SWOTTING STYLES USED BY KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS IN TEACHING: REFLECTIONS AND DISPOSITIONS IN FOCUS

Lani S. Mozo[1], Albert G. Musico[2]

[1]*Student, Graduate School, The Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.*
[2] *Faculty, Graduate School, The Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.*

ABSTRACT

Learning begins at home but technically, it will start the moment you enroll your kid to any kindergarten school. Kindergarten is a significant stage in every kid's life, because it is the transition period from home to formal schooling. Teaching kindergarten kids is a special opportunity to introduce children to school and instill in them a love of learning. It can be one of the most enjoyable and challenging jobs. There are several ways to make the educational experience more meaningful and successful for pupils must be studied. The very purpose of this study is clearly validated in light of recent education system in our country. Teachers in kindergarten are now held accountable for the education of pupils with difficulty in learning like never before. A phenomenological study describes the meaning of lived experiences of individuals about a concept or phenomenon (Creswell, 2003) was used in this study. The intent of a phenomenological study is to understand and describe an event from the point of view of the participants. Kindergarten, which literally means a garden for children, comprises a range of early childhood educational practices. The art of teaching kindergarten kids includes different instructional designs to help children learn at their own pace while in a social and collaborative environment. The art of teaching Kindergarten kids is nurturing and supportive rather than competitive. Children learn through fun and engaging activities like art and music, transforming playtime into opportunities to instill important cognitive skills, motor skills, and social skills. A good kindergarten program should combine a multitude of teaching methods and instructional designs.

KEY WORDS: *swotting styles, kindergarten teachers, teaching, reflections, dispositions*

INTRODUCTION

Learning begins at home but technically, it will start the moment you enroll your kid to any kindergarten school. Kindergarten is a significant stage in every kid's life, because it is the transition period from home to formal schooling. Teaching kindergarten kids is a special opportunity to introduce children to school and instill in them a love of learning. It can be one of the most enjoyable and challenging jobs.

One of the most challenging things about teaching kindergarten is keeping all of the students engaged. It can be difficult to find activities that are both developmentally appropriate and interesting for such a wide range of ages. In addition, kindergartners have short attention spans, so it can be a challenge to keep them focused on any one thing for very long most especially in teaching. It can be tough to keep everyone on track, but it's important to set clear expectations from the beginning and consistently enforce rules and consequences.

here are several ways to make the educational experience more meaningful and successful for pupils must be studied. The very purpose of this study is clearly validated in light of recent education system in our country. Teachers in kindergarten are now held accountable for the education of pupils with difficulty in learning like never before.

This study also highlights the use of scientific based interventions in the online or distance learning to ensure students' learning difficulties are not due to a lack of adequate instruction, but studies continue to report that kinder teachers minimally change their instructional methods when pupils with learning difficulties are placed in their classrooms

----

(Vaughn & Schumm, 1995). It is important to better understand the phenomenon of teaching and planning instruction for pupils with learning difficulty from the teachers' perspective in order to improve the strategies when teaching kinder using different learning approaches.

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the relevant literature regarding the pertinent aspects of this study. The first section, impact of learning styles on education, public financing of education, loss of instructional time delivered in a school setting, measure to continue students' learning.

The next section, teachers' preparedness to support digital learning, when and how to reopen schools on teaching and learning. The last section is a combination of the following issues: pedagogy for continuing education through modular and online, challenges in teaching and learning, opportunities for teaching and learning, most commonly used learning strategies for flexible teaching and learning policies and the most important issues on the characteristics of effective teacher. The review of the literature builds a logical framework for this study and locates it within a tradition of inquiry and a context of related studies (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

An abundance of information exists concerning learning styles and their implications for learning and teaching. According to Zapalska and Dabb (2002), an understanding of the way students learn improves the selection of teaching strategies best suited to student learning. For students, this matching of instructional strategies to their individual learning styles has "consistently evidenced positive results" in empirical studies (Minotti, 2005, p. 84). Although some researchers deny there is a statistically significant correlation between learning style and performance, many of these researchers acknowledge there is likely an educational benefit from the use of varied modalities in instructional practice (Hall & Moseley, 2005; Karns, 2006; Kratzig & Arbuthnott, 2006; Pashler, McDaniel, Rohrer, & Bjork, 2009).

METHODOLOGY

Research Design
The researcher made these qualitative assumptions that consist of the methods used in the process of qualitative research (Creswell 2003). The procedures used by the researcher are inductive and are based on the researcher's own experience in collecting and analyzing data. The research here is the product of the values of the researcher. Through an inductive approach, raw textual data is condensed into a brief, summary format. Clear links are established between research objectives and summary findings derived from raw data. A framework of the underlying structure of experiences or processes that are evident from the raw data is developed.

A phenomenological study describes the meaning of lived experiences of individuals about a concept or phenomenon (Creswell, 2003) was used in this study. The intent of a phenomenological study is to understand and describe an event from the point of view of the participants. A key characteristic of this approach is to study the way in which members of a group or community interpret themselves, the world and life around them (Mertens, 2005). The purpose of this study was to gain insights into the experiences of general education teachers and how they view and interpret their instructional planning, strategies, and outcomes when teaching to kinder pupils. Phenomenology is considered as the best approach applicable in this study since the researcher will be asking the lived experiences of the teachers in the kinder level on their strategies used to teach kinder pupils in order to boost perseverance and academic achievement.

Participants and Sampling
Ten participants who are all Kindergarten teachers in selected public schools in Davao City are the focused in this study. The said participants are chosen through random sampling. All of them are licensed teachers and has experience teaching kindergarten for almost two years.

Participant 1 is a licensed professional teacher in one of the public elementary schools in Davao City. She is an experienced teacher for almost 14 years and she taught general education subjects among kinder learners.
Participant 2 is a male teacher in one of the public schools in Davao City. He is a licensed professional teacher. He experienced teaching for almost two years and he taught general education subjects among kinder learners. He is currently enrolled in his master's degree in Educational Management.

Participant 3 is considered as a mother of learners in kindergarten. A teacher for almost fifteen years handling general education subjects under special education program. Some of her students are deaf, mute and blind. She obtained her master's degree in Guidance and Counselling three years ago.

Participant 4 is a female licensed teacher from public school in Davao City. She is currently teaching general education subjects to kinder learners.

Participant 5 is a male licensed teacher from public school teaching for almost three years in the kinder program handling general education subjects. Currently, he is pursuing his Master's Degree in Educational Management.

Participant 6 is a licensed professional teacher. She obtained her Master's Degree in Early Childhood Education two-years ago. Currently, she is handling general education subjects in the kinder program in one of the public schools in Davao City.

Participant 7 is a female licensed teacher. She is currently teaching in public school for 11 years. Currently she's pursuing her master's degree in Educational Management (Thesis Writing).

Participant 8 is a male licensed teacher. He is a public-school teacher for 7 years. He taught reading and writing to kinder learners.

Participant 9 is a licensed teacher. He is currently teaching in public school for 18 years. He graduated Bachelor in Elementary Education.

Participant 10 is a licensed professional teacher. He's teaching in public school for 15 years. He taught all subjects in the kindergarten program.

Research Instruments
Semi-Structured Interviews
Patton (1990) proposes researchers to conduct interviews in order to learn the things they cannot directly observe. Qualitative interviewing is not used to get answers to questions, but to understand the experiences of the participants and the meaning they make of that experience (Seidman, 1988). Generally, qualitative studies use unstructured, open-ended interviews, because they allow for the most flexibility and responsiveness to emerging issues for both the participants and interviewer; however, the use of semi-structured interviews is not uncommon and used when the researcher seeks to obtain specific more focused information (Schwandt, 2001). Semi-structured interviews combine the flexibility of unstructured, open-ended interviews with directionality and an agenda to produce focused, qualitative, textual data (Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte, 71 1999). This study collected data using semi-structured interviews in order to explore how general education teachers describe their instructional planning, strategies, and outcomes when teaching students with disabilities.

In order to ensure that the same information was collected from all the participants, an interview guide was used. The interview guide included open-ended questions and topics to help structure the interview, but when needed, the interviewer also explored, probed, and asked additional questions to clarify and expand on a particular topic. The interview guide helped make interviewing across a number of different participants more systematic and comprehensive by defining in advance the issues to be explored (Patton, 1990). The open-ended questions were framed in a way, so the participants could represent their views and perspectives in their own words and terms, in addition to taking the questions in any direction that they chose (Patton, 1990).

Data Analysis
Qualitative data analysis begins with the process of organizing, reducing, and describing the collected data (Schwandt, 2001). Unlike quantitative analysis there are no prescribed formulas for qualitative analysis. Marshall and Rossman (2006) remind researchers that qualitative analysis does not proceed in a linear fashion and it is not neat. However, good practice and procedures enhance the credibility of qualitative research. In this last section, the data analysis procedures will be explained and the steps taken to ensure the results from this study are credible, transferable,

dependable, and authentic will be thoroughly described. To guide the data analysis, the researcher used the seven phases of data analysis described by Marshall and Rossman (2006) as a means to reduce data, create manageable pieces, allow for interpretation, and find meaning in the words of the participants. The seven phases included: (a) organizing the data; (b) immersion in the data; (c) generating categories and themes; (d) coding the data; (e) offering interpretations through analytic memos; and (f) searching for alternative understandings (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Data analysis first begins with organizing the data. Organization of the data involved keeping information provided by each participant separate and in sequence with the order of the interviews. The process of organizing the data allowed it to remain manageable, easily accessible, and readily available. The digital audio files from the interviews were carefully transcribed into written form. Electronic folders were established to create organization for the data collected from each individual participant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Kindergarten, which literally means a garden for children, comprises a range of early childhood educational practices. The art of teaching kindergarten kids includes different instructional designs to help children learn at their own pace while in a social and collaborative environment.

The art of teaching Kindergarten kids is nurturing and supportive rather than competitive. Children learn through fun and engaging activities like art and music, transforming playtime into opportunities to instill important cognitive skills, motor skills, and social skills. A good kindergarten program should combine a multitude of teaching methods and instructional designs.

Also, Kindergarten teachers play an integral role in early childhood development by fostering basic intellectual and social foundations. kindergarten teachers should implement several teaching methods that challenge students to express themselves while learning. Teaching kindergarten kids successfully is about finding the right balance between fun and learning.

There are different teaching methods employed in education in many institutions. It is expected of a teacher to implement a range of instructional strategies. That will bring academic success to all the students. For any method to be able to bring good result in the present age, it should be a method that promotes maximum social interaction. Social interaction between students and between teacher and student plays a crucial role in learning. These further stressed the need for the students to be provided with a supportive, open and interactive environment as this could help them discover knowledge. The teaching methods commonly used in kinder classes are lecture and demonstration method.

From the foregoing there is no gain saying that effective teaching cannot take place in isolation most especially at the foundational stage which form the bedrock for subsequent education. However, teachers need support to develop and use child centered teaching methods so that children can participate more in the learning process. There is a need to shift the forms of teaching from gaining knowledge to using knowledge and skills based on cone of experience. Therefore, it is obvious that successful teaching at the kinder school level demands from teacher investigative capability in order to make sensible decision on the choice of method to adopt on the cone experience which is the process of learning that begins in concrete experiences and move toward the abstract if mastery is to be obtained in the child.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A number of recommendations for future studies emerged from the data. This study was restricted to ten elementary general education classroom teachers from Davao City. The first recommendation would be to expand this study's sample size and the geographic area of the participants. Another recommendation would be to study the perspectives of participants not included in this study: middle and high school teachers, specials teachers, and special education teachers. In order to collect more data on the lived experiences of general education teachers, follow-up classroom observations are recommended.

Studying the swotting styles for inclusion as described by the participants using a quantitative approach would also be beneficial. One of the findings from this study was the lack of collaboration between the general education and

----

special education teachers. Further research is recommended to explore what type of co-teaching and alternative school program models increase the collaboration between general education and special education teachers and better serve students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Moreover, educators, parents and individual students assess each student's situation and discuss adjustments needed for remote learning. Some examples include using alternatives to print, such as audio or other formats in instruction, as well as pictures, flexible scheduling and deadlines, and assistive technology.

Learning in a remote setting may differ from mainstream, classroom-based environments. This includes expectations for students and course methodology. Curricula must often be adjusted. For example, homework can be simplified, allowing students to dictate rather than type, and audio materials can be provided for reading assignments during online class.

REFERENCES

1. Acevedo J.G., Ochoa G.V., Obregon L.G. (2020) Development of a new educational package based on e-learning to study engineering thermodynamic process: combustion, energy and entropy analysis. Heliyon. 2020;6
2. Advanogy.com. (2011). Free learning styles inventory. Retrieved from http://www.learning-styles-online.com/inventory/
3. Alaka, A. M. (2011). Learning styles: What difference do the differences make?. Charleston Law Review, 5(2), 133-172.
4. Alesandrini, K., & Larson, L. (2002). Teachers bridge to constructivism. In K. M. Cauley, & G. M. Pannozzo (Eds.), Annual editions: Educational psychology (pp.118-121). Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill Contemporary Learning Series.
5. Alexander, B. (2010). Impact of personalized learning styles on online delivery and assessment. Campus Wide Information Systems, 24(2), pp. 105-119.
6. Anderson R.S., Speck B.W. (2019). Oh what a difference a team makes": why team teaching makes a difference. Teach. Teach. Educ. 1998;14(7):671–686.
7. Anderson, K. M. (2007). Tips for teaching: Differentiating instruction to include all students. Preventing School Failure, 51(3), 49-54. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.
8. Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). Introduction to research in education (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson & Wadsworth.
9. Atkinson, R.C. & Shiffrin, R.M. (1968): "Chapter: Human Memory: A Proposed System and its Control Processes". In: Spence, K.W. & Spence, J.T. (eds.): The Psychology of Learning and Motivation (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press. 89-195.
10. Baker, E. T., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (2020). The effects of inclusion on learning. Educational Leadership, 52, 33-35. doi:199433503461008
11. Barbe, W. B., Swassing, R. H., & Milone, M. N. (1979). Teaching through modality strengths: Concepts and practices. Columbus, OH: Zaner-Bloser, 1979.
12. Barber, M. (2007). Reassessing pedagogy in a fast forward age. International Journal of Learning, 13(9), 143-149. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.
13. Barsch, J., & Creson, B. (1980). Barsch Learning Style Inventory. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.
14. Bartoli, J., & Botel, M. (2019). Reading/learning disability: An ecological approach. New York: Teachers College Press.
15. Basilaia, G., Kvavadze, D. (2020). Transition to online education in schools during a SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in Georgia. Pedagogical Research, 5(4), 10. https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/7937
16. Belmont Report (1979). Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. Retrieved from https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html
17. Bembenutty, H. (2008). Self-regulation of learning and test anxiety. Psychology Journal, 5(3), 122-139. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
18. Bender, W. N., Vail, C. O., & Scott, K. (2019). Teacher's attitudes towards increased mainstreaming: Implementing effective instruction for students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28, 87-94. doi:10.1177/002221949502800203
19. Bergmann J., Overmyer J., Wilie B. (2019). The flipped class: what it is and what it is not. Daily Riff. 2013;9
20. Bergmann J., Sams A. (2019). International Society for Technology in Education; Washington DC: 2012. Flip Your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day; pp. 20–190
21. Bishka, A. (2010). Learning styles fray: Brilliant or batty?. Performance Improvement, 101 49(10), 9-13. doi: 10.1002/pfi.20181

----

22. Bletzer K.V. (2020). *Visualizing the qualitative: making sense of written comments from an evaluative satisfaction survey.* J. Educ. Eval. Health Prof. 2015;12

23. Bonacci, J. A. (1998). *An assessment of the preferred learning styles of undergraduates enrolled in a core curriculum introductory health course* (Doctoral Dissertation, Middle Tennessee State University, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts Online. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database.

24. Borgmann, A. and Wegner, C. (2011): *"Wissenschaft 2.0 mit Kolumbus-Kids".* Science 2.0 with the Project Kolumbus-Kids. Merz-Medien und Erziehung, Zeitschrift für Medienpädagogik, 55 (3), 80-81.

25. Borkowski, J.G. & O'Sullivan, J.T. (1985): *Memory Strategy Instructions Is Made of This: Metamemory and Durable Strategy Use.* Educational Psychologist, 19, 94-107.

26. Brandon Drew T. (2020). *Unflipping the flipped classroom: balancing for maximum effect in minimum lead-time in online education.* J. Chem. Educ. 2020;97(9):3301–3305.

27. Brown, B., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, C. (2003). *Teaching style vs. learning style. Myths and realities.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED482329) Retrieved from ERIC database.

28. Brown, J., & Cooper, R. (1993). *Learning Styles Inventory* [Educational Activities, Inc.]. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

29. Burden K., Aubusson P., Brindley S., Schuck S. (2019). *Changing knowledge, changing technology: implications for teacher education futures.* J. Educ. Teach. 2016;42:4–16.

30. Caine, R.N., & Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain.* Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

31. Canfield, A. (1976). *Canfield Learning Styles Inventory.* Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

32. Cano-Garcia, F., & Hughes, E. (2000). *Learning and thinking styles: An analysis of their interrelationship and influence on academic achievement.* Educational Psychology, 20(4), 413-430. doi:10.1080/01443410020016653

33. Carson, D. (2009). *Is style everything? Teaching that achieves its objectives.* Cinema Journal, 48(3), 95-101. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database. CAPSOL® Styles of Learning. (n.d.). CAP-SOL Styles of Learning. Retrieved from http://www.stylesoflearning.com/styles.html

34. Charlesworth, Z. M. (2008). *Learning styles across cultures: Suggestions for educators.* Education + Training, 50(2), 115-127. doi: 10.1108/00400910810862100 102

35. Collinson, E. (2000). *A survey of elementary students' learning style preferences and academic success.* Contemporary Education, 71(4), 42-48. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

36. Congress of the Philippines (2012). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/15th_Congress_of_the_Philippines

37. Cowden C.D., Santiago M.F. (2016). *Interdisciplinary explorations: promoting critical thinking via problem-based learning in an advanced biochemistry class.* J. Chem. Educ. 2016;93(3):464–469.

38. Cox, S. G. (2008, May). *Differentiated instruction in the elementary classroom.* Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 73(9), 52-54. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

39. Crawford R., Jenkins L.E. (2019). *Making pedagogy tangible: developing skills and knowledge using a team teaching and blended learning approach.* Aust. J. Teach. Educ. 2019;43(1):127.

40. Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE. Cross, N., Howard, K., & Pearson, C. (2013). *Culture: The missing link to learning.* Leadership, 42(4), 36–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.07.015

41. Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

42. Cuthbert, P. (2005, April). *The student learning process: Learning styles or learning approaches?.* Teaching in Higher Education, 10(2), 235-249. Retrieved doi:10.1080/1356251042000337972

43. Darabi A., Jin L. *Improving the quality of online discussion: the effects of strategies designed based on cognitive load theory principles.* Distance Educ. 2013;34(1):21–36.

44. Davis, S. E. (2007). *Learning styles and memory.* Institute for Learning Styles Journal, 1, 46-50. Retrieved from http://www.auburn.edu/~witteje/ilsrj/JournalVolumes/Volume1Fall2007 PDFs/Learning Styles and Memory.pdf

45. Denig, S. J. (2004). *Multiple intelligences and learning styles: Two complementary dimensions.* Teachers College Record, 106(1), 96-111. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

46. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

47. Dhawan, N., (2020). *Managing learning resources – technical issues with learning objects, repositories and searching the semantic web.* Greenwich, University of Greenwich.

48. Doucet, A., Netolicky, D., Timmers, K., Tuscano, F. J. (2020). *Thinking about pedagogy in an unfolding pandemic (An Independent Report on Approaches to Distance Learning during COVID-19 School Closure).* Work of Education International and UNESCO. https://issuu.com/educationinternational/docs/2020_research_covid-19_eng

----

49. Dunn, R., & Burke, K. (2006). *LSCY: Research and implementation manual.* International Learning Styles Network. Retrieved from
http://www.learningstyles.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&g id=36&Itemid=73&lang=en

50. Dunn, R., Denig, S., & Lovelace, M. K. (2001). *Two sides of the same coin or different strokes for different folks?.* Teacher Librarian, 28(3). Retrieved from EBSCOhost database. 103

51. Dunn, R., Dunn, K., & Price, G. (1976). *Learning Style Inventory [Price Systems, Inc.].* Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

52. Dunn, R., Honigsfeld, A., Doolan, L. S., Bostrom, L., Russo, K., Schiering, M., . . . Tenedero, H. (2009). *Impact of learning-style instructional strategies on students' achievement and attitudes: Perceptions of educators in diverse institutions.* Clearing House, 82(3), 135-140. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

53. Educational Testing Service. (2010). *Test Link Database.* Retrieved from http://www.ets.org/test_link/find_tests

54. Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Moody, S. W. (2019). *Grouping practices and reading outcomes for students with disabilities.* Exceptional Children, 65, 399-415. doi: 199910603306008

55. Esson J.M. (2016). *The Flipped Classroom Volume 2: Results from Practice.* American Chemical Society; 2016. Flipping general and analytical chemistry at a primarily undergraduate institution; pp. 107–125.

56. Evans, C., & Waring, M. (2006). *Towards inclusive teacher education: Sensitising individuals to how they learn.* Educational Psychology, 26(4), 499-518. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

57. Evans, D., Townsend, B. L., & Duchnowski, A. (2019). *Addressing the challenges of inclusion of children with disabilities.* Teacher Education and Special Education, 19, 180-191. doi:10.1177/088840649601900209

58. Experience Based Learning Systems, Inc. (2011). *Experience Based Learning Systems, Inc..* Retrieved from http://www.learningfromexperience.com/

59. Fautch J.M. (2020). *The flipped classroom for teaching organic chemistry in small classes: is it effective?* Chem. Educ. Res. Pract. 2015;16(1):179–186.

60. Felder, R. M. (1996). *Matters of style.* ASEE Prism, 6(4), 18-23. Retrieved from http://www4ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/LS-Prism.htm

61. Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2005). *Understanding student differences.* Journal of Engineering Education, 94(1), 57-72. Retrieved from http://www4ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/Understanding_D ifferences.pdf

62. Fine, D. (2003). *A sense of learning style.* Principal Leadership: High School Edition, 4(2), 55-59. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.

63. Flores N., Savage S.J. (2020). *Student demand for streaming lecture video: empirical evidence from undergraduate economics classes.* Int. Rev. Econ. Educ. 2007;6(2):57–78.

64. Fox, N. E., &Ysseldyke, J. E. (2019). *Implementing inclusion at the middle school level: lessons from a negative example.* Exceptional Children, 64, 81-89.

65. Friedrich, H.F. and Mandl, H. (eds..)(1992): *Lern- und Denkstrategien. Strategies of Learning and Thinking.* Göttingen:

66. Friend, M. (2019). *Special education: Contemporary perspectives for school professionals.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education

67. Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* 104 (7th ed). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

68. Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

69. Gately, S., & Hammer, C. (2020). *An exploratory case study of the preparation of secondary teachers to meet special education needs in the general education classroom.* The Teacher Educator, 40(4), 238-256. doi: 10.1080/08878730509555364

70. Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2019). *Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis.* The Elementary School Journal, 101 (3), 551-572. doi:10.1086/499668

71. Giorgi, A. (2006). *Concerning Variations in the Application of the Phenomenological Method.* The Humanistic Psychologist, 34(4), 305–319. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15473333thp3404_2

72. Glenn, D. (2009). *Matching teaching style to learning style may not help students.* Retrieved from Boston, MA

73. Gnagey, T., & Gnagey, P. (1970). *How A Child Learns.* Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

74. Gnagey, T., & Gnagey, P. (1982). *Analytic Learning Disability Assessment.* Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

75. Goby, V. P., & Lewis, J. H. (2000). *Using experiential learning theory and the Myers Briggs Type Indicator in teaching business communication.* Business Communication Quarterly, 63(3), 39-48. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

76. Gomez, R. (2020). *On Special Education: Academic Measures for Inclusion of Students with Special Needs (2012)* https://www.academia.edu/22753575/On_Special_Education_Academic_Measures_for_Inclusion_of_Students_with_ Special_Needs

77. Google. (2010). *Search: Learning style assessment instrument.* Retrieved from

----

http://www.google.com/webhp#hl=en&source=hp&q=learning+style+assessmentinstrument&btnG=Google+Search& aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs_rfai=CiBsFEoQ8TPTCLIvwygS59LH_CwAAAKoEBU_QuBHa&fp=36ec6be010d257f

78. *Gordon, N., 2005. The use of Diagnostic software in teaching a mathematics module for computer science students. York, Higher Education Academy.*

79. *Guba & Lincoln (1988). Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Sage Publications, Inc. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1989-98594-000*

80. *Guild, P. B. (2001). Diversity, Learning Style and Culture. New Horizons for Learning. Retrieved from http://www.newhorizons.org/strategies/styles/guild.htm*

81. *Haar, J., Hall, G., Schoepp, P., & Smith, D. (2002). How teachers teach to students with different learning styles. Clearing House, 75(3), 142-145. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.*

82. *Hall, E., & Moseley, D. (2005). Is there a role for learning styles in personalised education and training?. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 24(3), 243- 105 255. doi:10.1080/02601370500134933.*

83. *Hall, J. (2005). Neuroscience and Education. Education Journal, 84, 27-29. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.*

84. *Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., & Lloyd, J. W. (2019). Introduction to learning disabilities. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.*

85. *Hanafin, J. Shevlin, M. & Flynn, M. (2002). Responding to student diversity: Lessons from the margin. Pedagogy, Culture & Society 10(3), 409-423. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681360200200151*

86. *Harmer, J. (2007). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Harlow: Longman.*

87. *Hatch, J. A. (2002). Doing qualitative research in education settings. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.*

88. *Hawk, T. F., & Shah, A. J. (2007). Using learning style instruments to enhance student learning. Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 5(1), 1-19. Retrieved from EBSOhost database.*

89. *Helm, C. (2007). Teacher dispositions affecting self-esteem and student performance. Clearing House, 80(3), 109-110. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.*

90. *Hendrix F. H. (1989). Vocational Learning Styles. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.*

91. *Herman, M. (2009). The black-white-other achievement gap: Testing theories of academic performance among multiracial and monoracial adolescents. Sociology of Education, 82(1), 20-46. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.*

92. *Hogrefe. Huber, G.L. (2006): Lernen in Gruppen/ Kooperatives Lernen. Learning in Groups/ Cooperative Learning. In: Mandl, H.; Friedrich, H.F. (eds.): Handbuch Lernstrategien. Handbook of Learning Strategies. Göttingen:*

93. *Hogrefe. Konrad, K. (1999): Lernstrategien für Kinder. Learning Strategies for Children. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider.*

94. *Hogrefe. Friedrich, H.F. and Mandl, H. (eds..) (2006): Handbuch Lernstrategien. Handbook of Learning Strategies. Göttingen:*

95. *Honigsfeld, A., & Schiering, M. (2004). Diverse approaches to the diversity of learning styles in teacher education. Educational Psychology, 24(4), 487-507. doi:10.1080/0144341042000228861*

96. *Howell, D. C. (2008). Fundamental statistics for the behavioral sciences (6th ed). Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education. Hsieh, S-W., Jang, Y-R.,*

97. *Hoyt G., Kassis M., Vera D., Imazeki J. In: Teaching Innovations in Economics: Strategies and Applications for Interactive Instruction. Walstad W.B., Salemi M.K., editors. Edward Elgar; Cheltenham, UK/Northampton, MA: 2010. Making cooperative learning effective for economics; pp. 65–94.*

98. *Hwang, G-J., & Chen, N-S. (2011). Effects of teaching and 106 learning styles on students' reflection levels for ubiquitous learning. Computers & Education, 57(1), 1194-1201. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.01.004*

99. *Institute for Learning Styles Research. (n.d.). Overview of the seven perceptual styles. Retrieved from http://learningstyles.org/*

100. *International Learning Styles Network. (2008). About learning styles. Retrieved fromhttp://www.learningstyles.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=20 &Itemid=70&lang=en*

101. *Jacobs-Connell, J. D. (2000). Brain based teaching: Integrating multiple intelligences and emotional intelligence. Classroom Leadership, 4(3). Retrievedhttp://ascd/cms/objectlib/ascdframeset/index.cfm?publication=http://www.asc d.org/ed_topics/cl200011_jacobsconnell.html*

102. *Kamps, D., Leonard, B., Potucek, J., & Garrison-Harrell, L. (1995). Cooperative learning groups in reading: An integration strategy for students with autism and general classroom peers. Behavioral Disorders, 21(1), 89-109.*

103. *Karns, G. L. (2006). Learning style differences in the perceived effectiveness of learning activities. Journal of Marketing Education, 28(1), 56-63. doi: 10.1177/0273475305284641*

104. *Kauffman, J. M., & Pullen, P. L. (1989). An historical perspective: A personal perspective on our history of service to mildly handicapped and at-risk students. Remedial and Special Education, 10(6), 12-14. doi: 10.1177/074193258901000605*

105. *Kaufman, J. M. (2019). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. Exceptional Children, 60, 6-16.*

106. *Keefe, J. W., Monk, J. S., Letteri, C. A., Languis, M., Dunn, R., Jenkins, J. M., Roselund, P. (1986). Learning Style Profile. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.*

----

107. Kiernan, L. J., & Tomlinson, C. A. (1997). Why differentiate instruction? Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

108. King-Sears, M. E., & Cummings, C. S. (2019). Inclusive practices of classroom teachers. Remedial and Special Education, 17, 217-225. doi: 10.1177/074193259601700404

109. Koçakoğlu, M. (2010). Determining the learning styles of elementary school (1st-8th grade teachers). International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2(1), 54- 64. Retrieved from the Directory of Open Access Journals.

110. Koch, K. R. (2007). A Conversation with Dr. Rita Dunn. Institute for Learning Styles 107 Journal, 1. Retrieved from http://www.auburn.edu/~witteje/ilsrj/Journal Volumes/Volume1Fall2007 PDFs/Conversation with Dr. Rita Dunn.pdf

111. Kolb, A., & Kolb, D. (2009). The learning way: Meta-cognitive aspects of experiential learning. Simulation & Gaming, 40(3), 297-327. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

112. Kolb, D. (1976). Learning Style Inventory, Version 3. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

113. Koo C.L., Demps E.L., Farris C., Bowman J.D., Panahi L., Boyle P. (2020). Impact of flipped classroom design on student performance and perceptions in a pharmacotherapy course. Am. J. Pharm. Educ. 2016;80(2):33.

114. Kratzig, G., & Arbuthnott, K. (2006). Perceptual learning style and learning proficiency: A test of the hypothesis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 98(1), 238-246. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ734402) Retrieved from ERIC database.

115. Kuensel, J., (2020). Securing a sustainable future for higher education: An Independent Review of Higher Education Funding & Student Finance., London: HMSO.

116. Lage M.J., Platt G.J., Treglia M. Inverting the classroom: a gateway to creating an inclusive learning environment. J. Econ. Educ. 2000;31(1):30–43.

117. Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977, March). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics, 33(1), 159-174. Retrieved from JSTOR database. Lauria, J. (2010). Differentiation through learning- style responsive strategies. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 47(1), 24-29. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

118. Lange C., Costley J. Improving online video lectures: learning challenges created by media. Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ. 2007;17(2020):1–18.

119. LdPride. (n.d.). What's your learning style?. Retrieved from http://www.ldpride.net/learning-style-test.html Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). Practical research: Planning and design (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

120. Lerner, J. W. (2000). Learning disabilities: Theories, diagnosis, and teaching strategies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

121. Lifelong learning. (n.d.). Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition. Retrieved from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/lifelong learning 108

122. Lilly, M. S. (1988). The regular education initiative: A force for change in general and special education. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23, 253-260.

123. Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1989). Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. Baltimore: Paul Brookes Publishing Company.

124. Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2000). Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

125. Loo, R. (2004). Kolb's learning styles and learning preferences: Is there a linkage?. Educational Psychology, 24(1), 99-108. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

126. Lovelace, M. (2005, January). Meta-analysis of experimental research based on the Dunn and Dunn Model. Journal of Educational Research, 98(3), 176-183. Retrieved February 14, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

127. Madden, N. A., &Slavin, R. E. (1983). Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: Academic and social outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 53, 519-569. doi: 10.2307/1170220

128. Madge, S., Affleck, J., &Lowenbraun, S. (1990). Social effects of integrated classrooms and resource room/regular class placements on elementary students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23, 439-444. doi: 10.1177/002221949002300708

129. Magiera, K., &Zigmond, N. (2019). Co-teaching in middle school classrooms under routine conditions: Does the instructional experience differ for students with disabilities in co-taught and solo-taught classes? Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 20(2), 79-85

130. Malcom, P., Lutz, W., Gerken, M., & Hoeltke, G. (1981). Learning Style Identification Scale. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

131. Marshall, C., & Rossman, C. B. (2006). Designing qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

132. Martin, S. (2010). Teachers using learning styles: Torn between research and accountability? Teaching and Teacher Education, 26(8), 1583-1591. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.009

----

133. Marzano, R. J. (2019). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

134. Maurin, E., McNally, S. (2008). Vive la révolution! Long-term educational returns of 1968 to the angry students. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 26(1). https://doi.org/10.1086/522071

135. Maxwell, S. E. & Delaney, H. D. (2004). *Designing experiments and analyzing data: A model comparison perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

136. McCarron, L. (1984). *Assessment of Individual Learning Style: The Perceptual Memory Task*. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

137. McClanaghan, M. E. (2008). A strategy for helping students learn how to learn. *Education*, 120(3), 479-486. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

138. McConnell D. (2020). *The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press; Maidenhead: 2006. E-learning Groups and Communities*.

139. McLaughlin J.E., Roth M.T., Glatt D.M., Gharkholonarehe N., Davidson C.A., Griffin L.M., Esserman D.A., Mumper R.J. The flipped classroom: a course redesign to foster learning and engagement in a health professions school. *Acad. Med*. 2014;89:236–243.

140. McPherson, B. (1999). Correlating students' personality types with their rating of topics covered in business communication classes. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 62(3), 46-53. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

141. Merriam, S. B. (2019). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

142. Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

143. Messinger, J. F. (2020). Commentary on "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education" or "Is it time now for the lamb to lie down with the lion?" *Exceptional Children*, 51, 510-512.

144. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

145. Miller, S. E., Leinhardt, G. &Zigmond, N. (2019). Influencing engagement through accommodation: An ethnographic study of at-risk students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25(4), 465-487.

146. Minotti, J. L. (2005). Effects of learning-style-based homework prescriptions on the achievement and attitudes of middle school students. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(642), 67-89. doi: 10.1177/019263650508964206

147. Molnar A. (2018). Content type and perceived multimedia quality in mobile learning. *Multimed. Tools Appl*. 2017;76(20):21613–21627.

148. Mooij, T. (2008). Education and self-regulation of learning for gifted pupils: systemic 109 design and development. *Research Papers in Education*, 23(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/02671520701692551

149. Mooring S.R., Mitchell C.E., Burrows N.L. (2019). Evaluation of a flipped, large-enrollment organic chemistry course on student attitude and achievement. *J. Chem. Educ*. 2016;93(12):1972–1983.

150. Morrison, M., Sweeney, A., & Hoffman, T. (2006). Karns's learning styles and learning effectiveness: A rejoinder. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(1), 64-68. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.

151. Moustakas, (1994). *Improving student's oral communication skills and learners' speaking skills*. National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education.

152. Muega, M.A. (2020). *Inclusive Education in the Philippines: Through the Eyes of Teachers, Administrators, and Parents of Children with Special Needs*, Social Science Article, Diliman.

153. Nasmith, L., & Steinert, Y. (2001). The evaluation of a workshop to promote interactive lecturing. *Teaching & Learning in Medicine*, 13(1), 43-48. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

154. Nerantzi C. The use of peer instruction and flipped learning to support flexible blended learning during and after the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Int. J. Manag. Appl. Res*. 2020;7(2):184–195.

155. Newton, R. R., & Rudestam, K. E. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide of content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

156. Noble, T. (2004). Integrating the revised Bloom's taxonomy with multiple intelligences: A planning tool for curriculum differentiation. *Teachers College Record*, 106(1), 193-211. Retrieved from EBSCOhost. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

157. O'Flaherty J., Craig P. (2019). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: a scoping review. *Internet High. Educ*. 2015;25:85–95.

158. O'Brien, L. (1990). *The Learning Channel Preference Checklist*. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

159. Olakanmi E.E. The effects of a flipped classroom model of instruction on students' performance and attitudes towards chemistry. *J. Sci. Educ. Tech*. 2017;26(1):127–137.

---

160. Olson, J. K. (2006). *The myth of catering to learning styles. Science & Children, 44(2), 56-57. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database. Parker, L. (n.d.). The learning styles profile and the study skills inventory. Unpublished manuscript.*

161. Owusu-Agyeman Y., Larbi-Siaw O., Brenya B., Anyidoho A. (2020). *An embedded fuzzy analytic hierarchy process for evaluating lecturers' conceptions of teaching and learning. Stud. Educ. Eval. 2020;55:46–57.*

162. Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know. New York: Newbury House Publishers.*

163. Palden, R., (2020). *Learning Analytics: drivers, developments and challenges.. International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning (IJTEL), Volume 4, pp. 304-317.*

164. Pashler, H., McDaniel, Rohrer, D. & Bjork, R. (2009). *Learning styles: Concepts and evidence. Psychological Science in the Public Interest (Wiley-Blackwell), 9(3), 105-119. doi:10.1111/j.1539-6053.2009.01038.x.*

165. Pastor C.K.L. (2020). *Sentiment analysis on synchronous online delivery of instruction due to extreme community quarantine in the Philippines caused by Covid-19 pandemic. Asian J. Multi. Stud. 2020;3(1):1–6.*

166. Patton, M. (2005). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.*

167. Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.*

168. Pearson, L., & Quinn, J. (1986). *Bury Infant Check. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.* 110

169. Pedrosa de Jesus, H., Almeida, P., Teixeira-Dias, J., & Watts, M. (2007). *Where learners' questions meet modes of teaching: A study of cases. Research in Education. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.*

170. Peters, K. (2008). *Know your audience: An assessment of preferred learning styles of freshman students at Red River High School in Grand Forks, North Dakota. Ed.D. dissertation, The University of North Dakota, United States -- North Dakota. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3353639).*

171. Peterson D.J. (2019). *The flipped classroom improves student achievement and course satisfaction in a statistics course: a quasi-experimental study. Teach. Psychol. 2016;43(1):10–15.*

172. Peterson, M., & Beloin, K. S. (2021). *Teaching the inclusive teacher: Restructuring the mainstreaming course in teacher education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 21, 306-318.*

173. Petress, K. (2008). *What is meant by "active learning?". Education, 128(4), 566-569. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database. Piney Mountain*

174. Petrie, C. (2020). *Spotlight: Quality education for all during COVID-19 crisis (hundrED Research Report #01). United Nations. https://hundred.org/en/collections/quality-education-for-all-during-coronavirus*

175. Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child. (M. Cook, Trans.). New York: Basic Books.*

176. Pienta, E., (2016). *Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), pp. 33-40.*

177. Piney Mountain Press, I., Babich, A., & Randol, P. (1998). *Multimedia Learning Styles. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.*

178. Press, I. (1988). *Learning Styles Inventory [Piney Mountain Press, Inc.]. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.*

179. Pugach, M. C., & Johnson, L. J. (1995). *Collaborative practitioners: Collaborative schools. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.*

180. Randolph, J. J. (2008). *Online kappa calculator. Retrieved August 5, 2011, from http://justus.randolph.name/kappa*

181. Rau M.A., Kennedy K., Oxtoby L., Bollom M., Moore J.W. *Unpacking "active learning": a combination of flipped classroom and collaboration support is more effective but collaboration support alone is not. J. Chem. Educ. 2017:1406–1414.*

182. Reiff, H. B., Evans, E. D., & Cass, M. (2021). *Special education requirements for general education certification: A national survey of current practices. Remedial and Special Education, 12(5), 56-60. doi: 10.1177/074193259101200508*

183. Reiff, J.C. (1992). *Learning styles: What research says to the teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.*

184. Renzulli, J., Rizza, M., & Smith, L. (1978). *Learning Styles Inventory, Version III. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.*

185. Rheinberg, F. (2000): *Motivation. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln: Kohlhammer. Schräder-Naef, R. (2002): Lerntraining in der Schule. Voraussetzungen – Erfahrungen – Beispiele. Learner Training in school. Condition – Experience – Examples. Weinheim: Beltz.*

186. Ripoll V., Godino-Ojer M., Calzada J. (2021). *Teaching Chemical Engineering to Biotechnology students in the time of COVID-19: assessment of the adaptation to digitalization. Educ. Chem. Eng. 2021;34:94–105.*

187. Roberts, R., & Mather, N. (2020). *Learning disabilities: A field in danger of extension. Learning Disabilities: Research and Practice, 9, 49-58.*

188. Romanelli, F., Bird, E., & Ryan, M. (2009). *Learning styles: A review of theory, application, and best practices. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 73(1), 1-5. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048* 111

----

189. Rosenberg, M., Westling, D., &McLeskey, J. (2019). Special education for today's teachers. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

190. Rosenfeld, M., & Rosenfeld, S. (2008). Developing effective teacher beliefs about learners: The role of sensitizing teachers to individual learning differences. Educational Psychology, 28(3), 245-272. doi:10.1080/01443410701528436

191. Rudestam, K. E. & Newton, R. R. (2001). Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide of content and process. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

192. Salvia, J., & Munson, S. (2019). Attitudes of regular education teachers toward mainstreaming mildly handicapped students. In C.J. Meisel (Ed.), Mainstreaming handicapped children: Outcomes, controversies, and new directions, 111-128. Hills-dale, NJ: Eribaum.

193. Sapon-Shevin, M. (2019) Building a safe community for learning. In Ayers, W. (Ed.), To become a teacher: Making a difference in children's lives. NY: Teachers College Press, 1995, 99-112.

194. Scanlon, D., Deshler, D., &Schumaker, J. (2020). Can a strategy be taught and learned in secondary inclusive classrooms? Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 11 (1), 41-57.

195. Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., and LeCompte, M. D. (1999). Essential Ethnographic Methods. In J.J. Schensul and M.D. LeCompte, Eds. The Ethnographer's Toolkit. Baltimore, MD: Altamira Press of Rowan and Littlefield.

196. Schiefele, U. and Streblow, L. (2006): Motivation aktivieren. Activating Motivation. In: Mandl, H.; Friedrich, H.F. (eds.): Handbuch Lernstrategien. Handbook of Learning Strategies. Göttingen: Hogrefe.   Pressley, M.;

197. Schmeck, R., & Geisler B. E. (1977). Inventory of Learning Processes--R. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

198. Schmidt, R. J., Rozendal, M. S., & Greenman, G. G. (2002). Reading instruction in the inclusion classroom: Research-based practices. Remedial and Special Education, 23 (3), 130-140. doi: 10.1177/07419325020230030101

199. Schultz D., Duffield S., Rasmussen S.C., Wageman J. Effects of the flipped classroom model on student performance for advanced placement high school chemistry students. J. Chem. Educ. 2014;91(9):1334–1339.

200. Schumacker, R. E. & Akers, A. (2001). Understanding statistical concepts using S-plus. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

201. Schwandt, T. A. (2001). Dictionary of qualitative inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

202. Scott, B. J., Vitale, M. R., &Masten, W. G. (1998). Implementing instructional adaptations for students with mild disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Remedial and Special Education, 19, 106-119.

203. Scott, C. (2010). The enduring appeal of 'learning styles'. Australian Journal of Education, 54(1), 5-17. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

204. Seery M.K. Flipped learning in higher education chemistry: emerging trends and potential directions. Chem. Educ. Res. Pract. 2015;16(4):758–768.

205. Seery M.K. Harnessing technology in chemistry education. New Dir. Teach. Phys. Sci. 2013;9:77–86.

206. Seery M.K., Donnelly R. The implementation of pre-lecture resources to reduce in-class cognitive load: a case study for higher education chemistry. Br. J. Educ. Technol. 2012;43(4):667–677.

207. Seidman, I. (1998). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences. New York: Teachers College Press

208. Semmel, M. I., Abernathy, T. V., Butera, G., &Lesar, S. (2019). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. Exceptional Children, 58(1), 9-23. doi: 199124403306001

209. Sharp, J., Bowker, R., & Byrne, J. (2008). VAK or VAK-uous? Towards the trivialisation of learning and the death of scholarship. Research Papers in Education, 23(3), 293-314. doi:10.1080/02671520701755416.

210. Silver, H., & Hanson, J. (1980). Learning Styles and Strategies. Retrieved from Mental Measurements Yearbook database.

211. Silverman, F. (2006). Learning styles. District Administration, 42(9), 70-71. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

212. Sintema, H., (2020). Are universities collecting too much information on staff and students?. The Guardian, 5 August.

213. South Carolina State Department of Education. (2010). Technical Documentation for the 2009 Palmetto Assessment of State Standards of Writing, English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies [Draft].

214. South Carolina State Department of Education. (2011). Palmetto assessment of state standards (PASS): Grades 3 – 8. Retrieved from http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Assessment/PASS.html Sprenger, M. (2003). Differentiation through learning styles and memory. New York: 112 Corwin Press, Inc.

215. SPSS, Inc. (2008). SPSS student version 16.0. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.

216. Stanovich, K. E. (2000). Progress in understanding reading. New York: Guilford Press.

217. Sternberg, R., Grigorenko, E., & Zhang, L. (2008, November). Styles of learning and thinking matter in instruction and assessment. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3(6), 486-506. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00095.x

----

218. Subedi, S., Nayaju, S., Subedi, S., Shah, S. K., Shah, J. M. (2020). Impact of e-learning during COVID-19 pandemic among nurshing students and teachers of Nepal. International Journal of Science and Healthcare Research, 5(3), 9.

219. Swanson, H. L. (2019). Instructional components that predict treatment outcomes for students with learning disabilities: Support for a combined strategy and direct instruction model. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 14 (3), 129-140. doi: 10.1207/sldrp1403_1

220. Tomlinson, C. A. (2004). Differentiation in diverse settings. School Administrator, 61(7), 28-31. Retrieved from Wilson OmniFile database.

221. Tomlinson, C. A. (2005b). Quality curriculum and instruction for highly able students. Theory Into Practice, 44(2), 160-166. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4402_10

222. Tomlinson, C. A. (2007). Learning to love assessment. Educational Leadership, 65(4), 8-13. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

223. Tough, Joan (1977): Development of Meaning: Study of Children's Use of Language. Education Books Series. UK: HarperCollins Publishers. Wegner, C. and Minnaert, L. (2012): Promoting Future Scientists: The Project Kolumbus-Kids. Education in Science, 249, 20.

224. Trochta, C. S. (2008). Learning differences or learning disorders? Meeting authentic needs of the three-to-six child. NAMTA Journal, 33(2), 42-54. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

225. Tseng, J.C.R., Chu, H., Hwang, G., & Tsai, C. (2008). Development of an adaptive learning system with two sources of personalization information. Computers & Education, 51, 776-786.

226. Udvari-Solner, A., & Thousand, J. S. (1996). Creating a responsive curriculum for inclusive schools. Remedial and Special Education, 17, 182-192. doi: 10.1177/07419325960170030

227. United Nations . (2020). Policy brief: Education during COVID-19 and beyond. United Nations. https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/08/sg_policy_brief_covid-19_and_education_august_2020.pdf

228. UST Student Handbook . 2018. UST Student Handbook. Accessed at http://www.ust.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/UST-Student-Handbook-2018-final-copy.pdf;dateaccessed January 06, 2021.

229. Utely, C., Mortweet, S., Greenwood, C. (1997). Peer-mediated instruction and interventions. Focus on Exceptional Children, 29, 1-23. Vallecorsa, A. L., deBettencourt, L. U., &Zigmond, N. (2000). Organizing and managing instruction for students with disabilities in the mainstream. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

230. Vaughn, S., & Schumm, J. S. (2019). Meaningful professional development in accommodating students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 16, 344-353.

231. Wallen, N. E. & Fraenkel, J. R. (2000). Educational research: A guide to the process. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

232. Walton, G., & Spencer, S. (2009). Latent ability: Grades and test scores systematically underestimate the intellectual ability of negatively stereotyped students. Psychological Science (Wiley-Blackwell), 20(9), 1132-1139. doi:10.1111/j.1467- 9280.2009.02417.x. 113

233. Weinstein, C.E. and Mayer, R.W. (1986): "The Teaching of Learning Strategies". In: M. Wittrock (eds.): Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Macmillan. 315-327.

234. Williamson, M. F., & Watson, R. L. (2007). Learning styles research: Understanding how teaching should be impacted by the way learners learn: Part III: Understanding how learners' personality styles impact learning. Christian Education Journal, 4(1). 62-77. Retrieved from Academic OneFile via Gale: http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/itx/start.do?prodId=AONE

235. Willingham, D. T. (2005). Ask the cognitive scientist: Do visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners need visual, auditory, and kinesthetic instruction? American Educator, 29(2). Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pubsreports/american_educator/issues/summer2005/cogsci.ht m Winger, T. (2005). Grading to communicate. Educational Leadership, 63(3), 61-65. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

236. Wolcott, J. (2008). Influential qualitative research. Sage Publication. https://qualpage.com/2017/06/06/influential-qualitati-researchers-harry-f-wolcott/

237. Woolfolk, A. (2001). Educational psychology. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon. Yell, M. L. (2006). The law and special education. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. York, J., Doyle, M. B., &Kronberg, R. (1992). A curricular development process for inclusive classrooms. Focus on Exceptional Children, 25(4), 1-16.

238. Wormeli. R. (2005). Busting myths about differentiated instruction. Principal Leadership (Middle School Ed.) 5(7), 28-33. Retrieved from Wilson OmniFile database. Young, R. (2002). Experiential learning = hands-on + minds-on. Marketing Education Review, 12(1), 43-51. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

239. Zapalska, A., & Dabb, H. (2002). Learning styles. Journal of Teaching in International Business, 13(3/4), 77-97. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.