking, reading, and writing;

(c) **Teaching literacy skills**: Teachers teach reading and writing for communication and comprehension;

(d) **Using various techniques**: Teachers use manifold instructional strategies, like problem solving, role playing, and storytelling (Carrasquillo & Bonilla, 1990, p. 84);

(e) **Modeling**: Teachers provide examples that students can refer to;

(f) **Using consistent language**: The language used to describe complex ideas does not change;

(g) **Acceptance of errors**: Teachers consider students’ mistakes as a natural part of language acquisition and provide appropriate feedback;

(h) **High expectations in diversity**: Teachers should respect students’ cultural backgrounds;

(i) **Individual approach**: Teachers design instruction and services which meet each student’s personal needs;

(j) **Collaboration with students**: Teachers and students work together as a team to achieve class activities;

learning. The study by the U.S. Department of Education (2000), “Contextual Teaching and Learning”, described the effectiveness of contextualized instruction as follows:

Contextual teaching and learning is a conception of teaching and learning that helps teachers relate subject matter content to real world situations and motivates students to make connections between knowledge and its applications to their lives as family members, citizens, and workers; and engage in the hard work that learning requires. (C-3)

Instruction Bridges Students’ Knowledge to The Real World

Instruction with materials, methods, and contents related to the real world enhance attention. If a situation which occurs in the real world, like ordering in a restaurant, is provided as context, students are more interested in learning the task. It also motivates students to apply what they learn in class to the real world. Since students can learn and practice language skills with instruction relevant to the real world, they can more easily apply the skills they learn in situations relevant to their lives.

Another benefit of contextualized instruction is that it facilitates development of communicative competence. Communicative competence has been the ultimate goal of language education. In contrast to Chomsky, who put more emphasis on the importance of Language Acquisition Devices (LAD), innate to all human, Hymes (2001) emphasized cultural context. Language use takes place in contexts characterized by socio-cultural features (p. 55). Language competence refers not only to the linguistic use of accurate language, but also to language use relevant to context. For example, even though an ELL has a high score on a grammar test, his or her English competence is not considered as high if he or she cannot communicate with English-speaking people in real situations. Context is key to acquiring communicative competence. Human communication is highly
dependent “on context and on the shared knowledge that the interactions have with respect to a variety of contextual features” (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p. 11). Students can learn how to use language in context to make sense of the situations they are in.

The ultimate goal of communicative competence acquisition is to have students use language in the real world. Nunan (2004) highlights the use of language to achieve target tasks in their daily lives (p. 1). Target tasks are situations which occur in the real world, like asking about bus schedules, ordering food in a restaurant, and buying clothes in a store. Pedagogical tasks lead students to target tasks. For example, for learners to accomplish the real world task of ordering pizza on the phone, they might engage in pedagogical tasks in which they describe where the pizza should be delivered. Through a pedagogical task, learners are involved in “comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language,” and mobilize “their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning” (p. 4). Pedagogical tasks can be adapted and modified according to the learner’s level (Nunan, 1989, p. 41). If ELLs with special needs have difficulties in achieving target tasks due to their limited English proficiency or disabilities or both, pedagogical tasks might be designed so they can be easily achieved according to the students’ needs. Through accomplishing pedagogical tasks, students can gradually achieve target tasks. Pedagogical tasks and target tasks are not separate concepts. Rather, they fall along a continuum (i.d.). A pedagogical task is a bridge which connects learners in the classroom to real world target tasks.

To successfully achieve target tasks, pedagogical tasks should be designed based on an understanding of the target tasks. If a Korean student learns English, the
pedagogical tasks should reflect target tasks in English-speaking cultures. For example, the pedagogical task of how to greet others in English should reflect greetings in English-speaking cultures. Through this pedagogical task, the Korean student can learn how to greet others in the target culture, waving a hand (not bowing) and saying, “hello, how are you?”

The factors that make the pedagogical tasks easier should be also considered to successfully achieve target tasks for ELLs with special needs. Brindley (1987) analyzes what determines task difficulty. He points to three factors; learner factors, task factors, and text factors (as cited in Nunan, 2004, p. 85). Individuals might perform differently on the same task due to internal factors. This includes the extent to which individual students are confident about doing the task, are motivated to carry out the task, have prior learning experiences, function at the pace required, possess necessary language skills, and relevant cultural knowledge (i.d.). Teachers need to be aware of learner factors in the design of pedagogical tasks. Task and text factors also influence task difficulty. Learning is easier when tasks have low cognitive complexity, few steps, plenty of context and help available, no demands for grammatical accuracy, and as much time as necessary. Tasks are also easier when texts are short, not dense (few facts), clearly presented, have plenty of contextual clues, are familiar to students, and include everyday content (p. 86). To help ELLs with special needs achieve target tasks, teachers need to understand the target tasks and design pedagogical tasks that take these three factors into account.
Effective instructional strategies are delivered based on collaboration among professionals and between professionals and parents. As the issue of teaching English to English Language Learners (ELLs) with special needs is very complicated, encompassing a variety of educational fields, the professionals who are involved are also diverse. To efficiently provide instructional strategies, the professionals should build an interactive learning environment by maintaining contact, discussing how to build educational programs, and exchange information.

The critical-ecological model for ELLs with special needs described by De Valenzuela, Baca, and Baca (2004) emphasizes the importance of collaboration among professionals, including parents. This model focuses on “the whole child, with his or her surrounding contexts” (p. 377). According to this model, ELLs with special needs develop within three areas: his or her family, school, and the larger social context. These contexts are not separate concepts. They surround ELLs and connect to one another. ELLs with special needs develop by interacting within the three areas as an organism. Analysis of individual ELLs with special needs requires understanding them within the surrounding contexts. Based on this concept, the model suggests that the contexts of ELLs with special needs should be considered. This approach requires ongoing collaboration among teachers, families, and also the larger community.

Parental Involvement

Based on the critical-ecological model, building significant interaction between teachers, parents and families is an important strategy in educating ELLs with

The biggest benefit of parental involvement is that teachers can get valuable information from parents. In the field of ESL, families and parents provide information about cultural and linguistic contexts. By exchanging information with parents, teachers can learn about educational approaches in other countries and parents’ expectations (Copeland, 2007, p. 70). Parents have vast information about their children. Teachers facilitate this information exchange as a foundation of children’s education.

However, parental involvement entails more than providing information and expressing expectations. Parental involvement can extend students’ learning experiences when parents and teachers work together. They discuss and design appropriate instruction and learning environments. Students can enjoy more opportunities to apply what they learn at school in their homes if teachers and parents design and implement educational programs together. Thus, students can have more extended learning experiences.

Parental involvement also enables students to have more opportunities to receive individual support. Parents are incredible partners in providing individual services since they are the closest teachers to their children, spend the most time with them, and best understand them, based on daily interaction. This advantage grows, when ELLs with special needs are in inclusive education settings. Although ELLs with special needs require more attention, it is not easy to provide additional time for them in inclusive education settings, since there are other students who also need the teachers’
attention. Students can benefit from individual learning experiences provided by their parents in order to participate more in class activities in inclusive settings.

Parental involvement includes “the extent to which parents are interested in, knowledgeable about, and willing to take an active role in the day-to-day activities of the children” (Wong, 2008, p. 497). Parents need to know the value of parental involvement and participation in the process of teaching their children. They also need to understand their responsibility as decisive stakeholders in their children’s education. Parental involvement is based on cooperation, partnership, and interaction between teachers and parents. Staples and Diliberto (2010) describe three key strategies for successful parental involvement: “(a) building parent rapport, (b) developing a communication system with a maintenance plan, and (c) creating additional special event opportunities for parent involvement” (p. 60). Through these strategies, teachers and parents both accept responsibility for their children’s education and open channels for communication to discuss and build better learning environments.

Collaborative Consultation

To build interactive learning environments, collaboration among professionals involved in teaching ELLs with special needs is as essential as parental involvement. This is especially true for ELLs with special needs in inclusive settings with general education teachers. Students sometimes do not receive appropriate services because the teachers lack professional knowledge and experience in special education or teaching English as a second or foreign language. To provide appropriate and effective services for ELLs with special needs in general education settings, collaboration among professionals in various fields is very essential. Lipsky and Gartner (1998) note three types of collaboration for
inclusive education: “between general and special educators, between classroom practitioners and providers of related services, and between those involved in students evaluation and program development (that is, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team) and classroom practitioners” (p. 80). However, even when all these collaborations are achieved, it can be difficult to provide inclusive education, if the services are provided separately without continuity. It has been said that education services for students with special needs in inclusive settings are disjointed and have no continuity, since they are often provided through several different channels. Services provided by several different channels are sometimes unnecessarily repeated. If education services are continuously provided as an integrated program, students will have a more meaningful and effective learning experience.

Through collaborative consultation, students with special needs have a program which integrates various education services coordinated by professionals in different fields though one channel. Collaborative consultation is “a direct intervention service delivery approach that helps to enhance each teacher’s or family’s competence to meet the needs of the child” (Baca, Baca, a de Valenzuela, 2004, p. 106). As a professional directly delivers educational services, he or she encounters problems. Others from various fields provide support for the professional.

The fact that the students receive educational services coordinated by various professionals through one channel enables general education teachers to provide inclusive education in their classes. General education teachers often encounter difficulties in making decisions that require specialized knowledge and experience multiple fields. Professionals who have depth of knowledge and experience in their own fields can
“facilitate the consultee’s problem clarification and problem solving” (Graden, 1989, p. 32). Through assistance from other professionals, like special and language education teachers, curriculum developers, doctors, and therapists, general education teachers are better prepared to deal with the problems in their own classes.

Collaborative consultation has value when Individual Education Plans (IEPs) are developed. An IEP is a plan which includes all services students with special needs are to receive. To build an IEP, all of the professionals involved in teaching the students cooperate to contribute their professional knowledge and experience to the students’ education. For ELLs with special needs, the English language teachers must be involved in developing IEPs. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act notes that “regular teachers, a designation which can include foreign language teachers, will be part of the team that develops each child’s IEP” (Evarrs & Knotek, 2006, p.118). In developing an IEP, the team discusses what services are provided and how to provide the services. English language teachers can influence the extent to which language instruction is modified or adapted, based on consultation with other professionals, e.g., special education teachers, speech therapists, and psychotherapists. Building an IEP for language education also requires strong collaboration between first and second language educators (Ortiz & Yates, 2002, p. 83). The English language teacher can make connections with instruction in the student’s first language. For example, if English language instruction and Korean language instruction are designed together, it can help the student’s comprehension in English.

Since a professional directly delivers educational services in the concept of collaborative consultation, it is easy for other consultants to ignore their responsibilities
in the problem solving process. However, each member is accountable for contributing specific knowledge and skills. Successful collaborative consultation is achieved by involving all professionals’ willing, interactive, responsible, and reciprocal participation (Walker, Scherry, & Granbery, 2001, p. 35-38). Each professional should have responsibilities for participating in defining the skills students need to learn. Responsibilities are reinforced across activities to protect ELLs with special needs from unnecessary repetition of activities and controversy (Garcia & Tyler, 2010, p. 118).

Summary

The issues of teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) with special needs are complex since many educational issues are involved. Identification is one of the biggest issues. Because of the similarity of language difficulties of ELLs and students with special needs, ELLs with special needs are easily misidentified and misplaced. In Response to Intervention (RTI) model, they receive sufficient, effective, and intensive education services and not wasting time for identification. RTI is useful for inclusive education and monitoring all students’ performance in class because the RTI model provides appropriate services for all students before identification.

The features of effective instruction for ELLs with special needs is also important. Active learning, interaction, and contextualized instruction are identified as effective in nine studies. Of these characteristics, contextualized instruction is mentioned as effective in six of the nine studies. The relation between students’ real world and background knowledge helps to foster communicative competence to achieve target tasks in the real world. In class, teachers need to understand the target tasks and be aware of
what makes pedagogical task easy, how to bridge to target tasks, and modify tasks according to the individual student’s needs.

Collaboration between teachers and parents and among professionals contributes to building interactive learning environments for ELLs with special needs. Parents can provide information about their children, work with teachers to extend children’s learning experiences, and provide individual support. Collaborative consultation is an effective way for professionals in diverse fields to cooperate in the education of ELLs with special needs. This strategy enables a professional to directly provide educational services through one integrated channel supported by various professional. Further, meaningful Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for ELLs with special needs can be developed, based on collaborative consultation among professionals.
CHAPTER III

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION FOR
STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL
EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
(SSENS) IN KOREA

Background

The 2008 Special Education for Individuals with Disabilities Act defines individuals as Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENS). In the 8th edited special education curricular, the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology of Korea states that curricula for special education in Korea are available in four areas: the Preschool Curriculum, Basic Curriculum (BC), National Basic Common Curricula (NBCCs), and Selection-core Curriculum for High School Level Courses. These four curricular areas have been implemented since the 7th edited curricular was issued for SSENS in 1997.

For SSENS in elementary schools, the NBCCs and BC are used. The selection of the curricula depends on students’ needs. The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (2009) mandates the education of students from 1st grade to 10th grade in the NBCC (Park, 2008, ¶ 9). The ministry uses the term “National Basic Common Curriculum” for general and special education. The NBCC for special education is based on the NBCC for general education and supplements the NBCC for general educational purposes, course formation and time distribution, and guidelines for organization and
management, considering individual features of learners’ disabilities. The NBCCs are usually used for SSENs in inclusive settings.

The NBCC for special education focuses on extending instructional content and methods in order to accommodate individuals’ abilities, aptitudes, and specialized courses as well as general education (i.d.). Park also notes that the NBCC for special education modifies some subjects, like Korean and English, in order to meet individual needs. The NBCC for special education addresses Korean and English language instruction for students with sensory impairments and physical education for students with physical disabilities. It suggests a blueprint for the modification of the NBCC for general education for SSENs in inclusive settings for only these two subjects. However, the application of the NBCC for general education might not be possible for all students, as the NBCC has not considered the increasing number of students with severe and multiple disabilities.

The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology also establishes the BC for schools which are unable to apply the NBCCs because of students’ disabilities. Most special education schools for students with developmental disabilities, like learning disabilities, mental disabilities, and autism, use this curriculum. Han (2008) reported that the BC amended in 2008, reinforces the usefulness of the curriculum and student-core paradigm (¶ 3). Unlike the earlier version, the 8th edited BC is to be applied to all students as appropriate, regardless of disability type. The curriculum has also been aligned to match that of the NBCCs, as evident in the change of subject titles in the curriculum documents. For instance, the subject title of 건강 (Health) was changed to 체육 (Physical
Education), as in the NBCCs. Third, the purpose of subjects in the BC is stated in an active and achievement-oriented voice. Finally, the BC suggests modifying the instructional methods and assessment based on the features of individual disabilities. Reaching a conclusion, the BC (8th edition) focuses on building connections with the NBCCs in order to shorten the educational distance between the curricula for SSENs and students without disabilities, responding to individuals’ educational needs.

Language Curricula for Students with Special Educational Needs

The English Language Curriculum in the National Basic Common Curriculum

The English language curriculum in the National Basic Common Curriculum (NBCC) for general education builds upon the perspective of English as a bridge for communication among nations. The English language curriculum at the elementary level emphasizes the importance of the core instruction and student interest. These features and aims are clearly implied in the goals of the curriculum as follows:

초등학교 영어는 영어에 대한 흥미와 관심을 가지고, 일상생활에서 사용하는 기초적인 영어를 이해하고 표현하는 능력을 기르는 것을 목표로 한다.
가. 영어에 대하여 흥미와 관심을 가진다.
나. 기초적인 영어 사용에 대한 자신감을 가진다.
다. 일상생활에서 영어로 기초적인 의사소통을 할 수 있는 바탕을 마련한다.
라. 영어학습을 통하여 다른 나라의 관습이나 문화를 이해한다.

[The aims of the English language education for elementary students are to have students take an interest in English and to improve their abilities to understand and express themselves in basic level English used in daily life.]

a. Students will become interested in the English language.
b. Students will be confident in basic level English usage.
c. Students will build a foundation for basic communications in English in authentic situations.
Students will understand other cultures and conventions through learning English. (translated by author, Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2009c, p. 19)

Judging from the goals, the English language curriculum focuses on teaching basic communication skills in authentic situations based on interest. The use of language in authentic situations is emphasized across the English language curriculum in the NBCC. Students acquire English in natural situations and practical communication (p. 25). Authenticity is an important dimension of instruction in the field of teaching foreign languages. The English language curriculum in the 7th NBCC was based on the communicative approach to language learning and teaching, as it is in the 8th NBCC (Choi, 2007, p. 9). It also emphasizes providing authentic language to develop students’ communicative skills through language materials.

According to Choi, authenticity is determined by the use of content in the classroom which is natural for native speakers of the target language (p.10). Maxim (2002) defines authentic text as “materials written to be read by native speakers of the language rather than written only to teach language” (p. 20). Not limited to written material, any type of materials which delivers meaning in the real world can be authentic. Authentic materials must help students with practical communication. “Students may practice a range of sociolinguistic and functional features of language” with authentic materials in the target language (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p. 113). Nam (2001) described authentic materials as newspapers, magazines, movies, animations, cartoons, signs, maps, and post cards and studied their effectiveness with 76 Korean elementary students learning English (p. 8). According to the findings, authentic materials contributed to students’ participation, interest, confidence, effort, and cognitive
development in English. The use of authentic materials in English classes seems to be valuable across both affective and cognitive domains. The English language curriculum for elementary schools focuses on students’ affective development.

To encourage students to take an interest in the English language, the curriculum suggests the use of multi-media and Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (2009c) states that the use of multi-media materials and ICT can promote student interest and a sense of accomplishment (p. 71). The NBCCs feature two types of ICT education: ICT knowledge education and ICT utilized education. In ICT knowledge education, students learn how to produce, analyze, search, and process data using ICT. In the ICT utilized education, students utilize ICT to learn based on their knowledge about ICT. This means that ICT is used as an instructional medium in order to successfully achieve class goals.

Multi-media materials and ICT are said to be effective in educating English Language Learners (ELLs). García (2009) surveyed 33 English teachers and 38 students using a questionnaire in the city of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, in the Canary Islands from December 2007 to January 2008. Both teachers and students agreed on the importance and usefulness of using new technology in the English language classroom (p. 87). The effectiveness of ICT was also evident in a study of Korean elementary students. Chang (2003) evaluated the communicative competence of 40 elementary students, comparing the ICT group and the non-ICT group. The results of the study indicate that communicative competence in the ICT group was much more advanced than the non-ICT group. ICT seemed effective for students’ affective domain as well as their communicative competence. Kim (2002) provided a self evaluation questionnaire to 35
students in elementary schools, divided into experimental and control groups after completion of eight English language chapters. The results suggest that the use of ICT raised the students’ self-esteem in learning English, motivated them, and reduced their anxiety about learning English.

Thanks to the CD-Roms that back up the entire elementary English textbook, elementary school teachers can make better use of ICT than secondary teachers (Lee, Imm, Jin, Kim, Lee, Chang, Kim, Lee, and Choi, 2005, p. 156). The CD-Roms, which embody the content of the textbook in native voice, have been a core material for oral language instruction in the 7th and 8th amended NBCCs. The manual for English language curriculum in the NBCCs for elementary students states that ICT usage must be effective for students to experience other cultures and conventions, not limited to oral language instruction (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2009c, p. 72). However, differing from the expectations of ICT usage, the use of ICT causes teachers to standardize their instruction by using the CD-Roms. In addition, teachers’ lack of preparation for utilizing ICT, lack of teachers’ perspective and skills in education through ICT, and students’ lackadaisical attitude to ICT usage impedes the effective use of ICT in classes (Lee et al., 2005, p. 156). The emphasis on the use of ICT in the curriculum makes English instruction more ineffective, since many teachers rely on the CD-Roms too heavily.

The Alternative English Language Curriculum

In the National Basic Common Curriculum (NBCC) for special education, the alternative English language curriculum for Students with Special Educational Needs
(SSENs) with sensory impairments is based on the English language curriculum for general education. Thus, the alternative English language curriculum focuses on fostering communicative competence. This curriculum also responds to the degree of disability and individual difference. In order to meet the specific needs of students with sensory impairments, the curriculum adds two goals for students with sensory impairments to those in the NBCC for general education: “영어의 문자 매체로서 점자 또는 목자의 기초적인 사용능력을 기른다 (시각장애) [Students will be able to develop a basic ability to use Braille or print as a written communication medium in English (for students with sight impairments) (translated by author)]” and “영어 학습에 있어서 다양한 의사소통양식을 활용한다 [students will be able to imply various communication ways to learn English (for students with hearing impairments)]” (translated by author, Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2009b, p. 188). The NBCC for special education also redefines four language skills to meet needs of sensory impaired students. For students with hearing impairments, the terms of 듣기 (Listening) and 말하기 (Speaking) change to 듣기, 수화읽기, 말읽기 (Listening, Reading Signs, and Lip Reading) and 말 수화하기 (Speaking and Signing) and the terms of 읽기 (Reading) and 쓰기 (Writing) change to 점자 읽기, 확대문자 읽기 (Reading Braille and Extended Letters) and 점자쓰기, 글씨쓰기 (Writing Braille and Writing Letters) (p. 190). The guidelines
for teaching are also based on presenting modified or alternative communication mediums, depending on individuals’ needs. The guidelines for students with sight impairments suggest, use of educational technology and optical instruments to visually supplement their insufficient learning experience. Further, they build learning environments, like the degree of light, in order to allow students to exhibit their eyesight and sight abilities (p. 283). For students with hearing impairments, the use of a multisensory approach with ICT is emphasized in the guidelines (pp. 219-220). The approach is valuable in addressing hearing impairments and motivating learners. Moreover, the guidelines suggest providing modified communication mediums, depending on the profiles of hearing impaired individuals. For example, severely hearing impaired students can use communication boards with written words, sentences, or pictures. Finally, the alternative curriculum aims to provide various and plentiful learning opportunities for students with sensory impairments, since their learning experiences are limited due to their disabilities. This emphasis is embodied through the alternative English language curriculum.

On the other hand, several studies point to several disadvantages in the alternative English language curriculum. Lee (2006) reveals practical problems in applying the alternative curriculum because there are no specific textbooks for the alternative English curriculum. Since the alternative English language curriculum is subcategorized under the NBCC for general education, textbooks are provided only for general education, but not for students with sensory impairments. By interviewing eight teachers in three different special education schools, Lee reveals that the alternative English language curriculum is implemented with handouts created by teachers (p. 39).
Even though handouts have an advantage in that they can be designed with full consideration of target features, it is difficult to provide systemized and continuous education without any guidelines for their development.

Another problem identified by Cho, Kim, and Ahn (2003) is that the alternative English language curriculum is implemented contrary to its goal. The authors surveyed 220 English special educators in 93 special education schools for students with hearing impairments, sight impairments, and physical disabilities about teaching English language to elementary students with special needs based on the alternative English language curriculum in the NBCC. The most frequently used instructional strategy to teach English was listening and repeating which is not sufficient to acquire communicative competence (p. 159). Although this study does not report the actual number of teachers using this strategy, this result is significant as it shows that the goals of the alternative English language curriculum are not achieved in on-site classes. According to the goals, English education is supposed to focus on communicative activities. However, teachers in on-site classes still rely on listening and repeating.

The Korean Language Curriculum in the Basic Curriculum

According to the 8th curricula for special education, the ultimate goals of the Basic Curriculum (BC) are to develop basic learning abilities and adaptability to society. This perspective is fully described in the Korean language curriculum in the BC, whose key goal is to develop functional communicative competence. For Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENs) whose ultimate educational goal is to transition into their societies, language education should concentrate on developing competence rather than
delivering fragmentary language skills. Thus, the Korean language curriculum in the BC suggests providing four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), group activities, and many opportunities to willingly use the language through students’ experiences and in their daily lives (Lee, 2002, p. 11). Languages must be used in spontaneous situations, and the interaction of the students and communication partners needs to be reinforced. However, it is difficult to acquire communicative competence in highly controlled situations using the curricula presented. Highly controlled situations result in a lack of generalization in what students learn.

To overcome this limitation, the manual for the BC suggests enhanced milieu teaching. Generally, enhanced milieu teaching is a program to mediate instruction for students with mental retardation and various disabilities that interrupt language acquisition in natural communication situations. In other words, it provides activities, like games and play, in order to effectively elicit students’ speaking.

Enhanced milieu teaching is composed of “environment arrangement, responsive interactive techniques, and the use of new language forms in students’ functional context” (Hancock & Kaiser, 2002, p. 40). Environment arrangement, a significant feature of enhanced milieu teaching, triggers students’ willingness to communicate. Caregivers create “the physical context for language facilitation” (Kaiser, 1993, p. 76), a learning environment with materials that attract students’ attention and encourage speaking. Enhanced milieu teaching is based on affirmative and effective interactions between students and communication partners (Kaiser & Hester, 1994, ¶ 7). Responsive interactive techniques enable communication partners to build positive and communicative relationships with students by providing “a conversational base for
language learning” (Kaiser, 1993, p. 76). Kaiser emphasizes the need for teachers to follow the students’ lead, promote turn-taking, and extend students’ topics in conversation (i.d.). Teachers should strive not to dominate conversations during interaction with students. They need to promote balanced reciprocation with students by giving the lead in conversations to students. Finally, new language acquired through interactive relationships arranged by teachers should be used in functional contexts.

The most basic perspective of enhanced milieu teaching is the focus on language generalization. Enhanced milieu teaching strategies support students’ generalizations by stimulating their speaking in functional contexts. Kaiser describes four strategies to encourage students’ generalization: Incidental teaching, mand-model approach, model procedure, and time-delay procedure. Teachers use students’ incidental speaking as a model in incidental teaching. In the mand model, teachers demand that students respond and provide an appropriate model. This model is useful when students are not willing to express their thoughts. In the model procedure, teachers understand what students are interested in and provide a model that students can copy. The time delay model gives students time to respond. The guidelines in the Korean language curriculum in the BC are based on these strategies.

Even though the goal of the Korean language curriculum in the BC is to foster SSENs’ meaningful communication in practical situations, it has not been achieved in class. Kim (2005) surveyed 107 Korean language educators in 28 special education schools for students with mental retardation. According to Kim’s survey, 45.8% of the teachers agreed that developing students’ language ability to communicate in the real world was the goal of Korean language education (p. 30). However, 58% of the teachers
responded that they did not achieve the goals developed by the BC. Students’ individual differences were noted out as the primary reason why teachers did not follow the goals (p. 29). Communicative competence in authentic situations is the ultimate goal of Korean language curriculum in the BC. However, teachers do not teach along the goal due to students’ individual differences.

**English Education in Practical Classes in Korea**

Every student in the Korean schooling system should be taught under certain officially designed curricula, depending on individuals’ capabilities. Students without special needs are subject to the National Basic Common Curriculum (NBCC) for general education for 10 years, from 1st grade to 10th grade. In the NBCC for general education, English language education is implemented from 3rd grade to 10th grade. After the NBCC, students learn English using the High School Selection-core Curriculum. The NBCC for special education, designed for Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENs) in general education settings, has the same structure as the NBCC for general education, since the NBCC for special education is based on the NBCC for general education.

Implementation of the curriculums is strongly related to the placement of students. Current placements in Korea are based on the principle of full inclusion and the least restrictive environment (Kim, 2006, p.50). Full inclusion is a representative paradigm in the current climate of education reform. In reality, the idea of inclusive education is not new, although its meaning has been considered as a replacement for special needs education and the related problems of marginalization and exclusion.
(Florian, 2008, p. 203). Wamae and Kang’ethe-Kamau (2004) state the goal of inclusion as follows:

The goal of inclusion might be thought to be achieved by a variety of practices, for example, offering pupils with special needs finely tuned positive discrimination; or offering specialist or intensive learning experiences in a separate location which will lead ultimately to the goal of inclusion in the wider society as an independent, confident individual. (p. 33)

The concept of inclusive education is based on the idea of the least restrictive environment. “The 2004 amendments to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act continued to emphasize the importance of it by noting the provision of a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment as a priority area for monitoring” (Reynolds & Flecher-Janzen, 2007, p. 1086).

The SSENs in Korea are placed in special education schools, and special and general education classes in general education schools, based on the least restrictive environment. According to statistical surveys of enrollment in on-site special education by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (2010), 29.8% of SSENs are placed in special education schools, and 70% are in general education schools (p. 14). About 75.35% of SSENs in general education schools are in special education classes, and the remaining students in full inclusion settings (pp. 14-15).

The selection of curriculum for SSENs in special education classes in general education schools, including elementary, junior high, and high schools, is flexible. It is at the discretion of the schools and teachers. Rho, Kim, Kim, Park, Shin, and Lee (2008) report that 89% of the SSENs in special education classes in general education schools are in special education classes with partial integration (p. 192). Depending on educational needs, a SSEN is educated in both general and special education classes.
According to the survey by Rho, et al. (2008), 14% of the special education classes in general education used the NBCCs for the SSENs; 36% provided lower grade level instruction in the NBCCs to accommodate the students’ levels; and 24.3% combined the NBCC and BC to create a curriculum for their individual classes (p. 325). This study shows that 74.3% of special education classes in general education schools implemented the NBCCs for SSEN, which included English education. Therefore, the SSENs in these classes are educated in English. The surveys indicate that SSENs receive instruction consistent with the NBCCs. This differs from the SSENs under the BC, which does not include any guidelines for English education.

The NBCCs are implemented for SSEN in general classes, full inclusion. According to the Ministry of the Education, Science, and Technology (2010), 17% of SSENs (n=13,740) are placed in full inclusion (p. 14). The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology and Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education (2008) survey the placement of SSEN in full inclusion, depending on the types of disabilities. Students with mental retardation are mostly placed in full inclusion (28.76%, n=2,941), and students with physical disabilities are in full inclusion (22.9%, n=2,343) (p. 3). Even though this survey describes the number of students with learning disabilities as small, Jeong, Kim, and Kim (2001) reported that 77.07% of Korean students with learning disabilities (excluding severe and multiple disabilities) are placed in full inclusion (p. 114). These percentages do not seem to correspond with more recent placement information for students with learning disabilities in Korea, since the data was collected 9 years ago. However, it is meaningful because it shows that a large number of SSENs in full inclusion have opportunities to learn a second language.
Even though a number of SSENs in general education schools receive English education, in practice this does not seem to be the case. In 2008, The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology and Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education surveyed general education teachers (n=1421) and special education teachers (n=946) about the formation and implementation of general and special education guidelines. The authors reported that 32.3% of the teachers responded that they referred their students to special education classes for English education. This indicates that SSENs are physically sent from general education classrooms to special education classrooms for English education. In contrast, 44.6% responded that the subject matter content that teachers provide in special education does not match the content provided in general classes (p. 22). This suggests that special education teachers might not teach SSENs English even though they are referred to special education for English education. Although English education for SSENs who receive NBCCs has a legal basis, they are still excluded from English education.

The alternative English curriculum in the NBCC for special education is designed for students with sensory impairments, like hearing and visual impairments. The curriculum can be used wherever the SSENs who need it are located. This means that it can be used in any placement. According to the results of the survey by Cho, Kim, and Ahn in 2003, 36.1% of the teachers responded that the effectiveness of teaching English to SSEN is ‘only fair’, 29% responded ‘poor’, and 21.39% responded ‘very poor’ (p.150). Implementation of the alternative English language curriculum in the NBCC is rather uneven, since teacher expectations and implementation will vary. Shin (2008) also concludes that special educators’ use of the alternative English language curriculum in
the NBC is rather infrequent. In the survey, 60 English special educators in 48 special education schools for students with hearing and visual impairments, and physical disabilities assessed their teaching of English to SSENs, on a scale from 1 to 5. They self-evaluated their use and perceptions of the alternative English language curriculum in the NBCC as low $(M=2.9)$ (p. 18). From these two studies, it is evident that the students with sensory impairments, who are supposed to be educated in English in the alternative English language curriculum in the NBCC, have not received appropriate services. Moreover, students with severe or multiple disabilities also do not receive sufficient services, since this curriculum does not provide any guidelines for students with severe or multiple disabilities.

The Basic Curriculum (BC) is used for SSENs in special education schools. Although the BC does not explicitly provide for English language education, the BC implies that English education is an option through Discretionary Activities formulated for 90 hours in 1$^{st}$ grade and 102 hours from 2$^{nd}$ grade to 10$^{th}$ grade over 34 weeks (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2009a, p. 85). However, this does not seem practical, especially for elementary schools. The BC suggests that Discretionary Activities in elementary schools focus on creative activities rather than academic subjects. Whether or not English education is provided for SSENs in the BC and how it is taught totally depends on the school and its teachers. It is difficult for SSENs in the BC to be taught in English unless the schools and teachers perceive its importance.
Conclusions

Three documents related to the education of Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENs) English and Korean languages are illuminated in this chapter: the English language curriculum in the National Basic Common Curriculum (NBCC) for general education, the alternative English language curriculum in the NBCC for special education, and the Korean language curriculum in the Basic Curriculum. Communicative competence in authentic situations is emphasized across the language curricula for SSENs in Korea. To lead SSENs to acquire communicative competence, the curricular suggest use of ICT and enhanced milieu teaching strategy.

These curricula are usually provided, depending on the placement of SSENs. Teachers and schools can also select curricula which match their students’ needs. Generally, SSENs are placed in special education schools, special education classes in general education schools, and general education classes in general education schools. As the paradigm of full inclusion and restrictive environment, a great number of SSENs are placed in general education schools. The population in fully inclusive settings usually receives the NBCCs, which provide English education differing from the BC. However, English education in the NBCCs does not seem appropriately and effectively provided in on-site classes for SSENs. Many teachers do not provide English education by the reason of SSENs’ individual differences. Teachers who provide English education tend to rely on ‘listening and repeating’. The lack of implementation of appropriate curriculum also impedes English education for SSENs. They are physically placed in inclusive settings consistent with full inclusion, not in instructional inclusion for English education. Their
opportunities to receive effective and appropriate services for English education are still restricted.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

A voice for educating students with special needs in English has been raised in Korea. This coincides with the growing desire to teach English as a requirement for independent living. Teaching students with special needs is not a simple matter. Various educational issues in special, general, and inclusive education are involved in teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) with special needs. This complexity denies students with special needs the opportunity to be educated in English. Identification is the biggest issue in educating ELLs with special needs. It is important because decisive educational decisions are determined from identification. However, teachers cannot easily identify ELLs with special needs because of the similarity between the problems attributed to their disabilities and limited English proficiency.

Many ELLs with special needs are misidentified and misplaced, not receiving appropriate educational services. Response to Intervention (RTI) may be a sufficient alternative for misidentification. RTI insists on providing appropriate and intensive education services to students before identification. Through RTI, students can receive proper education services, not wasting their time waiting to be identified. RTI is valuable for all students. Teachers monitor all students’ achievement, and focus their attention on
individuals who do not show meaningful outcomes in class. Through three tiers of RTI, individual students are carefully monitored and considered.

Instructional strategies for educating ELLs with special needs are an important issue in the classroom. Features of effective instruction are determined according to who receives instruction. For ELLs with special needs, this study researches nine studies dealing with effective instruction for ELLs with special needs. The studies identify several significant features of effective instruction for ELLs with special needs: active learning, interaction, and contextualized instruction. Of these, contextualized instruction is most frequently considered as effective by six of the nine studies. Context basically means real world situations. Contextualized instruction is designed to relate to the real world of the students. Contextualized instruction enables students to generalize from what they learn in class and, to use what they learn to develop communicative competence. Communicative competence is acquired through activities in meaningful contexts. Students can gradually engage in target tasks in the real world through pedagogical tasks. To design effective pedagogical tasks, teachers need to understand target tasks which occur in the target culture. Based on this understanding, the pedagogical tasks should also be adopted and modified, depending on students’ needs. Teachers also need to consider how to design appropriate tasks for students based on three factors which determine task difficulty: learner, task, and text factors. Effective instructional strategies should be based on collaboration between professionals and parents and among professionals. As the issue of teaching ELLs with special needs is complicated, many stakeholders in various fields need to be involved. According to a critical-ecological model for ELLs with special needs, students interact within the context
they are in. It is important to facilitate parental involvement and collaborative consultation among professionals. Parents are the first teachers of their children and the best information providers who most closely observe their children’s lives. Through parental involvement, teachers and parents can exchange information, extend students’ learning experiences, and provide more opportunities for individual support to students. With collaborative consultation, a professional directly delivers educational services with support from other professionals on the team. This facilitates an integrated continuum of educational services for ELLs with special needs in inclusive settings. Since a professional directly provides educational services coordinated by various professionals, ELLs with special needs can receive appropriate and effective services through one channel, general education teachers, in inclusive settings. Besides, through collaborative consultation, professionals contribute their expertise to develop Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for ELLs with special needs. Successful collaborative consultation requires each professional’s willingness to engage in interaction and participation.

For Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENs) in Korea, the most emphasized concept across the language curricula is the use of communicative competence in authentic situations. Providing authentic situations develops students’ affective and cognitive domains. The English language curriculum in the National Basic Common Curriculum (NBCC) for general education suggests using multi-media materials and Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) for students’ communicative competence acquisition. The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology of Korea provides CD-Roms to support the use of multi-media materials and ICT. However, Korean English teachers tend to rely too heavily on these CD-Roms,
which make teachers standardize their instruction. Alternative English language curriculum for special education in the NBCCs is designed for students with sensory disabilities. Communicative activities are based on the NBCC for general education. This curriculum focuses on reflecting the degree of students’ disabilities and individual differences. However, this curriculum is not implemented effectively in on-site classes since there are no textbooks and teachers still use old fashioned strategies, such as listening and repeating. This emphasis differs from the goal of the curriculum to foster communicative competence. The Korean language curriculum in the Basic Curriculum (BC) also focuses on developing communicative competence in natural communicative situations using enhanced milieu teaching to achieve this goal.

According to the paradigm of full inclusion and least restrictive environment, Korea has maximized the placement of SSENs in inclusive settings. As a result, many SSENs are educated in inclusive settings, like general education classes and special education classes in general education schools. However, inclusion for English education is best characterized as physical inclusion. Although the BC, which does not include any guideline for English education, can provide English education through Discretionary Activities, it is difficult to implement as it relies on school and teacher decision making. Further, despite being placed in general education schools receiving the NBCCs, which include English education, the SSENs do not receive appropriate education services. SSENs with sensory impairments often lose opportunities to learn English due to teachers’ perceptions of English education and then understanding of the alternative English language curriculum.
Recommendations

The following recommendations for teaching Students with Special Needs (SSENs) English as a foreign language are based on the findings of this study:

(1) General education teachers should use the Response to Intervention model to teach SSENs English before referring students who struggle with English to special education classes.

(2) English instruction should be contextualized in order to enable students to develop communicative competence.

(3) Parents should actively participate in their children’s education as information providers, individual supporters of their children, and collaborators in the design and implementation of educational programs with teachers.

(4) Professionals involved in teaching SSENs English should cooperate through collaborative consultation to support general education teachers who teach SSENs in the class.

These are discussed in detail in the discussion that follows.

(1) The Response to Intervention (RTI) model must be useful for general education teachers in Korea. Even though a great number of SSENs is placed in general education schools for inclusive education, significant numbers of SSENs are easily referred to special education classes for English education in Korea. These SSENs are educated in English in special education classes. Through RTI, general education teachers provide appropriate instruction before referring them to special education classes for English education. It prevents students who struggle to learn English from being inappropriately referred to special education. Korean general education teachers can provide appropriate
services in their classes. Through the three tiers of RTI, general education teachers monitor individual students and also keep SSENs in their classes. They design and implement appropriate education services for all students, not only for SSENs. This point is valuable for general education teachers in Korea, where SSENs do not receive inclusive instruction even though they are physically placed in inclusive education settings.

To successfully implement RTI, general language education teachers need to accept responsibility for the English education of SSENs. Sometimes, general education teachers in Korea shift their responsibility for SSENs to special education teachers, claiming a lack of understanding about special education. This is especially problematic when the general English education teacher is not the classroom teacher. General language teachers need to recognize their responsibility for SSENs in their classes and strive to provide effective instruction for all students. The role of special educators is also important. As students are referred from Tier 1 to Tier 3, the general language teachers should provide more intensive and modified instruction based on consideration of the students’ needs. Identifying students’ needs based on their disabilities and modifying instruction accordingly requires professional knowledge and expertise in special education. Special education teachers should give positive support to general language teachers in the design and implementation of effective and appropriate instruction. To exchange knowledge and expertise, both teachers need to cooperate and carefully monitor the students’ progress. Administrators should conduct RTI training programs for general language teachers. Most universities of education in Korea prepare student teachers for elementary schools with only two credits of special education. Thus, most general education teachers do not
have professional knowledge in special education. Professional development programs should be provided for these teachers. Administrators should also conduct meetings for general language and special education teachers to monitor SSENs and discuss appropriate instruction for them.

(2) Teachers need to design instruction related to the real world. Fostering students’ communicative competence must be across the language curricula for SSENs, and teachers need to adhere to the policy. However, English instruction in Korean on-site classes for SSENs still relies on the traditional ways of teaching that emphasize listening and repeating despite the goal of communicative competence in authentic situations described by the language curricula for SSENs in Korea. Students who learn English through mechanical repetition might struggle to communicate with other English speakers. To foster students’ practical communicative competence, English should be taught in a context in which English is used. Contextualized instruction is an effective means for development of communicative competence. Pedagogical tasks related to English speaking cultures help SSENs achieve target tasks. Teachers need to design pedagogical tasks that achieve target tasks based on the consideration of learner, task, and text factors to meet individual students’ needs.

To make connections between tasks and activities in the classroom and the real world, language teachers need to understand students’ backgrounds. This subsumes students’ language and culture, preferred learning style, features of their disabilities, and access to private education out of school. Language teachers should be aware of these through interaction with other professionals, like class teachers, special education teachers, and parents. Language teachers should also be aware of the situations which
occur in English speaking cultures. Based on this awareness, language teachers can design effective instruction, without relying so heavily on old fashioned instruction, such as listening and repeating.

(3) Parents and professionals need to collaborate in students’ education. To Korean English teachers who have SSENs in their classes, the biggest issue is how to provide instructional inclusion for English education in their classes. In the sense that they have difficulties in providing additional support to SSENs in their classes, parental involvement is an excellent alternative. The SSENs can participate more effectively in instruction when they individually receive additional support from their parents. Furthermore, teachers and parents can also provide extended learning experiences by working together in designing and implementing students’ educational programs: SSENs can achieve the ultimate goal of Korean special education, transition into society, by applying what they learn in their homes and schools.

To achieve interactive and positive cooperation between teachers and parents, the role of parents is decisive. Parents need to understand the value of parental participation and take responsibility for their children’s education. When parents realize the value of parental involvement, they can become positive collaborators, thoughtfully and constructively participating in their children’s education as information providers, collaborators in the design of students’ instruction, and individual supporters. The effort of the teacher is also important in sustaining collaboration with parents. Teachers need to treat parents as partners. Some Korean teachers avoid sharing their instructional plans with parents, believing that what happens in classes should be respected as falling within the teachers’ authority. This interferes with parents’ positive participation in designing
proper education programs. To educate students as a team, teachers need to share the information with parents. Additionally, teachers must have continuous interaction with parents in various ways, including phone calls, email, meetings, and notes. To encourage collaboration between teachers and parents, administrators need to conduct regular meetings. They also need to play the role of trainers for parents, emphasizing their responsibility in their children’s education.

(4) Collaborative consultation enables professionals who are involved in teaching SSENs English to effectively support general education teachers. Even though the proportion of SSENs placed in inclusive settings is very high in Korea, instructional inclusion does not always take place in Korean English classes. The word inclusion is not synonymous with sitting in inclusive settings. A general education setting can provide meaningful education coordinated by professionals in various fields through one integrated channel. Individual Education plans (IEPs) can be developed based on collaboration among diverse professionals. Even though SSENs who receive National Basic Common Curricula (NBCCs) can be educated in English, the curricular documents do not provide any guidelines, except for sensory impaired SSENs. Because of this oversight, developing IEPs for English education is very significant for teachers. Collaborative consultation enables professionals in various fields to cooperate in order to develop IEPs for English education.

The critical point in implementing collaborative consultation is a shared responsibility and voluntary participation in all the processes of educating students, from design to assessment. In collaborative consultation for inclusion, general education teachers are generally the direct education services providers in English classes in Korea.
However, this does not mean that general education teachers have the greatest responsibility on the consultation team. All participants share equal responsibility for education and interaction. Support from administrators is absolutely essential. Collaborative consultation also requires the participation of professionals from various fields in the community, not just the school, in order to satisfy individuals’ diverse and specific educational needs. Administrators can secure and facilitate access to various professionals, like doctors, psychologists, and therapists for consultation. They also need to train the consultation team members to understand their roles on the team. The maintenance of the team and mediation of different views among the members are also a part of their role.

Conclusions

This study concludes as follows:

- Research reveals that Response to Intervention (RTI), contextualized instruction, and parental involvement and collaborative consultation to build an interactive learning environment are important issues in teaching a foreign language and English as a second or foreign language to students with special needs.

- Research reveals two important points for teaching SSENs English in Korea. First, communicative competence is emphasized across the curricular documents for the language education of Students with Special Educational Needs (SSENs). Second, they do not receive inclusive instruction in English classes, even though they are physically placed in inclusive settings.
Based on a synthesis of research findings, RTI, contextualized instruction, parental involvement, and collaborative consultation are recommended to Korean stakeholders involved in teaching SSENs English.

This study is significant, especially for general language education teachers who teach SSENs in Korea. Even though the population SSENs in inclusive settings is very high in Korea, English education has not been provided in many classes, due to teachers’ perspectives on the effectiveness of English education for SSENs and limitation in the curricula. This study can be used in the design of training for general education teachers, in order to achieve instructional inclusion in physically inclusive settings and special education teachers, who need to be aware of more effective ways to deliver language education. Parents need to be aware of their responsibility for and participation in their students’ education. Finally, this information is valuable for administrators in setting the stage for inclusive English education.

The features of effective instruction for ELLs with special needs are based on only nine studies, and the recommendations are based on a synthesis of research findings. Research on the effectiveness of RTI, contextualized instruction, parental involvement, and collaborative consultation to teaching SSENs English should be conducted in Korea.
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