

CO-TEACHING WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS:
English and Swedish teachers' experiences and perceptions

Master's thesis

Iida Kalmari

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Language and Communication Studies

English and Swedish

May 2020

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos
Tekijä – Author Iida Kalmari	
Työn nimi – Title CO-TEACHING WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS: English and Swedish teachers' experiences and perceptions	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti ja ruotsi	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Toukokuu 2020	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 99 + 2 liitettä
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Samanaikaisopetuksessa vähintään kaksi opettajaa opettaa yhdessä samassa luokkahuoneessa. Tässä pro gradu -tutkielmassa tutkin englannin ja ruotsin opettajien kokemuksia ja käsityksiä samanaikaisopetuksesta erityisopettajan kanssa. Samanaikaisopetus on lisääntynyt kouluissa muun muassa siksi, että sitä käytetään inklusion haasteisiin vastaamisessa. Tähän asti samanaikaisopetusta on tutkittu lähinnä erityisopettajien ja luokanopettajien näkökulmasta. Kieltenopettajien käsitysten tutkimus on ollut selvästi vähäisempää.</p> <p>Koska kieltenopettajien yleisin samanaikaisopetuspari on erityisopettaja, tutkimuksen osallistujiksi valittiin kahdeksan englannin ja ruotsin opettajaa, joilla oli kokemusta samanaikaisopetuksesta erityisopettajan kanssa. Tutkimuksen tavoitteena oli kartoittaa osallistujien kokemuksia ja käsityksiä samanaikaisopetuksesta. Tutkimus suoritettiin haastattelujen avulla, joista viisi tehtiin kasvotusten ja kolme puhelinhaastatteluna. Aineisto analysoitiin pääosin laadullisesti sisällönanalyysiä käyttäen.</p> <p>Sekä osallistuneiden opettajien koulujen että opettajien itsensä asenteet samanaikaisopetusta kohtaan olivat valtaosin positiivisia. Suurin ongelma samanaikaisopetuksen toteuttamisessa oli erityisopettajien vähäisyys ja siitä johtuva kiireisyys sekä yhteisen suunnitteluajan puute. Yleisimmin käytetty samanaikaisopetusmetodi oli se, että kieltenopettaja opetti luokan edessä ja erityisopettaja kierteli auttamassa. Tähän toimintatapaan päädyttiin siksi, että se oli helpointa kieltenopettajan jouduttua suunnittelemaan tunnit yksin. Opettajien auktoriteetti luokassa nähtiin kuitenkin tasa-arvoisena. Kieltenopettajien kokemukset samanaikaisopetussuhteesta erityisopettajien kanssa olivat pääosin positiivisia ja he kokivat samanaikaisopetuksen sopivan hyvin kieltenopetukseen. He kokivat samanaikaisopetuksen tarjoavan ylimääräistä tukea sekä opettajille että oppilaille. Kieltenopettajat toivoivat erityisopettajilta kuitenkin vieläkin aktiivisempaa roolia luokkahuoneessa ja oppituntien suunnittelussa. Osallistujat eivät olleet saaneet juuri ollenkaan koulutusta samanaikaisopetukseen.</p> <p>Osallistujien positiiviset kokemukset voisivat innostaa yhä useampia kieltenopettajia kokeilemaan samanaikaisopetusta. Tulosten perusteella samanaikaisopetukseen tulisi kiinnittää huomiota opettajankoulutuksessa ja siihen tulisi luoda paremmat olosuhteet kouluissa, joissa sitä käytetään. Jatkotutkimusta aiheesta voitaisiin tehdä esimerkiksi vaihtamalla tutkimusmetodiksi kyselylomake tai suurentamalla haastateltavien määrää. Myös muiden kielten kuin englannin ja ruotsin opettajien käsityksiä voitaisiin tutkia tulevaisuudessa.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords co-teaching, language teaching, English and Swedish teachers, special education teachers, perceptions	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
2 BACKGROUND.....	4
2.1 Reason for co-teaching.....	4
2.2 Current situation in comprehensive education.....	6
2.3 Definition of co-teaching	8
2.4 Benefits and disadvantages of co-teaching.....	10
2.5 Co-teaching models	12
2.6 Successful co-teaching and co-teaching relationship.....	18
2.7 Previous studies on teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching	24
3 THE PRESENT STUDY	35
3.1 Aims of the study.....	35
3.2 Participants	36
3.3 Background information about the participants' situation	37
3.4 Ethics of the study	39
3.5 Collecting the data through interviews	40
3.6 Analyzing the data through content analysis	42
4 RESULTS	47
4.1 The participants' experiences on co-teaching.....	47
4.1.1 Co-teaching conditions in schools.....	48
4.1.2 Teachers' roles in co-teaching and methods for grouping of the students	50
4.1.3 Co-teaching relationships	57
4.2. The participants' perceptions on co-teaching.....	64
4.2.1 Co-teaching as a supporter of teachers and students.....	64
4.2.2 Co-teaching as an answer to the challenges of inclusion.....	65
4.2.3 Co-teaching in languages.....	68
4.2.4 Perceptions on effective co-teaching and suggestions for improvements	71
4.2.5 Changes in the language teachers' perceptions and co-teaching conducted.....	80
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	84
5.1 Summary and conclusions of the results.....	85
5.2 Evaluation of the study and suggestions for the future	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	93
APPENDIX 1: Privacy notice and consent form	100
APPENDIX 2: Interview questions.....	103

1 INTRODUCTION

The topic of this study is English and Swedish teacher's experiences and perceptions on co-teaching with special education teachers. *Co-teaching* happens when two or more teachers teach in a same classroom together (Friend and Cook 1996: 44). I chose to study this topic because I am interested in co-teaching and other collaboration that teachers do together. Co-teaching has, lately, become more popular as it is used in schools in trying to answer to the challenges of inclusion and the heterogenous groups that it causes (Friend and Cook 1996: 44). Co-teaching is a somewhat researched topic but most of the research has been conducted from special education and primary school teachers' point of view. Research on language teachers' perceptions on co-teaching with a special education teacher is scarce. More information on the topic is needed so that the situation in schools could be made as optimal for the teachers as possible and, for example, the need for changes in teacher education could be surveyed. I chose, specifically, co-teaching conducted by a language teacher and a special education teacher because it is, likely, language teachers' most common manner of co-teaching and, hence, I thought it would be easiest to find interviewees who have experience of that.

Co-teaching was a method regularly used by only under half of the teachers in Finland ten years ago. Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015: 5) surveyed frequency of co-teaching in Central Finland on spring of 2010. According to the results, co-operation between a general education teacher and a paraprofessional was common, but co-teaching between two qualified teachers was scarce. Out of subject teachers (n=73) who are the target group of this study only 3% taught almost daily or every week with a special education teacher. Co-teaching with another subject teacher was scarce, too, but teaching with a paraprofessional was slightly more common as 38% taught with one at least once a week. 15% of special education teachers (n=27) told that they teach at least weekly with a subject teacher. Saloviita and Takala (2010) studied subject teachers (n=74) working in basic education or upper secondary school (*lukio*) in Helsinki on 2009. 16% of them co-taught every week and 43% of the subject teachers co-taught sometimes. 89% of the times the subject teachers' co-teaching partner was a special

education teacher. Co-teaching is likely slightly more common nowadays, but increased research and knowledge could encourage even more language teachers to try it.

In the next chapter, I will give more background information on the topic of this study and present different definitions of co-teaching. I will, also, go through benefits and disadvantages of co-teaching, present different models through which co-teaching can be conducted and tell what successful co-teaching and co-teaching relationship are like. Lastly, in chapter 2, I will summarize findings of the previous studies on the topic. In chapter 3, the aims, the research questions and the data collection and analysis methods of this study will be presented. Background information on the participants will be given and the ethics of this study will be discussed. Chapter 4 presents the results of this study. In chapter 5, I summarize the results and analyze them further. The results will, also, be compared to the previous research. Lastly, I will evaluate this study and its significance as well as give suggestions for further research.

2 BACKGROUND

In this chapter, I will, firstly, present reasons for co-teaching, its history and how the situation is today. Secondly, I will review definitions for co-teaching and what the benefits and disadvantages of it are. Thirdly, I will present different models of co-teaching and discuss what is required for co-teaching to be successful. Finally, at the end of this chapter, I will summarise some previous research on teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching. There is quite little literature and research specifically on co-teaching in language teaching, so most of the information will be more general, but it is, of course, relevant in language teaching context, too.

2.1 Reason for co-teaching

The primary reason for co-teaching is fulfilling the needs of students at all skill levels (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 10). The goal is to provide suitable instruction for all students and help special education students to socialize with general education students. Co-teaching benefits all the students as they receive more attention. (Friend and Cook 1996: 46-47.) Another goal of co-teaching is to reduce the times when special

education students need to leave the general education classroom and, thus, implement inclusion (Friend and Cook 2004: 7). This, in many cases, reduces the stigma that special education students have (Friend and Cook 1996: 47). According to Ukkola (2016: 116), some students do not learn successfully in general education classrooms because the teaching is directed towards more successful students, but through co-teaching this problem can be solved without having separate classrooms. Saloviita (2016: 168) claims that co-teaching is necessary when implementing inclusion. Not surprisingly, one more reason to co-teaching is to make teachers' job easier (Friend and Cook 2004: 7).

Co-teaching has its roots in 1950's United States where lack of teachers led to *team teaching* in which multiple groups of students were gathered to one large group and taught by multiple teachers. In 1990's, also, other forms of teachers' co-operation were established, and it was noticed that co-teaching, as the new teaching method was called, suited especially general education teacher and special education teachers' co-operation. In Finland, co-teaching is called *samanaikaisopetus* or *yhteisopetus* and teachers started to use it in 1970's to better face the challenges of inclusion. (Saloviita 2016: 7-9.)

One of the main reasons to the increasing popularity of co-teaching is inclusion. According to Unesco's Salamanca's declaration from 1994, *inclusion* means that every child, even disabled, should be able to study in a regular classroom so that the school adapts to their needs (Saloviita 2016: 168). Inclusion is based on valuing equality and actualising human rights (Naukkarinen, Saloviita and Murto 2001: 199). For example, in Italy, it was legislated, already, in 1970's that all students have a right to attend general education classrooms. There are many sections in Finnish law that emphasize even disabled children's right to study with general education students. (Saloviita 2008: 13-14.) It is stated in the Basic Education Act (628/1998) that teaching needs to promote equality in the society and that teaching has to be provided in a manner that is suitable for pupils' age and abilities. Special education should be arranged considering pupils' best interest, which in some situations means that the teaching needs to happen in a general education classroom. Finnish basic education curriculum

2014 states that teaching should be arranged, primarily, in a general education classroom.

However, for inclusion to be successful, it is not enough that the students are situated in the general education classrooms, but there should, in addition, be adequate support and arrangements conducted to help them learn better than when they are segregated (Stainback and Stainback 1996: 4). As not all teachers are, initially, supporters of inclusion, it is important that there is education available explaining the rationale and research behind it as well as options offered to help teachers to survive in inclusive classrooms (Murawski 2010: 13). Co-teaching is one of the methods used to ensure the best possible learning environment for all students in the inclusive classrooms (Friend and Cook 1996: 44). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (1999: 49-51) states, that in many countries, full inclusion has been proved beneficial but that there are, however, some conditions in which it might not be the most advantageous procedure. For example, if a student presents danger to other students by being violent, it might be justifiable to segregate him or her. Another possible reason not to have, at least, all of the lessons in the same classroom is, for instance, if a special education student wants more support from peers who have similar problems and he or she does not have such peers in the general education group.

2.2 Current situation in comprehensive education

Finnish basic education curriculum 2014 states that learning happens in interaction and co-operation, which means that co-teaching suits curriculum's requirements excellently. Curriculum states, as well, that in English and Swedish classes pupils should feel a sense of community and they should be able to learn together, so co-teaching suits these subjects well. Nowadays, employers value collaboration and communication skills over many other skills and that trend is visible in school environment, too, for example, due to more diverse groups of students (Conderman et al. 2009: 24 and Murawski 2010: 49.) That is why Murawski (2010: 49) wonders how it is possible that many teachers try and even manage to avoid co-teaching. Previously, Finnish state gave money to municipalities for each student that was transferred to

special education classrooms, but now the law has been altered so that segregating students is not rewarded anymore. Simultaneously, new solutions for providing education for heterogenous groups of students began to be promoted, one of which was co-teaching. (Saloviita 2016: 10.)

Special education strategy 2007 mentions two possible reasons for co-teaching. One of them is to conduct part-time special education and the other is to consider it as one of many manners to support full-time special education students. Special education has three support levels in Finnish basic education curriculum 2014: general, intensified and special support. General support is available for all the students without any additional decisions. Possible manners to implement general support are, for example, remedial instruction and part-time special education. A student for whom general support is not enough is entitled to intensified support. Intensified support is firmer and more regular than general support. Special support is provided for such students whose learning cannot be ensured otherwise and it is concluded that they will not reach the requirements of the curriculum without it. Special support can include, for instance, adjusting the syllabus more suitable for a student's skills in some subjects. (Finnish basic education curriculum 2014: 62-70.) Teachers are expected to co-operate on each support level, and differentiation, changing study groups as well as co-teaching are means through which problems in learning can be prevented even before they occur. Co-teaching can, also, help with fulfilling one of the curriculum's principles which is arranging possibility to study close to home for all students. The support system is easier to implement on each of its levels when co-teaching is used. (Pulkkinen, Ahtiainen and Malinen 2017: 28-29.)

Administrators have a significant role in how successful co-teaching is in a school. In this paper, the term *administrators* refers to people who make decisions on how the teaching is conducted in schools, mostly principals. According to Friend and Cook (2004: 32), when arranging co-teaching the administrators should prefer students' needs above teachers' desires. Beninghof (2012: 148) states that administrators should hire teachers who are committed to implement inclusion. In most schools, it is not realistic that co-teaching would be the only method used in order to implement

inclusion, but the variety of means should be more versatile (Friend and Cook 2004: 10).

Co-teaching is not very often a part of general education teachers' training. On the contrary, it is a more prominent part of special education teachers' education, but they might be more skilled in one-on-one teaching than teaching in a general education classroom. (Murawski 2012: 43-44.) Often, co-teachers have not received adequate training for co-teaching, so they need to learn while teaching. This is the most common among teachers who have started working many years ago. (Conderman et al. 2009: 1, 19.) To fix the situation, different workshops and consultants are used by administrators to educate teaching staff about co-teaching (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 46-47). The situation seems to be quite similar in Finland as, for instance, in University of Jyväskylä's teacher education, co-teaching is not mentioned in subject teacher's course descriptions but co-operation with other teachers is mentioned in special education teacher students' courses. Special education teachers' education, also, emphasizes more the skills required when teaching students with special needs. (Jyväskylän yliopisto: Kasvatustieteen ja psykologian tiedekunnan erilliset opintokokonaisuudet 01.08.2017-31.07.2020.)

2.3 Definition of co-teaching

Co-teaching has been defined in various manners according to who are the ones conducting it and in what kind of environment it happens. The most commonly used and one of the strictest definitions for *co-teaching* is Friend and Cook's (1996: 44): "Co-teaching occurs when two or more professionals jointly deliver substantive instruction to diverse, blended group of students in a single physical space." Conderman, Pedersen and Bresnahan (2009: 2-3) use this same definition, too, and they, furthermore, clarify the matter similarly to Friend and Cook (1996: 45-46) by stating what co-teaching is not. According to them, two or more professionals teaching together means that working with, for example, a paraprofessional is not co-teaching. They add that co-teaching does not happen if the teachers act similarly to how they would if they were alone in the classroom. Ahtiainen et al. (2011: 22) concur with them stating that the full potential of two teachers working together should be utilised.

Lastly, according to Friend and Cook (1996: 46) and Conderman et al. (2009: 3), teaching a homogenous group or separating certain students to another classroom does not count as co-teaching.

Some definitions do not include a requirement for the environment in which co-teaching occurs. Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015: 5) and Saloviita (2016: 7) define co-teaching so that at least two teachers share the responsibilities that have traditionally belonged to only one teacher. In their definition, the teachers can have the same or different job titles. Ahtiainen et al. (2011: 17-18) have similar definition with them and they clarify that the reason to defining co-teaching is to separate it from other collaborative planning that teachers do with each other without teaching the content together in the same classroom. In contrast to them, according to Murawski (2010: 25-27) and Malinen and Palmu (2017: 10), co-teaching happens when two professionals co-plan, co-instruct and co-assess and teach heterogenous groups in the same physical space. Villa, Thousand and Nevin (2007: 5) have the broadest definition as they count even a general education teacher working with a paraprofessional as co-teaching. Malinen and Palmu (2017: 10) notify that the definitions for co-teaching may differ between Finnish and international literature. They remark that, in Finland, the term co-teaching can refer to collaboration between a general education teacher and a special education teacher or two general education teachers working together whereas internationally co-teaching usually means co-operation of a general education teacher and a special education teacher.

As I am going to study English and Swedish teachers' perceptions on co-teaching with special education teachers, the most suitable definition for co-teaching in my study is Wilson and Blednick's (2011: 6) definition. They state that co-teaching is precisely collaboration of a general education teacher and a special education teacher. They continue by saying that the goal of this kind of co-teaching is to provide good conditions for learning for heterogenous groups of students that include, among others, students with learning disabilities. Wilson and Blednick (2011: 6) emphasize that co-teaching is not collaboration of two general education teachers or adding a paraprofessional to the classroom. Friend and Cook's (1996: 45) definition is close to

Wilson and Blednick's but they accept, also, other professionals such as a speech therapists as possible partners for a general education teacher. All the sources that I will be referring to in this paper do not follow this chosen definition of co-teaching but that has a very minimal effect on the content of these sources when it comes to relevancy.

In this paper, I will study language teachers' *perceptions* on co-teaching. According to Cambridge Business English Dictionary, perception is "the way that someone thinks and feels about a company, product, service, etc.". People's perceptions about something like co-teaching can be shaped, for example, by their experiences or what they have read or heard about a topic.

2.4 Benefits and disadvantages of co-teaching

Co-teaching has many benefits for students as well as for teachers. Wilson and Blednick (2011: 11) list benefits associated with co-teaching. Their list includes that all students are provided with varying group sizes and methods that suit many kinds of needs. Furthermore, special education students may participate more actively when there are more adults in the classroom, and they might not have such stigma that they could have if they studied in a separate room. They, also, suggest that the expectations towards the special education students are higher in co-taught classrooms. When the teachers work together in the classroom, they give students an example of co-operation (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 7). Special education students will interact more with their peers in co-taught classrooms (Malinen and Palmu 2017: 11). Co-operation and participating in, for example, oral tasks are fundamental parts of language learning, which is why co-teaching seems to suit language teaching well.

As stated above, co-teaching enables teachers to experiment with teaching more than when working alone (Conderman et al. 2009: 2). Co-teaching gives teachers a sense of community and having two teachers in the same classroom enables teachers to use tasks in which the students need much assistance (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 7, 33). When co-teaching, teachers have a chance to learn from their colleagues (Villa et al. 2007: 6 and Conderman et al. 2009: 4). In addition, they can receive support from each other, which can be helpful with managing work-related stress (Malinen and

Palmu 2017: 11). An ability to observe another teacher's teaching can be very helpful even after teacher education, as a part of teachers' behaviour in the classroom might be subconscious, hence, teachers do not tend to teach those aspects to each other (Rytivaara, Pulkkinen, Palmu and Kontinen 2017: 21-22). While co-teaching, the special education teacher will become more familiar with the curriculum and what students are expected from academically and behaviour-wise in general education (Friend and Cook 2004: 7). Some teachers believe that special education students learn better in general education classroom and that the combined groups will benefit, also, general education students, which is why they decide to co-teach (Conderman et al. 2009: 7). Teachers can better control students' behaviour when they are in the classroom together (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 35). In a best possible scenario, co-teaching can lighten the teachers' workload (Beninghof 2012: 33).

Despite the benefits, there are disadvantages associated with co-teaching, too. Co-teaching simply does not fulfil every student's needs, for example, students with attention concerns might have difficulties focusing in co-taught lessons (Conderman et al. 2009: 29). If the co-teaching is not successful, the good intentions will only lead to poor academic results and amplified stigma for the special education students (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 2). It might be problematic if the students are not properly informed about how the changes in teaching might affect their results (Conderman et al. 2009: 7). This might lead to damaged self-esteem (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 12).

Friend and Cook (1996: 51) claim that co-teaching can seem even threatening for potential co-teachers and Conderman et al. (2009: 24) assume that many teachers would, in fact, rather teach independently. Sometimes, co-teaching might even end friendships between co-teachers even though they had decided to begin co-teaching themselves (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 36). One of the difficulties that beginner co-teachers face is that some of them do not have any training for it and they do not understand what the goal of and reason for co-teaching is (Murawski 2010: 24). One other common problem that co-teachers face is the lack of common planning time and that the teachers might feel that they are not equal (Malinen and Palmu 2017: 11). Occasionally, the co-teachers are so different and have so distinct teaching

philosophies that they do not enjoy teaching with each other (Conderman et al. 2009: 10, 13, 16 and Murawski 2010: 30). Some teachers might not like giving up some of the control that they have when they work individually (Murawski 2010: 30). The teachers might struggle to adapt the teaching so that the special education students' needs will be fulfilled but the general education students will not be slowed down (Beninghof 2012: 147). Beginning to co-teach might be challenging and before the teachers get used to it, it might take more time than teaching alone (Saloviita 2016: 167). More benefits and disadvantages of co-teaching according to the previous research will be presented in the chapter 2.7.

2.5 Co-teaching models

Co-teaching models that I will be referring to in this study are Friend and Cook's (2004: 15-21) models which Conderman, Pedersen and Bresnahan (2009: 30) have commented on. There are other ways to categorise co-teaching models, too, but Friend and Cook's categorisation is the most comprehensive. These slightly different means to categorise the co-teaching models include, for instance, Pulkkinen and Rytivaara's (2015: 25-29) and Wilson and Blednick's (2011: 22-27) models. However, all of these are more or less compressed versions of this following Friend and Cook's categorisation that was first presented in 1990's. Later in this chapter, I will, also, present Beninghof's (2012: 144-145) co-teaching models that suit especially general and special education teachers' collaboration.

The first one of the Friend and Cook's (2004: 15-21) models is *one teach, one observe* in which one teacher teaches in front of the classroom and the other observes students' behaviour. This model is useful when the teachers do not have much time for planning, or they want to gather data about their students. The type of data that are gathered should be decided upon before the classes. If the teachers are more experienced, they can use this model, even, to observe each other's teaching. *One teach, one drift* is a sometimes useful but often over-used co-teaching model in which one teacher teaches and the other one focuses on circulating in the classroom and helps the students in need. This model can be used when one teacher is an expert in the field that is discussed or when the teachers do not yet know each other very well. Another reason

for using this model can be that the activities performed during the lesson are such in which the student's working needs to be carefully surveyed. The risk of this model is that the students will have trouble focusing their attention solely on the teacher they are supposed to on the particular moment. Similarly, to the first model, one teach, one drift can be easily chosen when there is not much common planning time. Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015: 26) comment on these models by saying that they are good when the teachers are new to co-teaching and that there is a good chance for differentiation when using them. They go on to state, though, that using these models should not lead to a situation in which the other teacher is stuck always drifting in the classroom and never receives an opportunity to teach in front of the classroom.

The rest of the Friend and Cook's (2004: 15-21) models require more planning than the first two. In *parallel teaching* teachers divide students into two equally sized groups and teach them simultaneously. This is helpful for the students as they receive more individual attention. Both groups are taught by using the same lesson plan. Sometimes teachers can choose to divide the groups strategically based on their needs. During *station teaching* there are multiple stations in the classroom and students rotate from one to another. The teachers are at their own stations and there can, also, be stations at which the students are required to work individually or in pairs without the teachers. Station teaching can be used, for example, when each station focuses on a different aspect of the same theme. In *alternative teaching* the teachers divide students so that there are a large group and a smaller group. The large group studies the lesson like it was originally planned while the smaller group has the same lesson taught more suitably for their level or an alternative lesson. This model can be useful when the students' level of mastery differs majorly and reaching a certain level is essential or some of the students have a different curriculum. It is important that the composition of the groups varies, and the teachers alternate teaching the groups. *Team teaching* happens when both teachers teach the group simultaneously. This model can be used, for instance, when it is beneficial that the teachers can have a discussion together while teaching. Other manners to execute team teaching are that while one teacher is talking the other is demonstrating an experiment or how to take notes. This model requires

the most expertise from the teachers, and they need to know each other very well. These co-teaching models are summarized in table 1.

Table 1. Friend and Cook's co-teaching models

Co-teaching model	Qualities
One teach, one observe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - one teacher teaches in front of the classroom while another observes at the back - useful when there has not been co-planning time or when teachers want to gather information about students
One teach, one drift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - one teacher teaches in front of the classroom while another circulates in the classroom helping students - useful when one teacher is an expert in something, or students' work needs to be carefully surveyed - is often used when there is not common planning time
Parallel teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teachers divide students to two equally sized groups and teach them same lesson - students can be grouped strategically
Station teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are multiple stations in a classroom and students rotate from one to another - teachers have their own stations and there can be stations without a teacher, too
Alternative teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - students are divided into a larger and a smaller group and they are taught the same lesson in different skill levels - useful when students' skill levels differ significantly
Team teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - both teachers teach simultaneously - teachers can have different roles - requires careful planning

Friend and Cook (2004: 14) give, also, advice on how to choose the best co-teaching model for each situation. Of course, the teachers should always work having student's best interests in mind, which means that if the students, for example, have trouble focusing on the tasks when the lessons include many transitions, they should be avoided. However, even though the focus should be on the students' preferences, the teachers can work more effectively together if they choose a model that suits their teaching styles and how they match. Undoubtedly, it is reasonable to consider the content that is to be taught, too. In addition, the physical space where the lessons are held affects the choice of the model, as well.

Beninghof (2012: 144-145) presents co-teaching models that are suitable specifically for general education teacher and special education teacher's collaboration. The *Duet Model* is similar to Friend and Cook's team teaching, which means that the teachers plan their teaching beforehand so that their simultaneous instruction works seamlessly. According to Beninghof, the problem with this model is that special education teachers often have several different groups and, hence, do not have enough time for planning the lessons with each general education teacher to be able to use this model well. The *Skill Groups Model* has some features from Friend and Cook's alternative and parallel teaching because the Skill Groups Model includes an opportunity to divide pupils into groups based on their skills, too. However, grouping is not the only possible manner to implement this model as the teachers can alternatively teach a lesson so that the instruction includes differentiation for various skill levels.

In the *Complementary Skills Model* (Beninghof 2012: 144), the teachers regularly check that they remember each student's learning goals and ensure that the teaching will lead to accomplishing those goals. The special education teacher's skills are very important when using this model and the changes that are made to the teaching can benefit general education students, too. In the *Speak and Add Model*, the special education teacher adds clarifications and repetitions to the general education teacher's teaching. Similarly, to Friend and Cook's team teaching, the special education teacher can support the general education teacher's teaching by, for instance, using visual aids. The *Learning Style Model* answers to many special education students' needs of hands-on tasks and kinesthetic experiences that are strengths of many special education teachers. Beninghof (2012: 144) states that to reach the best possible outcome the teachers should use a combination of all the models mentioned above. Her co-teaching models are summarized in table 2.

Table 2. Beninghof's co-teaching models

Co-teaching model	Qualities
Duet Model	- both teachers teach simultaneously
Skill Groups Model	- students can be divided into groups according to their skills - teachers can, also, include differentiated instruction into the whole group instruction
Complementary Skills Model	- teachers regularly check that each student is accomplishing their goals - special education teacher has a significant role
Speak and Add Model	- special education teacher adds clarifications and repetitions to general education teachers teaching - special education teacher can use, for example, visual aids
Learning Style Model	- hands-on tasks and kinesthetic experiences are used to help special education students - special education teacher has a significant role

All these abovementioned Friend and Cook's and Beninghof's co-teaching models seem to be suitable for language teaching. For example, one teach, one observe could be used if the special education teacher is not specialized in language teaching. Alternative teaching or the skill groups model could be used, not only, when some students have special needs, but also, when some students are very skilled in the language if they, for example, have two mother tongues or have lived abroad. Team teaching or duet model can be used, for instance, so that the teachers present dialogues in the taught language. The speak and add model could be implemented, for instance, so that the special education teacher translates the language teacher's speech to the special education students.

Conderman et al. (2009: 7-10) present three stages of co-teaching by Gately and Gately (2001) that are beginning, compromising and collaborating. The *beginning stage* is all about getting to know one's teaching partner. According to Conderman et al. (2009: 9), general education teachers might feel like the special education teacher has invaded their territory. In the beginning stage, it often happens that one of the teachers spends substantial amount of time in the back of the classroom. The teachers avoid conflicts and, hence, their dialog is polite. However, it is important that the teachers can

communicate, also, more difficult subjects honestly and empathetically so that they could advance to the next stage of co-teaching.

In the *compromising stage*, teachers take turns while teaching and they have somewhat developed their communication from the beginning stage. The general education teacher does not feel as territorial as before and the students see the special education teacher as more than just a helper, already, but the teachers' relationship is not as advanced as in the *collaborative stage*. In the collaborative stage, it seems like the teachers would be "thinking as one" (Conderman et al. 2009: 10). Both teachers feel comfortable and they enjoy co-teaching. The teachers feel accepted and an outsider could not tell which one of them is the special education teacher. When co-teaching partners are moving from one co-teaching stage to another, their relationship can include characteristics from more than one stage.

Villa et al. (2007: 149-152) divide the development of the co-teaching relationships into four stages. According to them, teachers' work is more effortless if they focus on certain communication skills in each stage. The first stage is the *forming stage* the goal is to form a complementary relationship. Important interpersonal skills in this stage are, for instance, capability to build trust and being able to decide on appropriate manners through which to communicate. The second stage is the *functioning stage* in which the co-teachers' goals are to decide how their co-teaching relationship is going to be and, for example, how they will divide the tasks between them. In this stage, communication and shared leadership skills are important. The third stage is the *formulating stage* which focuses more on the co-teaching itself and, therefore, problem solving skills and courage to try new teaching methods are valuable. The last stage is the *fermenting stage* in which the teacher's team cohesiveness can be at its best, but conflict management skills are, still, essential. According to Villa et al. (2007: 149-152), to reach the co-teaching relationship's full potential the teachers would be beneficial to, for example, understand that criticism on their teaching should not be taken personally and to have good conflict management skills.

2.6 Successful co-teaching and co-teaching relationship

Co-teaching is not successful if it is not conducted in an effective manner and if the co-teaching partners do not have a good relationship. A basis for successful co-teaching is that teachers and administrators recognize the importance of co-teaching when conducting inclusive curriculum and the teachers must be determined to fulfil the needs of all students (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 13-14). For the co-teaching to be successful students' differences should be accepted and the teachers need to realise that treating students fairly might mean that not everybody is treated similarly. When referring to the special education students, the teachers may not use degrading language as the students will adopt their attitude (Beninghof 2012: 18). Co-teaching does not happen if the same students are often taken to another room with the special education teacher and that will only lead to them being stigmatised (Murawski 2010: 33). The teachers should emphasize that for the best possible outcome every students' contribution counts (Beninghof 2012: 19-20).

Furthermore, co-teaching will be much more successful if the teachers share, at least, somewhat similar teaching philosophies (Friend and Cook 2004: 9 and Conderman et al. 2009: 13, 16). The teachers should, for instance, agree on what kind of behaviour they expect from their students and interfere with unwanted behaviour in a similar manner (Conderman et al. 2009: 26-27 and Palmu, Kontinen and Malinen (2017: 70). Conderman et al. (2009: 27) suggest that to reach the best outcome the teachers should emphasise to the students that they both agree on the rules and when one teacher implements them, the other should support him or her. So, for example, in language classes, language teachers need to accept that the special education teacher and special education students are in the same classroom with everybody else and be willing to collaborate with them.

It is, also, important that there is parity which means that both teachers feel that their contributions are valued (Villa et al. 2007: 6). Friend and Cook (2004: 26) and Beninghof (2012: 147-148) suggest some manners through which teachers can demonstrate to students that they are equal. They include, for instance, that both teachers write on the students' assignments, both participate in instruction and that they both work with all

the students. Murawski (2010: 32-33) claims that this kind of parity cannot happen between a general education teacher and a paraprofessional as paraprofessionals' job description often does not include planning of the lessons or assessing students. She states, also, that it is problematic if the paraprofessional who does not have adequate education has to help the students who struggle the most, and if the general education teacher makes all the decisions in the classroom by saying that he or she is the one who is the qualified teacher. According to Murawski (2010: 33), a general education teacher and a special education teacher can reach such a visible parity between them that the students can see it.

Especially, when students are somewhat older, they tend to question the authority and the expertise of the adults in the classroom if they do not seem to be equal with each other. For example, if a special education teacher does not have an equal role with a general education teacher, the students might not want to receive help from him or her but they, instead, wait for the general education teacher to come and help them. (Murawski 2010: 37). When co-teaching, both teachers should be accountable for all students' learning (Conderman et al. 2009: 4).

Co-teachers need to be committed to their relationship as well as respect and trust each other (Friend and Cook 2004: 9). They, also, need to be prepared to rely on that the partner does the tasks as well as one would have done oneself (Friend and Cook 1996: 51). The focus and the goal of the co-teaching relationship should be the students' best interests (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 43). Villa et al. (2007: 7) and Wilson and Blednick (2011: 45) note that the teachers need to realise that no-one can alone be responsible for a whole heterogeneous group of students and that they are dependent on each other's help. Beninghof (2012: 18) refers to Woodie Flowers' term *gracious professionalism* which entails determination, respect, high quality of work and valuing of others and states that teachers who have these qualities are the most likely to succeed at co-teaching.

Usually, teachers like to work with teachers who are like they are themselves, but if the co-teaching partners do not agree on everything, they have to be ready to modify their teaching habits so that working together is possible (Conderman et al. 2009: 10).

According to Friend and Cook (1996: 52), some beliefs that the co-teachers would be beneficial to agree on are, for example, all students' right and ability to learn and what the teachers' role is in that. Even though, the teachers should think somewhat similarly on the core aspects of teaching, teachers who have some differences in their philosophies can complement each other's teaching (Conderman et al. 2009: 26 and Beninghof 2012: 22). It is essential that the teachers communicate and share their thoughts with each other and not, for example, first tell issues that annoy them in their co-teaching partner to someone else (Murawski 2010: 41). To avoid misunderstandings, the teachers should know each other's communication styles, strengths and weaknesses (Conderman et al. 2009: 10).

Co-teachers might have very different life situations. They might, for example, have a substantial age gap which could affect their goals in teaching. However, very different people can make successful co-teaching partners if they just openly discuss teaching together. (Beninghof 2012: 21-22). Sometimes, the co-teachers might feel like they do not have enough time to talk about their preferences in teaching but omitting that part might lead to having to solve more problems in the future (Beninghof 2012: 22). As Beninghof (2012: 25) states, even though the teachers had a functioning co-teaching relationship, they should not quit having regular discussions about their collaboration. During these meetings, the co-teachers should monitor how successful their collaboration is and how well their students are learning (Villa et al. 2007: 8). Honesty is a crucial part of an effective co-teaching relationship even though especially beginner co-teachers might find it challenging to discuss their feelings (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 39). As stated above, language teachers and special education teachers' education differ from each other. This might lead to the teachers having different viewpoints and discussion is needed so that the teachers could be aware of the differences.

Even though the teachers would try their best, some problems might emerge between them. Villa et al. (2007: 154) note that one possible reason for conflicts occurring can be if people are afraid that their needs may become overlooked. They (2007: 155-158) give suggestions on how to avoid conflicts. According to them, the teachers should, for

example, ensure that they know each other's goals so that there are no hidden agendas. In addition, they should decide what kind of language they use so that both will understand, and they should keep their partner updated if he or she is not able to attend all meetings. Beninghof (2012: 27) suggests that the teachers should carefully consider when the best time to bring certain topics up is and be fully present when the conversation, then, takes place.

It is self-evident that there will be conflicts between the co-teaching partners as no collaborative relationship can be perfect when it lasts for a long time. Unfortunately, if the conflicts are not solved, they can affect students' performance. (Beninghof 2012: 25.) According to Beninghof (2012: 27), many teachers avoid talking about difficult topics with their partners. Villa et al. (2007: 153) state that covert conflicts need to be made overt and that they need to be solved or they might ruin a potentially effective co-teaching relationship. However, Conderman et al. (2009: 27) notify that not all the conflicts and disagreements need to be addressed. They note that one should consider why he or she wants to confront the other teacher and would the confrontation be beneficial for the co-teaching relationship and the students that the matter is addressed. Villa et al. (2007: 154) mention that it is not crucial to address conflicts that occur infrequently. Conderman et al. (2009: 27), further, state that if one decides to confront the other teacher, he or she should not do it when being angry and that the best manners to solve a conflict are through compromising and collaboration. Even though conflicts are, often, seen as a solely negative issue, Villa et al. (2007: 154) state that they can have value, too, if, for instance, the co-teaching relationship is strengthened through solving a conflict.

General and special education teachers have different starting points to teaching. General education teachers tend to be, for example, good at whole group instruction and they know the curriculum well whereas special education teachers are skilled at differentiation and diagnosing students' problems (Conderman et al. 2009: 4). General education teachers are familiar with the requirements at each grade level and they tend to teach the group in such a manner that majority of the students will learn. On the contrary, special education teachers are more focused on individual students.

(Murawski 2012: 43.) Special education teachers are experts at breaking tasks down to smaller parts and noticing possible difficulties that students might face and, of course, find fitting solutions for those problems (Beninghof 2012: 143). In language teaching context, this could mean that language teachers have better language skills than special education teachers who have not specialized in languages but they can, still, be useful in the classroom as they are more familiar with, for instance, dyslexia.

It is very important that the co-teachers plan their lessons together in addition to co-teaching, as co-planning helps the teachers, for example, to reach parity (Murawski 2010: 35). However, it might be challenging to find time for co-planning (Friend and Cook 2004: 27). If the teachers do not find enough time to co-plan, there is a risk that one of the teachers ends up, only, working as an assistant instead of being an equal teaching partner (Conderman et al. 2009: 25 and Palmu, Kontinen and Malinen 2017: 66-67). By planning together, the teachers are able to utilize both of their strengths as well as take differentiation into consideration, already, at the planning stage (Murawski 2010: 36). Co-planning is easier when the teachers know each other well and in addition to planning, it is, afterwards, fruitful to discuss how the teaching succeeded (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 17-18). When planning co-taught classes, it is important to take into consideration which teacher teaches each content and how the roles are, otherwise, distributed as well as how the students will be grouped (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 20-21). Even though co-planning might sound like a significant amount of work, teachers should notice that co-planning reduced individual planning time (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 24).

Co-teaching can be as successful as possible, only, when the environment in which it is arranged is suitable. For co-teaching to be effective, it needs to be supported by administrators through, for instance, thoughtfully selecting co-teaching partners, making schedule optimal for co-planning and providing training for the teachers (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 14). Wilson and Blednick (2011: 43) suggest that in some situations the administrators could support co-teachers by hiring a consultant who specializes in team building and co-teaching practises. In some schools, all special education students are put into the same group whereas in some other schools there

are special education students put into every single classroom. Both grouping manners are risky because the point of co-teaching is that the special education students have enough role models from general education but if they have been spread too widely, there will not be enough special education teachers for each classroom. (Friend and Cook 2004: 29 and Beninghof 2012: 148.) To avoid these situations, Wilson and Blednick (2011: 15) suggest that even bigger class sizes can be arguable. According to Wilson and Blednick (2011: 16) and Beninghof (2012: 148), only 30 percent of the students in a classroom should be special education students at a time. Sometimes the problem may not be the administrators' attitudes but the physical spaces that are offered as too small classrooms might make combining groups difficult (Saloviita 2016: 167). A solution to this could be, for example, to use, only, chairs and no desks when grouping the students (Wilson and Blednick 2011: 30).

There can be many different reasons why teachers start implementing co-teaching in their work. It is crucial that the teachers co-teach voluntarily (Friend and Cook 2004: 9). Often, the co-teaching of the teachers begins by directing some smaller project together, which, then, leads to them noticing that they could benefit from each other's expertise otherwise, too. Another reason for getting excited about co-teaching can be attending a co-teaching course with co-workers. (Villa et al. 2007: 6.) However, sometimes the initiative to co-teaching comes from the administration but even in these situations it should be made sure that the teachers co-teach voluntarily (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 11). Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015: 11) add that when the initiative comes from the administration, it is most likely that the co-teaching receives better support, which means that, for example, schedules are suitable for co-teaching and there is enough planning time.

Wilson and Blednick (2011: 36-28) list some possible reasons behind deciding to pair certain teachers with each other. In addition to two teachers voluntarily deciding to teach together, Wilson and Blednick mention that administrators might pair some teachers together if they think that they would be a good match, yet it should not be taken as self-evident, but the teaching partners should be supported. They continue that, sometimes, two teachers are paired just because it is convenient, for example,

because of the schedule or teachers' availability, but it does not mean that these kinds of pairs could not work. Wilson and Blednick state that, occasionally, an inexperienced teacher is paired with a more experienced co-worker so that the beginning teacher would receive advice from his or her co-teacher but even two beginning teachers can learn to teach together very successfully.

When a new co-teaching pair starts co-operation, they should not feel the pressure of being perfect immediately. It is, especially, important that the teachers discuss their roles and philosophies together. (Pulkkinen and Rytivaara 2015: 12-13.) The teachers should, also, have a conversation about how they are going to take the special education students into account during teaching (Conderman et al. 2009: 20). According to Conderman et al. (2009: 20), finding a common ground between the two teachers can be challenging. Thus, Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015: 12) mention that it might be helpful for the teachers to receive some form of training before beginning to co-teach.

In this chapter, I have presented many important factors that affect co-teaching. This information is helpful when trying to understand teachers' perceptions on co-teaching and acknowledge possible problems that they face. The information can be used when trying to improve the conditions of co-teaching. This previous knowledge was used as a base for the interview questions in this study, too. In addition to the already existing research, it would be important to study specifically language teachers' perceptions so that co-teaching in language classes could be made as effective as possible.

2.7 Previous studies on teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching

There are several previous studies conducted on co-teaching. In this chapter, I will focus on reviewing studies that have been conducted specifically on teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching which is the topic of this present study. Firstly, I will present studies conducted on teachers' overall perceptions towards co-teaching.

Strogilos, Stefanidis and Tragoulia (2016) researched Greek co-teachers' attitudes towards different aspects related to co-teaching. They aimed to identify the teachers' preferences on co-teaching and how they implied inclusion through planning and

teaching methods as well as modified the curriculum for special education students. 400 teachers answered a questionnaire and 10 of them were chosen to a follow-up interview. The teachers taught students from age 5 to 12 and there were both general and special education teachers among the participants.

The results of Strogilos et al.'s (2016) study indicated that the teachers tend to use less time to plan their co-teaching lessons and evaluate them than they feel they would need to. The participating teachers felt that they did not have enough time to plan together so they, only, talked about what the general education teacher would do with the general education students and what the special education teachers would do with the special education students. They did not have time to plan shared instruction. According to the participants, the most important task during planning time was to select appropriate teaching methods for special education students whereas, in their opinion, the most important task during evaluation time was to determine how well the special education students had reached their goals. Majority of the teachers preferred to use one teach, one drift model so that the general education teacher had the main responsibility of instruction. This happened even though they thought that team teaching is the most effective co-teaching model because they felt that the special education teacher was substantially more skilled with special education students than the general education teacher. The content was mostly modified for special education students rather than teaching them something else and they were, often, included in whole-class-activities. Both general and special education teachers felt that inclusion was beneficial for the special education students.

Austin (2001) studied teachers' beliefs about co-teaching. He had multiple research questions that sought answers for what the teachers' experiences with co-teaching were like, which co-teaching and preparation practices they found effective and what kind of support they wanted from administrators. Austin aimed to research, also, how the teachers thought their students felt, how the workload divided between general education teachers and special education teachers as well as what the answers for the survey could mean for teacher education. The participants were 139 teachers from northern New Jersey who taught from kindergarten to 12th grade. The data was

collected via questionnaire and in the second stage some teachers were randomly selected for a follow-up interview.

Austin's (2001) findings suggested that the special education teachers had more co-teaching than the general education teachers and that only 37 teachers had started co-teaching voluntarily. Most of the teachers felt that the general education teacher had more work in the co-taught classrooms. Experiences were mostly positive indicating that the co-operation was successful and beneficial. Both general education teachers and special education teachers felt that they had learned from each other. Results concerning the planning time were contradicting as the teachers said that they should plan daily but the ones that had tried daily planning themselves responded that it did not seem effective. The teachers, also, recognized the value of sharing, for example, instructional responsibilities in the classroom but, yet, did not actualize that in their work. Special education teachers considered practicing co-teaching in teacher education more important than general education teachers. The participants had conflicting opinions on the importance of provision of mutual planning time. The most effective co-teaching methods according to the teachers were co-operative learning and distributing students to smaller groups. Some teachers wanted more support from administrators, for example, in a form of common planning time. The teachers felt that co-teaching was beneficial for all the students, for example, because that reduces student-teacher ratio and more varied teaching methods. They experienced that co-teaching had made the students more tolerant but, also, that some special education students disrupted general education students' learning and that the benefit they received was more social than academic.

Next, research on teachers' perceptions on co-teaching conducted in Finland is presented. Ahtiainen, Beirad, Hautamäki, Hilasvuori and Thuneberg (2011) studied co-teaching in Finnish comprehensive schools in Helsinki and one part of the study was interviews of co-teachers. The teachers could talk about co-teaching quite freely and emphasize such themes that they found significant. According to the interviewees, the benefits of co-teaching included, for instance, the support that they received from their co-teaching partners and that they could utilize each other's strengths. Co-

planning was considered useful for teaching better lessons. The participants felt that co-teaching added variation to teaching and some said that it was simply motivating and more enjoyable than teaching alone. Some teachers said that co-teaching makes managing the students' behavior easier but not all of them agreed. The participants stated that in co-taught classrooms students receive more individual help and special education students do not have to leave general education classroom. In addition, when a special education teacher is in a general education classroom every student gets to know them and their teaching methods.

Ahtiainen et al.'s (2011) participants mentioned several downsides of co-teaching, too. One of the challenges was lack of co-planning time which might lead to the special education teacher only observing and assisting in the classroom, which was not seen as an optimal situation. Especially, subject teachers experienced that it was challenging to place their lessons to the schedule so that it would be possible to co-teach. Some of the teachers noted that if co-taught groups were too large, co-teaching did not save the situation but there were opposing opinions, too.

Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015) studied 26 teachers in central Finland in the autumn of 2010. The research was conducted through interviews and diaries. The participants worked as preschool, classroom, subject and special education teachers from preschool to 9th grade. The teachers felt that co-teaching improved the sense of community in the schools and the students seemed to feel safer when they knew more adults in the school. The teachers felt, also, that they received more ideas and could learn from each other as well as divide responsibility in the classroom. One reason to why the teachers decided to start co-teaching was that they thought that it would be a suitable manner to answer to the requirements of new special education laws.

According to the participants of the study of Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015), an important trait in a co-teaching partner is that he or she is interested in co-teaching but their opinions on if the co-teaching partners have to have similar personalities were divided. The teachers agreed more on that it is important that the co-teachers' teaching philosophies are similar. They stated that the teaching partner should be trustworthy and flexible. The participants mentioned that it is useful to find a common ground

before starting to co-teach and evaluate the lessons afterwards with the partner. As in many other studies, the factor that was seen as the most challenging was finding time to co-plan.

Rytivaara, Pulkkinen, Palmu and Kontinen (2017: 18-21) collected data on teachers' experiences on co-teaching from interviews conducted by Finnish National Board of Education on 2010-2011. Rytivaara et al. (2017: 19) state that teachers wished for more support and more individualized help for the students. They were mostly satisfied with co-teaching but some of them mentioned that if the teaching partner experiments too much with teaching, that might make co-operation harder. According to Rytivaara et al. (2017: 19), teachers had different co-planning methods but the essential part for success was being able to be oneself and trust the other teacher. Respect was seen very important especially when the teachers had different teaching methods. If the teachers are committed to co-teaching, it makes the teachers job more flexible. Rytivaara et al. (2017: 20) note that it is essential to discuss openly about the students and the teachers' own thoughts and feelings.

Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara (2012) studied the development of co-teaching in four Finnish schools during one school year 2010-2011. The participants were 120 teachers who taught grades from 1 to 9 and some of them taught in a special needs school. Some of the questions Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara (2012) asked in their three questionnaires during the year related to teachers' perceptions on co-teaching. The participants' opinions regarding the benefits of co-teaching seemed to become slightly more negative during the year as the percentage of teachers who taught that co-teaching is useful for almost all students fell from 60% in the first questionnaire to 30% in the last, but there was no statistical significance. The participants considered learning from colleagues as one of the benefits of co-teaching. Another valuable issue was being able to share responsibilities and have fun with a co-teaching partner and the significance of these matters increased during the year. Other positive sides of co-teaching according to the participants were that the lessons were planned better and the students received more attention. The teachers reported, also, that the students had more varied social contacts and could learn co-operation through the teachers'

example. Furthermore, it was mentioned that co-teaching makes transition from primary to secondary school more effortless for the students.

The problem that the teachers mentioned the most often in Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara's (2012) study was the lack of co-planning time. The participants mentioned that co-teaching needs to be voluntary and that it does not suit all situations. Some teachers commented that they did not like having an assistant and some teachers did not communicate enough with their partners and, thus, were not satisfied in the situation. The best functions of co-teaching were, according to the teachers, differentiation and promotion of learning. There were some differences in different teachers' answers, such as, managing a restless class was important especially in subject teachers' opinion.

Pesonen, Rytivaara, Palmu and Wallin (2020) researched which factors could possibly impact primary school teachers' sense of belonging in co-teaching relationships. 38 teachers working in general and special education participated in the study in which they wrote an imaginary story based on a situation that was given by the researchers. Half of the teachers wrote about a co-teaching situation in which they would have felt comfortable and seen the co-teaching relationship as positive whereas half of them wrote about a situation in which they would have felt uncomfortable and seen the co-teaching relationship as negative.

According to the stories written in Pesonen et al.'s (2020) study, the factors that enhanced teachers' sense of belonging to a co-teaching relationship included co-planning, shared responsibility and support received from a co-teaching partner. Other factors that had a positive effect were knowing the co-teaching partners manner of working, mutual trust and respect as well as a positive atmosphere between them. In addition, having a similar teaching philosophy with the co-teaching partner and knowing one's own strengths were considered as helpful aspects, too. The factors that were experienced to hinder teachers' sense of belonging to a co-teaching relationship were if the teachers did not agree on practical issues or they did not stick to what was decided on. Situations that were considered awkward and unnatural and in which teachers became nervous or irritated were experienced to hinder the sense of

belonging. Furthermore, it was negative if one other teacher ignored the other in the classroom or the teaching philosophies differed drastically. The main results of previous research on the topic are summarized in table 3.

Table 3. Summary of the main results of previous research

Researcher(s)	Main results
Strogilos, Stefanidis and Tragoulia (2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teachers did not have enough time for co-planning - it is important to select appropriate teaching methods for special education students and to see how well they reach their goals - the most common co-teaching model used was one teach, one drift where general education teacher taught the most - team teaching was perceived the most effective co-teaching model - teachers felt that inclusion helps special education students
Austin (2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - special education teachers had more co-teaching than general education teachers - general education teacher had more work in the classroom even though sharing responsibly more was valued - teachers' experiences were mostly positive, they had learned from each other and they felt that students had benefited - some teachers wanted more co-planning time - the most effective methods are co-operative learning and dividing students into smaller groups
Ahtiainen, Beirad, Hautamäki, Hiltavuori and Thuneberg (2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - another teachers' support was considered useful - co-taught lessons were considered better than other lessons - more support for the students - there was not enough co-planning time, which led to special education teacher only observing and assisting
Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - co-teaching improved sense of community and made students feel safer - teachers had more ideas and learnt from each other - a good co-teaching partner is interested in co-teaching and has a similar teaching philosophy as well as is trustworthy and flexible - teachers found finding co-planning time challenging
Rytivaara, Pulkkinen, Palmu and Kontinen (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teachers were mostly satisfied with co-teaching - it was important to be able to be oneself and trust the co-teaching partner - respect was considered important especially when teaching philosophies were different - teachers wished for more support and more individualized help for students
Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the participants' opinions on co-teaching became slightly more negative over time and the teachers felt that co-teaching does not suit all situations - learning from colleagues and sharing responsibilities was seen beneficial - students received more attention and friends in a co-taught classroom - there was not enough co-planning time - the best functions of co-teaching were differentiation and promotion of learning
Pesonen, Rytivaara, Palmu and Wallin (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - factors enhancing teachers' sense of belonging to a co-teaching relationship were co-planning, shared responsibility and support of the co-teaching partner as well as knowing the partner's manner of working, trust and respect - factors hindering sense of belonging were disagreements and not sticking to what had been decided on as well as awkward situations or drastically different teaching philosophies or becoming ignored in the classroom by the co-teaching partner

According to these studies, the most commonly mentioned problem with co-teaching is lack of co-planning time. Most of the teachers had positive perceptions on co-teaching. They liked, especially, that they could learn from their co-teaching partners and they felt that the students benefited from co-teaching, too, in form of more individual help. Some teachers' ideals differed from their actions so that they did not distribute work as evenly as they thought they should have done, and they did not co-plan as much as they thought would have been optimal.

Some studies are conducted on teachers' preparedness to co-teach and training's impact on their perceptions. Chitiyo and Brinda (2018) researched teachers' preparedness to co-teach in north-eastern USA. They studied 77 teachers who had from 0 to 25 years of co-teaching experience. Majority of the teachers were general education teachers teaching in elementary school, middle school and high school and most of them had a master's degree. The data was collected through a questionnaire in which they were asked how they had learned about co-teaching, if they had used co-teaching in their job and how prepared they felt to co-teach by choosing the most suited option. Almost half of the participants chose the option that they had learned about co-teaching in university courses. Almost all the participants understood what co-teaching is and 78% of them had co-taught themselves. However, half of the participants stated that they did not feel prepared enough to co-teach. Whether the respondents had co-taught themselves or not did not affect their sense of preparedness.

Pancsofar and Petroff (2013) studied how pre-service training and in-service opportunities regarding co-teaching affected general and special education teachers' confidence and attitudes towards co-teaching. The participants were 129 teachers from a Mid-Atlantic state of United States, and they taught from kindergarten to 12th grade. Majority of them had taught more than ten years and 27% of them were special education teachers. The teachers answered to an online survey where they were asked how much training they had received on co-teaching during their teacher education and career, and they were asked to rate their confidence, interest and attitudes towards co-teaching.

Pancsofar and Petroff's (2013) results showed that more experienced teachers had had less opportunities to learn about co-teaching than their more recently begun colleagues. The teachers who conducted co-teaching had had more training on co-teaching than such teachers who were not co-teaching. Special education teachers had received more training on co-teaching than general education teachers. The teachers who had received more training had more positive attitudes towards co-teaching and they felt more interest and confidence. The results of Citiyo and Brinda's (2018) and Pancsofar and Petroff's (2013) studies suggest that there is, still, work to be done so that better teacher preparedness to co-teach would be reached.

In addition to other research, there are some Doctoral Thesis written about teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching. Abbye-Taylor (2014) studied successful co-teachers' and their administrators' experiences by interviewing 11 co-teachers, 5 principals and 6 special education administrators. The participants were from such school districts in New York State where co-teaching had been conducted over five years. According to her results, successful co-teachers and their administrators believed in the power of inclusion and that co-teaching is beneficial for all students. Effective co-teaching relationships and co-planning were viewed crucial for success. Administrators valued personal development more than co-teachers.

Rodrigues (2013) researched general and special education teachers' perceptions of co-teaching and how they differed between teachers who had co-taught themselves and teachers who had not. She studied how general and special education teachers' perceptions differed from each other, too. The data was collected through an online survey in which the 37 participants answered questions using a Likert Scale. The most used co-teaching model by the participants was one teach, one assist even though it is not ideal. The results showed that co-teaching was mainly seen as positive according to co-teachers. However, the special education teachers did not have a very positive perception of co-teaching possibly because they worked mainly as assistants and the ones who did not yet have experience had more positive mindsets towards co-teaching.

King (2010) researched elementary school teachers' perceptions on co-teaching. Her participants were altogether 15 general and special education teachers. The study was conducted via interviews. Most of the participants had positive views about co-teaching and felt that special education students benefited from not being taken to their own room. According to the results, the co-teaching would have been even more effective if the teachers had had more education on it.

Rytivaara (2012) studied two primary school teachers who co-taught together. The aims of her study were investigating what the teachers thought about co-teaching and how they implemented it, in addition to researching what they learned while co-teaching. The data were collected through ethnographic fieldwork and interviews. The participant felt that they were supportive co-teaching partners to each other. Their cooperation led to learning about teaching, for example, new disciplinary techniques and manners of grouping the students. According to Rytivaara (2012), co-teachers' shared values and philosophies can lead to a positive teaching environment. These Doctoral Thesis' results were in line with other research conducted in the field.

Lastly, there are various Masters' thesis written about co-teaching but very few from language teachers' point of view. Hattukangas and Kotimäki (2010) studied two co-teaching pairs of a mathematics teacher and a special education teacher in a Finnish lower secondary school by using ethnographic methods. According to their results, the teachers were equal and trusted each other. The most important factors promoting co-teaching were, according to the results, teachers' skills and the whole teaching community's positive outlook on co-teaching.

Kettula and Repola (2008) studied how co-teaching was implemented in Finnish comprehensive schools and how satisfied teachers were with it. The data were collected through a questionnaire. The participants commented that they were mainly satisfied with the co-teaching methods they used. Some possible threats that they mentioned were lack of co-planning time, uneven amount of work between co-teachers and changing co-teaching partners.

Peltonen (2017) studied adult classroom teacher students' perceptions on co-teaching based on the experience they had gained in teacher training and working life before

their teacher education. He conducted his study by interviewing four teacher students. The participants felt that co-teaching gave them additional resources and that they could learn from their co-teaching partners. According to them, a good co-teaching partner is flexible, reliable and ready to develop his or her skills.

Perttala and Salonen (2013) studied teachers' experiences on co-teaching by interviewing five teachers who were classroom teachers and special education teachers. Reasons for starting to co-teach were large group sizes and offering special education students support and role models from general education classroom. The participants were satisfied with their co-teaching relationships and they felt that they were equal. The teachers wished for more co-planning time and more suitable spaces for co-teaching.

Soukkala (2016) studied teachers' perceptions on co-teaching by using a questionnaire. In the qualitative part of the study, participants wished for more knowledge and experience on co-teaching. They mentioned that the most beneficial sides of co-teaching were that the teachers' responsibility divided on more than one person, that they received peer support and that the students received more individualized teaching. The quantitative part revealed that the amount of years of co-teaching did not affect the participants' answers.

Takala and Vartiainen (2014) studied teachers' learning during co-teaching. They analyzed interviews conducted during a Finnish National Agency for Education's Special education project. The interviewees that Takala and Vartiainen chose to study were classroom and special education teachers. According to their results, co-teaching provides opportunities for teachers' learning. While co-teaching the teachers enjoyed their job more and the students received additional support, too. These Master's Thesis conducted in Finland had similar results to other studies. Overall positive experiences, learning from co-teaching partners and lack of co-planning time were prominent in these studies, too.

I did not find any master's or bachelor's thesis on co-teaching from Swedish teacher's point of view but there is one bachelor's thesis written about co-teaching from English teacher students' view. Matikainen (2016) studied the topic by conducting an online

questionnaire which 23 English teacher students answered. The participants opinions on co-teaching were mainly positive even though they mentioned that they did not receive enough education for it in the university.

Most of the previous studies are focused on researching experiences and perceptions of classroom teachers or general education teachers in general. Special education teachers' perceptions on co-teaching have been studied relatively much, too. As it becomes clear from this overview, there is very little research conducted on teachers' perceptions on co-teaching from language teachers' viewpoint and that is one reason why I chose this topic. Of course, there are many studies conducted on co-teaching in language classrooms, especially, in English as a foreign language context but most of them do not focus on language teachers' perceptions which is the topic of this study and, thus, they were left out of this overview.

In the next chapter, I will tell how this present study was conducted. The research aim and the participants as well as the data collection and analysis methods will be presented.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

In this chapter, I will introduce how I conducted this study. First, I will present my research aim more thoroughly than I have done previously in this Paper. Then, I will tell who the participants of this study were, give background information about their situation, and explain the research methods that were used. I will, also, explain how ethics were taken into consideration during this study and how the data was analyzed. The reasons behind my choices are explained, too.

3.1 Aims of the study

I study English and Swedish teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching with a special education teacher. The language teachers' experiences on co-teaching and in their co-teaching relationships are studied. In addition, their perceptions on the need of co-teaching in language teaching and their opinions on what effective co-teaching is like are investigated. My study is qualitative as I aimed to understand

English and Swedish teachers' perceptions more deeply than, only, by collecting numerical data (Kalaja, Alanen and Dufva 2011: 19).

As stated in chapter 2, co-teaching is a somewhat researched topic but there is not much research conducted from subject teachers' viewpoint. There is, especially, lack of research on language teachers' perceptions on co-teaching. It is important to study this topic further as the utilization of co-teaching constantly increases in schools. The research questions in this study were:

1. What kind of experiences the participating English and Swedish teachers have on co-teaching?
 - What kind of co-teaching they have conducted?
 - What kind of experiences they have had in their co-teaching relationships?
2. What kind of perceptions the participating English and Swedish teachers have on co-teaching?
 - Do they think that co-teaching is needed in schools today?
 - How does co-teaching suit language teaching in their opinion?
 - What do they think effective co-teaching is like?
 - How could co-teaching in language classes be developed further?

3.2 Participants

I began searching for the participants from schools in which I knew co-teaching was conducted. At first, I sent e-mails to English and Swedish teachers in those schools. In the e-mail, I told who I am, what the topic of the study is and how I am planning to conduct it. When I received answers, I told more about the study and answered teachers' questions. (Kuula 2015: 121.) Even after reminding the teachers about my study after a couple of weeks of waiting, I did not receive many answers. However, I ended up finding the rest of the interviewees through my already existing participants when I got to contact with them face-to-face or via telephone. Like Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2008: 85) state, I had to be persistent when trying to make people participate my interview as I could not choose just any teachers as my interviewees. Some of the

participants decided to take part when they heard that I had had problems with finding interviewees.

I had eight participants in my study. Results of qualitative research are not meant to be generalized so the number of participants can be smaller than in quantitative research (Dufva 2011: 134). In the following table 4, I present the background information about the participants of this study. All the teachers who participated in my study had co-taught in lower secondary school (*yläkoulu*), which is not surprising as there are more language teachers working in lower and upper secondary schools (*lukio*) than in preliminary schools (*alakoulu*) and there are not many special education teachers working in upper secondary schools.

Table 4. The participants of my study

Teacher's name (changed)	Subject	Years of teaching	Years of co-teaching approximately	Co-teaching at the moment
<i>Heidi</i>	English and Swedish	14	5	Yes
<i>Niko</i>	English (German)	1,5	0,5	Yes
<i>Anne</i>	Swedish and English	28	2	Yes
<i>Raili</i>	English and Swedish	35	15	Yes
<i>Mikko</i>	English	8	2,5	Yes
<i>Antti</i>	English and Swedish	6	2	No
<i>Jenni</i>	Swedish (Textile work)	12,5	1	No
<i>Laura</i>	Swedish (German)	12,5	0,5	Yes

3.3 Background information about the participants' situation

This study was conducted by interviewing the participants. The data collection methods are presented more thoroughly in chapter 3.5 and the results of the study in chapter 4. However, some background information about the participants' situation that was collected in the interviews will be presented, already, in this chapter. Issues

that are looked at in this chapter are the amount of co-taught lessons that the teachers had per week and the reason why they had started to co-teach.

Many aspects and conditions that the teachers mentioned regarding their co-teaching experiences could not be controlled by the teachers themselves, but the school environment affected their teaching. The amount of the participants' co-teaching lessons in a week depended on their school's situation and what kind of groups they taught. Sometimes, the classes that were planned to be taught with a special education teacher were cancelled due to the special education teacher's other responsibilities and one teacher mentioned that some of the co-teaching had been cancelled because of poor indoor air quality. In the table 5, the amount of the co-teaching lessons the participating teachers had in a week are listed.

Table 5. Classes co-taught with special education teacher in a week (hours)

Heidi	Niko	Anne	Raili	Mikko	Antti	Jenni	Laura
5-6	3-5	5-6	1	2-3	8-10	4	2

The participants had co-teaching with special education teacher approximately from 1 to 10 hours in a week. Many of them co-taught more than that but it was partially conducted with paraprofessionals which is not what this study focuses on.

Based on the interviews, there seemed to be three different sources for deciding to start co-teaching in language classes. The idea came either from headmasters, special education teachers or English and Swedish teachers themselves. In table 6, the reasons for each participant's co-teaching are listed.

Table 6. Who has decided that co-teaching is conducted

Whose idea was co-teaching	Heidi	Niko	Anne	Raili	Mikko	Antti	Jenni	Laura
Administrators	x		x		x	x		x
Special education teacher		x			x		x	x
Own will				x		x		x

Over a half of the teachers said that co-teaching had been suggested by the administrators. However, the teachers, often, adopted the co-teaching philosophy, too, when they had familiarized themselves with it. Half of the teachers told that co-teaching was the special education teacher's idea. Often, the special education teachers knew what kind of groups the language teachers had and suggested that they would help with the most challenging groups. Like stated above, language teachers' education does not, often, include co-teaching and that is why without someone else suggesting it they might not even consider it as an option. Three teachers said that the reason for them starting to co-teach was, at least, partially that they wanted to do it themselves. Some teachers mentioned that there was not only one source that suggested co-teaching. In some cases, the decision to co-teach came from all administration, the special education teacher and the language teacher.

3.4 Ethics of the study

Research ethics were taken into consideration in all phases of this study. Participating the study and giving the data up for publishing was voluntary (Dufva 2011: 142). The participants had possibility to withdraw from the study at any moment (Kuula 2015: 87). I did not collect any other personal information about my participants than their names, what subject they taught, what age group they taught and how long they had been teaching. The interviews were recorded so that they could be transcribed. The recordings were deleted after transcribing and the transcribed data was, only, used in this study and the transcribed interviews were anonymous. I had planned beforehand how I would protect information about the participants and how I would dispose the materials when my project would be over (Kuula 2015: 85).

The participants read and signed a privacy notice so that they knew what they took part in. In the form, I told them who I am, why I was studying the subject, how I was about to use the data and that the participants would remain completely anonymous. I, also, informed them what personal information I was going to collect from them, that I would record the interviews and that participating was completely voluntary. Furthermore, they were told that after I would no longer need the recordings and

transcriptions, I would dispose them. (Dufva 2011: 142 and Kuula 2015: 61, 102, 105.) My privacy notice can be seen in appendix 1.

An ethical problem with interviews is that the participants do not receive similar anonymity as they would in, for example, a questionnaire (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 36). I was faced with this problem when writing about my results as many of the teachers who participated in this study worked in same schools and many teachers there knew that they had participated. So even though as little personal information was gathered as possible, they could be recognized from the sample by their co-workers. This is significant because the data includes the participants opinions on their school's procedures and on their co-teaching partners. Individual participants should not be recognizable from the report by other people but if all the personal information is left untold, it might decrease the value of the study as, for example, different groups of people cannot be contrasted with each other (Kuula 2015: 112). That is why when writing my report, I was extra careful with trying to ensure the participants' anonymity without losing valuable information.

3.5 Collecting the data through interviews

The study was conducted through *a semi-structured theme interview*. In a semi-structured interview, some aspects of the interview have been predetermined, for example, the themes that are discussed are the same for all the interviewees but the interviewer can, for instance, change the wording or the order of the questions (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 47). This was a suitable interviewing method for me because by having predetermined themes and questions helped me to receive answers for my research questions but I could react to what the interviewees said and, thus, the interview did not seem like an interrogation. As I was not able to meet all my participants face-to-face, I conducted three of the interviews via telephone (Dufva 2011: 138). As Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2008: 64) state, telephone interviews were slightly more challenging than the interviews conducted face-to-face as I could not see the interviewees and, thus, determine if they had understood the questions and if they were, still, planning to add something or if I could proceed to the next question. While conducting telephone interviews the interviewer needs to carefully focus on

expressing that he or she is listening to the interviewee as the interviewee cannot see him or her (Ikonen 2017: 277). All the interviews were recorded by an appropriate device so that they could be transcribed afterwards.

For the interviews, I composed three themes: teachers' perceptions on co-teaching, teachers' perceptions on their co-teaching relationships and the effect of education and learning while co-teaching. Under these themes, I listed possible interview questions so that I would direct the participants to talk about co-teaching from many different angles. When designing my interview questions, I was inspired by the literature and previous research that I had read on the topic (Dufva 2011: 136). As Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2008: 106) state about the nature of theme interviews, my interview questions were open and there were no predetermined answer options. As they (2008: 107) suggest doing, I started with more general questions and proceeded to ask more specific questions afterwards. Hyvärinen (2017: 25) mentions that if an interviewee adjusts to answering very briefly, he or she does not easily lengthen his or her answers towards the end of the interview. That is another reason why I started the interview with such questions that the participants could not answer by only using a couple of words.

While I was interviewing, I listened to what the participants said and followed up with other questions based on that and implied that I remembered what they had said earlier, which Hyvärinen (2017: 27) recommends doing. The comments that the interviewer makes should be neutral (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 109). Like Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2008: 109) advice, I did not judge the interviewees about anything they said and, only, commented on issues that I agreed on. I felt that commenting on some of the participants statements made the situation feel more natural and less like an interrogation. Hyvärinen (2017: 30) states, too, that if the interviewer does not react at all, it does not encourage the interviewee to talk. My interview questions can be found in appendix 2.

The main reason for choosing interviewing as my method was that I would not have been able to find enough participants for a questionnaire because co-teaching is not that commonly used in Finnish schools yet. Moreover, I could not expect that all the

teachers who had experience on co-teaching would be willing to participate in my study as they are so busy in their jobs. Another advantage of an interview compared to a questionnaire is that people who have promised to attend an interview rarely withdraw from the study and it is easier to choose such participants who have experience on the subject and, thus, have more to say (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 74).

Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2008: 36) mention that one beneficial feature of the interview as a research method is that it is more flexible and it allows interviewees to ask specifying questions if they do not know what the interviewer means. I agree with them as it was useful that the interviewees could ask me to specify what I meant with some of the questions. I could, also, steer the conversation towards the right direction if I noticed, that the interviewee did not see the question that I had asked in the same manner that I did.

3.6 Analyzing the data through content analysis

After conducting the interviews, I transcribed the recordings. As I, only, needed to analyze what the participants said and not how, I decided to transcribe everything that was significant in my study but not, for instance, all filler words. I did not include my responses to the participants' answers unless they affected what they said next (Ruusuvuori and Tiittula 2017: 57). In addition, I did not transcribe parts of our conversation that were not associated to the topic of my study (Ruusuvuori and Nikander 2017: 435). I did not mark, for example, pauses or how the matters were said because my goal was not to analyze how the participants spoke but, rather, what they said.

When analyzing qualitative data, the aim is not to generalize but rather to understand a phenomenon (Kalaja et al. 2011: 20). I used *content analysis* as my method when I analyzed my data. In short, content analysis means that in the first stage a researcher decides what he or she is interested in his or her data. Second, the researcher goes through the data and marks down parts that are relevant for his or her research questions. Third, the researcher categorizes the chosen parts of the data or divides them into different themes. (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 91-93.) Often, even when conducting a qualitative study, a researcher uses some quantitative methods, for

instance, when telling how often something was mentioned in the data. This leads to that many studies are practically descriptive in nature. (Kalaja et al. 2011: 20.) That is why my study could be considered descriptive as in my parts of my analysis, I counted the participants who had said certain issues.

My interview questions were based on the theories that I presented in the chapter 2. However, while analyzing my data, I used inductive analysis which means that I analyzed the data by focusing on its content and not, for example, trying to find proof to something that has been claimed in previous research (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2008: 136). This means that my analysis method was theory driven analysis (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 97, 117). As Hirsjärvi and Hurme (2008: 136) state, I automatically, already, started my analysis while I was interviewing the participants as I could not help noticing many similarities between their answers with each other and the research that has been conducted before. The first step of my analysis was that based on my observations while interviewing and my research questions, I decided on themes that I wanted to start looking for from the data. I underlined different themes by using different colors. The initial themes can be seen in table 7.

Table 7. The initial themes

The initial themes
School's situation and administrator's attitude
What kind of co-teaching has been conducted
How the co-teaching that has been conducted has developed
Who has co-teaching been conducted with and how it differs depending on partner
How much co-teaching in a week
The problems related to co-teaching
Is the co-teaching necessary
Positive sides of co-teaching
Co-teaching in languages and what has been learnt from special education teachers
How could the co-teaching conducted be developed further
Planning of co-teaching
Co-teacher's roles
Co-teaching relationship with the special education teacher
What is effective co-teaching like
Changes in the participants perceptions
Reason to co-teaching
Grouping of the students
Significance of education

I, then, sorted the themes into four groups. A couple of themes were left out of the results chapter as they, in fact, provided more of a background information for the participants' perceptions on the other issues. This grouping stage can be seen in table 8.

Table 8. The second stage of analysis

The themes and subthemes
Participants' views on co-teaching
Is the co-teaching necessary
Positive and negative sides of co-teaching
Changes in the participants perceptions
Co-teaching methods
What kind of co-teaching has been conducted
Planning of co-teaching
What is effective co-teaching like
Grouping of the students
Co-teaching in languages
How the co-teaching that has been conducted has developed
How could the co-teaching conducted be developed further
Co-teaching relationships
Co-teaching relationship with the special education teacher
Co-teacher's roles
Different co-teaching partners and difference to special education teacher
Education received on co-teaching
Teacher training
Education provided by working place
What has been learnt from special education teachers
Themes left out but included as background information
School's situation and administrator's attitude
How much co-teaching in a week
Reason to co-teaching

However, while looking at these themes more closely, I noticed, for instance, unnecessary repetition and the themes being more like topics. That is why I decided to modify the themes one more time and that is how I ended up with the final themes that can be seen in table 9.

Table 9. The final themes

The final themes
The participants' experiences on co-teaching
Co-teaching conditions in schools
Teachers' roles in co-teaching and methods for grouping of the students
Co-teaching relationships
The participants' perceptions on co-teaching
Co-teaching as a supporter of teachers and students
Co-teaching as an answer to the challenges of inclusion
Co-teaching in languages
Perceptions on effective co-teaching and suggestions for improvements
Changes in the language teachers' perceptions and co-teaching conducted

After choosing the themes, I started to read through the underlined comments on each theme one by one, list the statements of each participant who I had given a number each and count the similar statements. In table 10, an example of listing and counting the statements is given. In this example the positives of co-teaching according to the participants are listed.

Table 10. An example of listing and counting the statements

Statement (positive sides of co-teaching)	Mentioned by whom (as a number)
Help and support for language teacher	1, 2, 3, 6, 7
More help and attention for students	1, 2, 4, 5, 8
Better discipline and peace in classroom	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Special education teacher's knowledge	1, 2, 3
Excellent when works	3, 4, 5, 8

This is how I gained an idea of all different opinions and experiences the participants had and which of them were the most common. Based on my findings, I wrote my report, composed tables and, lastly, chose demonstrative, interesting or unique statements from the sample to be used in the examples.

In the next chapter, I will present the results of my study.

4 RESULTS

In this chapter, I will present the results of this study. The results are divided into two parts. In the first part, the participants' experiences on the co-teaching with special education teachers are presented. The second part, then, presents their perceptions on co-teaching which are, undoubtedly, influenced by their experiences. The first part is divided into three and the second part into five themes.

4.1 The participants' experiences on co-teaching

In this part the language teachers' experiences on co-teaching with special education teachers are presented. The themes in this chapter include, firstly, the co-teaching conditions in schools experienced by the participants and, secondly, what kind of roles the teachers have in co-teaching as well as how they group their students. The language teachers' experiences in their co-teaching relationships with the special education teachers will be presented and compared to their experiences with other co-teaching partners in the third theme.

4.1.1 Co-teaching conditions in schools

In this theme, the conditions that the teachers had for conducting of co-teaching in their schools are presented. How co-teaching is conducted in language teaching depends, partially, on what the administrators' attitude towards it is like. The different aspects the teachers mentioned during interviews when talking about administrators' attitudes towards co-teaching are presented in table 11.

Table 11. School's situation and attitude towards co-teaching

School's situation	Heidi	Niko	Anne	Raili	Mikko	Antti	Jenni	Laura
Positive attitude, encouragement	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Co-teaching has slowly become more effective	X			X				X
Special education teachers are too busy	X	X	X	X			X	
There is time for discussion			X	X				X
There is no time to co-plan					X	X		
No advice has been given	X						X	

All the participants felt that their school had a positive attitude towards co-teaching. They were encouraged and even recommended to co-teach more. The school's positive attitude can be seen in example 1 in which Raili tells that the special education teachers were told to co-teach with subject teachers and not to separate the students.

Example 1. Raili

Siis todella myönteinen sillä tavalla, että tänne muutama vuosi sitten nimenomaan palkattiin erityisopettajia niin, että he eivät saa viedä tonne noihin omiin pikku koppeihinsa eli et idea oli se, et he on luokassa.

Very positive as a couple of years ago, special education teachers were hired specifically so that they are not allowed to take the students to their own little rooms so the idea was that they are in the general education classroom.

According to the results, co-teaching seems to be a relatively new phenomenon in the participants' schools, as some teachers mentioned that it had slowly increased and become more effective. A few teachers, for example, Anne in example 2 mentioned that they had possibilities to discuss co-teaching with other teachers during the school day.

Example 2. Anne

Meillä rehtori tukee tätä ja on uudistushaluinen ja on käytetty aikaa näihin ja kyllä me iteki otetaan hetki jostaki, jos me halutaan puhua jostaki tietystä oppilaasta tai ryhmästä niin ihan löytyy sitte kuitenkin aikaa.

Our headmaster supports this and is a reformist and we have used time to these and we take time ourselves, too, if we want to talk about some student or group and there is always time after all.

Many teachers mentioned that some problems in their school make co-teaching more difficult. The most commonly mentioned problem was that there are not enough special education teachers. This had led to English and Swedish teachers not being able to have special education teacher in their classroom whenever they wanted as Jenni states in example 3.

Example 3. Jenni

Se on sitte tämmönen lukujärjestystekninen asia, että miten saadaan, että vaikka haluaisinkin erityisopettajan tunnille, niin sehä ei aina onnistu.

It is this kind of schedule-related thing, that even if I wanted to have a special education teacher in my classes, it cannot always be done.

It was, also, not exceptional that they had already planned a co-teaching lesson and the special education teacher did not come to the classroom as they had something else to do as in example 4 by Heidi.

Example 4. Heidi

Välillä sitä semmostaki ikävää tapahtuu, että erityisopettajia käytetty sijaisina niinku joutuvat sinne. Ajatellaa, että kuitenkin sitte parempi yks aikuinen per ryhmä, ku että yhdessä ei olis ketää.

Sometimes such unfortunate things happen that special education teachers have been used as substitute teachers. It is thought that it is better to have one adult per group than if one group had none.

In addition, special education teachers did not have time to co-plan or discuss the classes afterwards with English and Swedish teachers. Some teachers said that their school did not provide time to plan lessons during the day and that they had not received advice from the administrators. In conclusion, despite the schools' positive attitude towards co-teaching there was, still, room for improvement in terms of the number of special education teachers and co-planning time according to the participants.

4.1.2 Teachers' roles in co-teaching and methods for grouping of the students

In this theme, the co-teaching methods used by the participants are presented. Their roles in the classroom and manners of grouping of the students will, also, be showcased. The co-teaching methods that the English and Swedish teachers told they had used during their lessons are listed in table 12.

Table 12. Co-teaching methods used in the participants' classes

Co-teaching methods mentioned	Times mentioned
Some students are separated to a different room	4
Special education teacher has an assisting role	6
Teachers circulate and help students together	2
Special education teacher has own teaching moments	1
Students are split in groups and teachers teach own groups	3
Special education teacher adds to language teacher's teaching	1
Doing such things that both teachers have something to do	1
Teachers teach together in front of the class	1

There was variation between the methods that each teacher had used while co-teaching but there were, also, some similarities. Even though that is not considered co-teaching and, hence, not a target of this study, four teachers mentioned that they had,

sometimes, separated some students to a different room against their schools' recommendations. Usually, the separated students were the ones who had challenges with learning and the special education teacher took them to his or her own room. Furthermore, one teach, one drift was the method almost all the participants told they were using. This was not surprising but, also, not optimal as Friend and Cook (2004: 17) state that it is an, often, over-used method in co-teaching. The participants, also, stated that the special education teacher was almost always the one in the assisting role. Mikko's situation was like that and he told about it in example 5:

Example 5. Mikko

Mä ohjaan et oon se aineenopettaja siellä, joka vetää tunnin läpi sen aineen pohjalta ja sit se toinen erkaopettaja siinä on enemmän sellanen luokkatilanteenhallitsija. Siinä tosiaan enemmän siihen kurinpitoon keskittyy ja siihe, että saadaan oppilaat mukaan niihin tehtäviin ja muutenki, että ne on hereillä siellä ja seuraa, mitä tapahtuu.

I lead so I am the subject teacher there and I instruct the lesson through the subject's point of view and the special education teacher's job is more to keep the situation under control. They focus more on the discipline and that the students take part in the tasks and that they are alert and follow what is happening.

Laura said that they had been using speak and add model so the special education teacher commented on her teaching and they, also, had been circulating in the classroom together (Beninghof 2012: 144). Niko had circulated in the classroom together with the special education teacher, too, but they were, in addition to that, the only co-teaching partners who sometimes taught together in front of the class, so they conducted team teaching (Friend and Cook 2004: 21). Heidi remembered one time when the special education teacher had had his or her own moment of teaching something alone. Raili, Anne and Laura had experience of grouping the students during lessons, so they had used alternative teaching. Raili had split the group in two so that the special education teacher had less students, Heidi had even used a paraprofessional to help one group in addition to her and the special education

teacher's groups and Laura had, also, had three groups at the same time as can be seen in example 6:

Example 6. Laura

Meil on ollu sellastaki, et jos ollaa vaiks nyt käännetty kappaleita, niin me ollaan jakaannuttu sillee, et erityisopettaja on saattanu ottaa siin luokassa muutaman heikomman semmosee omaa ryhmää ja ollaan siirretty pulpetit ja tuolit sillee, että he on tehny sitä omassa ryhmässää ja sit taas etevämmät on tehny iteksee ja mä oon tehny osan kans.

We have had such, too, that if we have, for example, translated textbook chapters, we have divided ourselves so that the special education teacher can have taken a couple of weaker students to their own group and we have moved the tables and chairs so that they have done it in their own group and the most talented ones have done it by themselves and I have done it with some of the students.

As seen in the example, Laura and her co-teaching partner had grouped the students according to their skills. Anne stated, simply, that when the special education teacher has been available, they have not done such things that he or she would have nothing to do as can be seen in example 7:

Example 7. Anne

Mä oon yrittäny sillee mieltää, että kun se tunti on se, et erkka on mulla, niin en esimerkiks pidä tuntia, jossa vaan kuunnellaan vaan sellasia, joissa toimitaan ja joutuu mieltää ja joutuu tuottamaan, että meille molemmille on töitä, ettei erkka vaan istu siellä, jos me tehdään kuunteluita ja hän vaan lähinnä kattois, että onko kaikilla oikee sivu niin eihän se oo järkevää.

I have tried to think it so that when I have that class that I have the special education teacher, I don't hold a class where we only listen but such where we do things and the students have to produce language so that we both have something to do and the special education teacher won't just sit there and watch when we do listening comprehension and they would only check that everyone is on the right page. That is not reasonable.

The participants had different manners of grouping the students and dividing them between the two teachers. Some teachers had made more permanent solutions on how they divide the work but some of them had more varying responsibilities depending on the situation. The participants' manners of dividing the responsibility of the students between the co-teachers are presented in table 13.

Table 13. How co-teachers divide responsibility of teaching the students

Who is responsible for the students	Heidi	Niko	Anne	Raili	Mikko	Antti	Jenni	Laura
Both teachers but special education teacher more for the weaker students		X			X	X	X	X
Sometimes students are divided into skill groups	X							X
Both teachers are responsible of all students	X		X					
Special education teacher takes some students to their room sometimes		X	X	X	X			
Language teacher has more responsibility		X		X				

The most common manner to conduct co-teaching was that both teachers taught all students, but the special education teacher had more responsibility on the special education students. Heidi and Anne said that the responsibility of teaching all the students divided equally between the teachers. Anne told about their co-operation like this in example 8:

Example 8. Anne

Me on kokeiltu ihan just sitä, että kun saattaa olla haastavia oppilaita ihan omanki jaksamisen kannalta, että vähän niin sanotusti kierrätetään siitä pikasesti, että ota sä tosta ja mä haen tuolta ja kun mäkin haluan kuitenkin oppia siitäkin lisää.

We have tried that when there might be challenging students that even just for us managing our own job that we quickly circulate the students like you take

them and I get them from there ja I want to learn more about teaching special education students.

According to her, their well-being in the job improved by dividing the responsibilities. Heidi and Laura divided students into groups based on their language skills, sometimes, and the special education teacher took the students who needed more help. Two teachers felt that the students were more on the language teacher's responsibility. Niko felt that, overall, teaching of the students was more on his responsibility but he could, sometimes, give the responsibility of the special education students to the special education teacher. Four teachers mentioned that the special education teacher takes students to his or her room, sometimes. Mikko commented on how the matter affected his teaching like this in example 9:

Example 9. Mikko

Tietysti on ollu semmosiaki oppilaita, jotka on ollu välillä muualla ja välillä siellä pienryhmässä, mut meidän koulussaki on oppilaita, jotka on melkee valla ollu sit siellä pienryhmähommassa, että on ihan täysin joku eri kirjaki käytössä, että on oma opsi siinä ja mä en sitte kauheasti näekään niitä tunnilla. Mutta totta kai, jos ne on tunnilla siellä ne oppilaat, niin se on sitte mun vastuulla se, että ne oppii jotaki, mut totta kai se auttaa, jos toinen opettaja sattuu olla paikalla.

Of course, there have been such students, too, who have been sometimes in my classroom and sometimes in the small group in the special education teacher's room but we have, also, such students in our school who have been almost completely in the small group and they even have a different book and own curriculum and I barely see them in my classes. But, of course, if they are in my class it is my responsibility that they learn something but, of course, it helps if another teacher happens to be there.

He stated that teaching such students who were, often, in another room was challenging. Most of the participants' statements indicated that language teachers had the leading role in the co-teaching conducted with a special education teacher. In the table 14, the participants' most common statements related to the teachers' roles and authority are listed.

Table 14. Co-teachers' roles in the classroom

Co-teachers' roles	Heidi	Niko	Anne	Raili	Mikko	Antti	Jenni	Laura
Language teacher usually leads and special education teacher assists	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Language teacher circulates in the classroom too	X	X	X		X	X		X
Language teacher leads because he or she has planned the lesson	X		X	X	X		X	
Both teachers have approximately the same authority in the classroom	X	X	X		X		X	X
Language teacher has more authority in the classroom				X		X		

Almost all language teachers said that, usually, they are the ones teaching in front of the classroom and the special education teachers have, mostly, the assisting role where they, for example, help the special education students or focus on discipline. However, most of the language teachers told that they circulate in the classroom, too, with the special education teacher. Five participants explained that they had the leading role in the classroom because they had, also, mostly done all the planning. Six teachers felt that they were equal with their co-teaching partner in terms of authority in the classroom but two of them felt that they had more authority than the special education teacher. Jenni's comments on the matter can be seen in example 10:

Example 10. Jenni

No kyllä se enimmäkseen mun vastuulla on ollu, että mä oon sen tunnin rakenteen suunnitellu ja toteuttanu ja erityisopettaja siinä sitte on mukana omalla panoksellaan. No kyllä se erityisopettaja on siinä tavallaan myös johtajana, että hän on mukana siinä kurinpidossa ja työrauhan takaamisessa samanlainen rooli ku opettajallakin, että on se auktoriteetti siinä sillee yhtä hyvin kun mullaki.

Planning and teaching the lesson has been mostly my responsibility and the special education teacher has, then, given their contribution to it. The special education teacher has kind of, also, had a leading role with me as they have been

there to help with discipline and ensuring the peace in the classroom, so they have authority just as much as I have.

As seen in the example, in Jenni's classroom, the teachers had equal authority. Anne commented on the development of their authority like this in example 11:

Example 11. Anne

Aluks oppilaat ei oikein tajunnu sitä, että ne ei osannu oikein ottaa erkkaa niinku ja osa edelleen kääntyy ekaks mun puoleen, mutta kyllä ne selvästi alkaa siihen pääsemään mukaan, että yhtä lailla ollaan siellä opettajina.

In the beginning the students didn't quite realize the special education teacher's role and some of them, still, turn first to me but they clearly start to understand that both of us are there as teachers just as much.

In some schools, co-teaching is a new method for the students, as well, and it might require some time that they accustom to it. Antti and Laura stated that they were stricter with disciplining the students than their co-teaching partners but they, still, felt that they had equal amount of authority with them. Raili said that she was the leader in the classroom even though she would have wanted to be equal with the special education teacher. She felt that the special education teacher was more like a paraprofessional even though she had tried to encourage her to take a more visible role. Laura stated that the special education teacher actually wanted to be in a more assisting role herself. Antti wondered if their roles were fair in example 12:

Example 12. Antti

Voitais tietysti ajatella, että oliko se reilua, että itse olin niin paljon äänessä suhteessa nimenomaa samanaikaisopetuksen näkökulmasta. Ehkä ei, mut sitte taas, koska jokaises näistä tilanteista erkka on ollu hyvinki paljon kokeneempi, niin jos he olisivat kokeneet tilanteen jotenkin epäreiluna tai et heidän olis tarvinnu päästä enemmän ääneen, niin oma fiilis siitä on se, että kyllä he olis siitä maininneet ehdottomasti.

You could, of course, wonder that is it fair that I was talking so much during the lessons when thinking about co-teaching. Maybe not, but then again because in all of these situations the special education teacher has been much more

experienced than I am, if they had felt that the situation was unfair or that they should have gotten more time to talk, I feel like they would have told me for sure.

As seen in the example, Antti felt that their relationship was such that his co-teaching partner would have told him if something had bothered him or her. Jenni told that in their classes the special education teacher's role was to encourage and motivate the students. She, furthermore, stated that she was happy with how their roles were. Anne was not as happy with her and her co-teaching partner's roles as she wanted that the special education teacher would participate more on the planning. All the participants did not comment on if they were happy with their roles or not but Heidi and Mikko said that it would be interesting to alternate them sometimes so that the special education teacher would lead the teaching, which Heidi had already tried with her co-teaching partner.

The most common manner of co-teaching seemed to be that the language teacher led the lesson and the special education teacher assisted. The special education teacher had more responsibility on the special education students, but the language teacher was also there to help the students and the students considered them as equal authorities.

4.1.3 Co-teaching relationships

This theme includes the language teachers' experiences in their co-teaching relationships with special education teachers and in other co-teaching relationships such as with paraprofessionals in comparison to them. All participants stated that everything had, mostly, went well with the special education teachers who were their co-teaching partners. They felt that it was relatively effortless to work with the special education teacher and that they got along well. As they had not had any major difficulties in their co-operation, they assumed that their teaching philosophies did not differ substantially from each other. All but one had never felt that the special education teacher would have come to their territory, either. Three language teachers mentioned that they could discuss even difficult topics with the special education teacher, for instance, if they had some problems in their co-teaching relationship. Niko said that the special education teacher had been helpful and answered if he had any

questions as a novice teacher. Antti commented on their effortless co-operation like this in example 13:

Example 13. Antti

Ei vaan tuu mieleen mitään, mikä olis ollu sillee konflikti. Mä oon aina ollu hyvä pääsemään asioista nopeesti yhteisymmärrykseen ja hyväksyn erkankin ehdotuksia. Et jos joku asia tuntuu toimivan, niin sillä mennään ihan sama kuka sen keksi.

I just can't think of anything that would have been a conflict. I have always been good at getting to an agreement on things and I accept the special education teacher's suggestions, too. If something seems to work, that is how we do regardless of whose idea it was.

Even though the teacher's experiences were, mainly, positive, they had some negative recollections, too. In example 14, Jenni told about a situation in which they were not, completely, on the same page with the special education teacher.

Example 14. Jenni

Ehkä yks tilanne muistuu mieleen, että oli näitä käytössääntöjä käyty läpi ja tuntikäyttäytymistä, että erityisopettaja ei muistanukkaan näitä, mitä oli sovittu ja hän sitte vähän niinku eri tyyliin kerto, että missä mennään ja mikä on seuraamus, jos käyttäytyvät tietyllä tavalla.

Maybe I remember one situation when we had gone through these rules and how the students should behave in the classroom and the special education teacher didn't remember what we had agreed on and they told a bit differently about the rules and what happens if the students behave in a certain way.

Raili had probably the most negative experiences out of all the participants maybe because, as will be seen in example 28, her best experiences were from her previous workplace and she felt that the co-teaching could be conducted better than they did in her current school. One of the incidents she talked about can be seen in example 15:

Example 15. Raili

Oli yks nuori erityisopettaja täs vähän aikaa muutama vuosi sitten, niin mä sanoin siitä, että senkin pitäis sitte sellanen rooli ottaa, niin se kyllä otti sellasen roolin, että siinä tuli ihan riitaa opettajien kanssa sillee, et ku se rupes määrää niinku kaikesta.

We had one young special education teacher here a little while a couple of years ago. I told them that they should take some kind of a role, too, and they took such a role that it even caused arguments with teachers as they started to determine about everything.

She did not like the special education teacher's manner of trying to decide on their own how everything would be done.

The participants' experiences on giving and receiving feedback in their co-teaching relationships were versatile. Feedback seemed to be an important factor affecting the participants' co-teaching relationships. In table 15, the participants' statements about feedback-giving are listed.

Table 15. Manners and reasons of giving feedback with the co-teaching partner

Teacher	Feedback giving with a special education teacher about co-teaching
Heidi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - asked the special education teacher to take a more active role - the special education teacher has given positive feedback - has given feedback about something negative to the special education teacher - would like to ask for more feedback and help from the special education teacher
Niko	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would like to ask for more feedback and help from the special education teacher - the special education teacher gives feedback if he teaches something in an unclear manner
Anne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - might not have courage to give negative feedback to the special education teacher - both teachers have given feedback and support to each other
Raili	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - has given feedback about something negative to the special education teacher - would like to receive more feedback from the special education teacher and has told them about it - is annoyed about giving positive feedback to the special education teacher without receiving it back
Mikko	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - both teachers have given feedback and support to each other - would like to receive more feedback from the special education teacher - has given feedback about something negative to the special education teacher
Antti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - both teachers have given feedback and support to each other - would like to receive more feedback from the special education teacher and has told them about it - believes that the special education teacher would have had courage to give feedback to him if it had been necessary
Jenni	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have not given much feedback to each other with the special education teacher partially because there would not have been time
Laura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - both teachers have given feedback and support to each other

Many teachers had experience about giving and receiving positive feedback in their co-teaching relationships. Anne told about how they support each other with the special education teacher in example 16:

Example 16. Anne

Välitön palaute aina toisille saatetaan semmosia, että tsemppiä, että kyllä oli kova tunti ja kiitos kun sä teit näin kyllä aina siinä hetkessä heti tunnin jälkeen annetaan. Joskus vaan katotaan, kun ei pysty puhua merkkejä, että hiki ottas. Mutta joo, kyllä me paljo annetaa, se on semmosta myönteistä se toisen tuki.

We always give each other instant feedback such as good luck and that was a hard class and thank you that you did that always right after the class. Sometimes we just look at each other when we can't talk and give each other sings like our foreheads are sweating. But yea, we give each other a lot of feedback and the other person's support is a positive thing.

Through their feedback, Anne and her co-teaching partner expressed each other, for example, sympathy during challenging lessons. In example 17, Heidi told about a situation in which she was not happy with the special education teacher's actions, but she felt like giving feedback to them helped.

Example 17. Heidi

On ollut sellasia tilanteita, että vaikka lähtee jonnekki muualle siks ajaksi, ku meillä on täällä jotain ns. kevyempää. Niin sitte tästä oon sanonu, että kyl mä kaipaisin sen avun kokonaisuudessaan siihen ryhmään, että mulla ei oo semmonen olo, että ku on jotain kevyempää niin mä jään sinne yksin, koska eihän ne haasteet sitte aina poistu kuitenkaa, vaikka on jotain ns. kevyempää. Et se riippuu vähän päivästäki, mut koen kyllä, että tulin kuulluksi.

I have had such situations that the special education teacher, for example, goes somewhere else while we have something lighter in the classroom. So I have said about this that I would want to have that help during the whole time with that group so that I don't feel like that when we have something lighter that I am left alone there because the challenges don't always disappear even though we would have something lighter. It depends on the day, but I feel like I got heard.

Not everyone had had courage to give feedback to their co-teaching partners like Heidi even though they would have wanted to. Nevertheless, even though the teacher's

experiences varied, the most common situation was that the communication between the co-teachers worked well and they both gave each other feedback.

All participants had experience of working with a paraprofessional in a classroom, too. Many even said that there was more often a paraprofessional in the room than a special education teacher. This was likely due to the lack of special education teachers. Antti had taught a couple of times with another language teacher during theme weeks. He said that teaching with a language teacher differed from teaching with a special education teacher so that they had more equal roles with a language teacher. In table 16, the participants statements about how teaching with a paraprofessional differed from teaching with a special education teacher are listed.

Table 16. Working with a paraprofessional and a special education teacher compared

Teacher	Working with a paraprofessional and a special education teacher
Heidi	- does not expect as much from the paraprofessional as the special education teacher
Niko	- the paraprofessionals have less authority than the special education teacher as they cannot, for example, penalize the students - teaching with the paraprofessionals in almost similar to teaching with the special education teacher
Anne	- some paraprofessionals are shier than the special education teacher - the paraprofessionals need more clear instructions than the special education teacher - the paraprofessional spends time more clearly with one student than the special education teacher
Raili	- some paraprofessionals are shier than the special education teacher - sometimes teaching with one paraprofessional goes even better than teaching with the special education teacher
Mikko	- the paraprofessionals have less authority than the special education teacher as they cannot, for example, penalize the students - the students get used to the paraprofessionals as they are with them in every subject and they do not respect them anymore
Antti	- does not trust the paraprofessional's skills as much as the special education teacher's
Jenni	- the special education teacher has a more noticeable role and is in front of the classroom whereas the paraprofessional goes to the back of the room
Laura	- the paraprofessional has an assisting role and they do not teach like the special education teacher

Based on the language teachers' statements, it could be concluded that, overall, co-teaching with a special education teacher was in their opinion more beneficial than teaching with a paraprofessional. This can be seen in what Raili said about her co-teaching partner thinking they were not needed when there was a paraprofessional in the classroom in example 18:

Example 18. Raili

Mä tota äsähdin yhdelle meidän erityisopettajalle tänä talvena, kun oli yks heikompi oppilas, niin se näki siel luokassa, et koulunkäyntiavustaja x istu sen lapsen vieressä, niin sitte hän lähti tämä erityisopettaja vetämään taaksepäin, että x onki tuolla, minäpä otan y:n tekemään lukitestin ja minä sanoin, että ei, sinä et ota y:tä yhtään mihinkään ja täällä on z niin sinä otat z:n ja viet tuonne koppiisi, että sinähän olet se erityisopettaja. Siis mä panin sen järjestykseen. Mä luulin et se on mulle suuttunut koko loppuelämäksi, mut ei se ollu. Mut se, että hänhän ite pistää oman työpanoksensa avian kölin alta, jos hän näkee, et on koulunkäyntiavustaja, että minua ei tarvita. Siis hän vertaa itseänsä koulunkäyntiavustajaan, niin eihän siinä oo mitää järkee. Heiän palkathan on ihan erilaisia. Jos hän ite kokee, että hän ei pysty parempaan kuin koulunkäyntiavustaja, niin se on aika kummallista.

I snapped to one special education teacher this winter as there was one weaker student and the special education teacher saw that paraprofessional x sat next to that child so this special education teacher started to back up and said that oh x is there, let me take y to do a reading test and I said no, you don't take y anywhere, z is here so you take z to your room as you are the special education teacher, after all. So I put them in order. I thought that they would be mad at me for the rest of their life but they weren't. But that they underestimate their work completely if they see that there is a paraprofessional and that they are not needed. So they compare themselves to a paraprofessional and that doesn't make any sense. Their salaries are totally different, though. If they feel that they can't do better than a paraprofessional, that is strange.

In conclusion, the participants' experiences in their co-teaching relationships were mainly positive. Successful communication between the teachers was one of the most important factors affecting their well-being in their co-teaching relationships.

4.2. The participants' perceptions on co-teaching

In this part, the English and Swedish teachers' perceptions on co-teaching with special education teachers are presented. The chapter includes five themes. The first theme is the support that co-teaching gives to teachers and students and the second theme concerns co-teaching as an answer to the challenges of inclusion. In the third theme the teachers' observations on co-teaching, specifically, in languages are presented. In the fourth theme, the participants' perceptions on what is effective co-teaching and how it could be, further, developed are presented. The changes that have happened in the participants' perceptions and the co-teaching that they have conducted will be presented in the fifth theme.

4.2.1 Co-teaching as a supporter of teachers and students

This theme includes the participants' perceptions on the advantages of co-teaching. There were several positive sides to co-teaching with a special education teacher according to the English and Swedish teachers. The most mentioned points are listed in table 17.

Table 17. Positive sides of co-teaching according to the participants

Positive sides of co-teaching	Heidi	Niko	Anne	Raili	Mikko	Antti	Jenni	Laura
Help and support for language teacher	X	X	X			X	X	
More help and attention for students	X	X		X	X			X
Better discipline and peace in classroom		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Special education teacher's knowledge	X	X	X					
Excellent when works			X	X	X			X

One of the most mentioned benefits of co-teaching was that the special education teacher could help the language teacher with the special education students and support the language teacher, also, otherwise. Another benefit that the participants referred to was that together with the special education teacher they had more time for individual students and as Laura mentioned general education students could ask

help from the special education teacher, too. Special education teachers' knowledge about teaching special education students and official paperwork related to organizing teaching to them was regarded useful, as well. Niko commented on the matter like this in example 19:

Example 19. Niko

Täällä on sellasia ryhmiä, joissa on useampi, joka vaatii sitä apua koko ajan niin sitte, jos sä oot yksin opettajana niin sä et mitenkään pysty auttamaan sitä yksittäistä oppilasta, koska sun pitäis koko ajan kiertää paikasta toiseen ja se on mahdotonta. Sinänsä se erityisopettaja on hyvä, koska hänellä on eri se aspekti, kuinka työskennellä.

We have such groups here in which there are more than one students who need help all the time and if you are alone as a teacher there is no way that you could help that individual student because you should circulate constantly from one place to another and that is impossible. In that case the special education teacher is needed as they have that different way to do things.

In Niko's opinion, the special education teacher was needed in the classroom, especially, if there were several special education students in a group. The most common benefit that the participants talked about was that when there were two teachers in the classroom, they could better ensure the peace in the classroom together. For many, it was useful and important that there was any other adult in the classroom to help them with educating the students. Half of the language teachers said that there are only positive sides to co-teaching if it works well and they, almost, could not name any negatives related to it. Of course, it is possible that even the teachers who did not mention some of the benefits listed would have agreed with their colleagues, but all the points just did not occur to them during the interview.

4.2.2 Co-teaching as an answer to the challenges of inclusion

In this theme, the participants' perceptions on how co-teaching answers to the challenges caused by inclusion and how useful co-teaching is are presented. Inclusion is closely related to co-teaching because co-teaching is one of the methods that are used to ensure every student's learning in inclusive classrooms. All teachers except one felt

that co-teaching is needed, for example, when trying to overcome challenges caused by inclusion. Laura commented on the matter like this in example 20:

Example 20. Laura

Joo on se varmaa ihan tarpeellista varsinki, kun tää inkluusiohan on päivän sana, et jos siihen mennää enemmän ja enemmän niin kyl mun mielest varsinki sitte tällänen erityisopettajan kanssa tehtävä yhteistyö luokassa alkaa olemaa ihan välttämätöntä.

Yea, I think it is quite needed especially as inclusion is so trendy nowadays that if there is more and more of it, I think that then this kind of co-operation with a special education teacher in a classroom becomes completely necessary.

In Laura's opinion, the importance of co-teaching increases the more inclusive the groups become over time. In example 21, Raili saw the need for co-teaching but expressed, also, some negative realities related to conducting it in weaker groups.

Example 21. Raili

Kyllähän siinä on hirveen tarpeen. Sit voi miettiä taas toisaalta yhteiskunnan kannalta, et se rahallinen panostus, mitä menee niitten vitosen kutosen poikien ruotsiin niin eihän sille tuu mitään tuotosta, et siihen laitetaan kahen aikuisen palkka niinku siihen, et vedetään kivirekee perässä niin siitä vois olla semmosille taitavammille lapsille enemmän hyötyä, mikä yhteiskuntaaki hyödyttäis.

It is very needed there. But then you can think about it from society's point of view that that money that is put to teaching Swedish to boys who have grades 5 and 6, it doesn't give anything back. Salary of two adults is put to dragging them behind and that money could benefit talented children more and that would benefit society, too.

Raili was not entirely sure if, forcefully, trying to make everybody learn very well, is worth the teachers' time and administrators' money. She felt that there should be more focus on giving opportunities for the talented students, as well. Heidi was the only one who did not, completely, see the need for co-teaching as can be seen in example 22:

Example 22. Heidi

Ehkä joskus olis parempi se, että sieltä otetaan jotkut tietyt pois erilliseen tilaan, et turhaan tulee semmosta monesti siihen työrauhaan liittyvää ongelmaa. Et jos aina sokeasti ajatellaan, et tää on se paras vaihtoehto tää samanaikaisopetus, koska se ei aina oo kuitenkaan ihan paras. Et jos on oikeasti sellainen tilanne, et muuten ryhmä toimis hyvin, mutta siel on vaikka jotkus kaks, jotka pelkästään vaa häiritsee, sillo musta välillä on parempi et ne otetaa sieltä pois.

Maybe sometimes it would be better that some students are taken to a separate room as, often, there is problems with peace in the classroom for no reason. If we always blindly think that this co-teaching is the best option even though it is not always quite the best. If there is, for example, such a situation that the group would, otherwise, function well but there are, for instance, two students who, only, disrupt then I think it is sometimes better to take them away from there.

In Heidi's opinion, co-teaching constantly to be able to be inclusive is not the best possible situation for the students who are bothered by the special education students' behavior in the classroom. Niko commented on the matter saying, that he thinks that co-teaching is not necessary in good groups because the students will study well regardless.

Five of the eight teachers thought that co-teaching had a positive effect on the students' learning. Some of them did not, necessarily, see a difference in the students' grades but more in how they behaved during lessons and that better behavior lead to more progress. In example 23, Antti tells about the positive effects of co-teaching in his groups.

Example 23. Antti

Kyllä ihan karuimmissa tapauksissa sillä, että tuloksia tuli eli luokassa oltiin ja saatiin koe tehtyä. Mutta kyllä ihan sellasissakin tilanteissa, että oppilaalla oli haasteita x y, mut olis tehny ne laput muutenki niin kyllä ihan käytännössä huomattavissa kyllä koetuloksissa oli parempia havaittavissa. Sitte kun kuunteli heitä, kun he puhu, heidän lukutahtinsa parani aika suoranaisesti kerta kerralta. Ei tule mieleeni sellasta tilannetta, että erkka olis luokassa ja olis tilanne menny huonompaan suuntaan.

In the most severe cases it showed in such way that there were some results, so the students were in the classroom and got the exam done. But, also, in such situations that a student had problems x and y but would have done the tasks anyway, there was improvement in the exam results. Then when I listened to them speak their reading speed got better every time. I don't remember such a situation that the special education teacher would have been in the classroom and the situation would have gotten worse.

According to Antti, without co-teaching some students did not get anything done so they really benefited from the additional attention co-teaching provided them. Furthermore, Antti had noticed improvement in some students' exam results. Three teachers said that they did not notice any difference in the learning results compared to traditional teaching. Many teachers, also, mentioned that it was difficult to estimate co-teaching's effect on the students' academical results as they could not compare the same students' performance before and after co-teaching.

Overall, the English and Swedish teachers considered co-teaching as a useful tool when teaching inclusive groups. The special education students needed co-teaching the most according to the participants.

4.2.3 Co-teaching in languages

In this theme, the participants' perceptions on how co-teaching suits languages and how it could be used in language teaching are presented. The participating English and Swedish teachers talked about many different tasks and divisions in language teaching in which co-teaching is useful in their opinion. Many teachers perceived that co-teaching suits language teaching well even though they admitted that it was challenging to compare its usage in languages to teaching of other subjects as they had, only, taught languages. Anne felt that co-teaching is useful, especially, in Swedish teaching as, in her opinion, many students tend to lack motivation to study it in Finland. Niko and Mikko talked about that when the language teacher, sometimes, needs to lecture in front of the class, having another teacher to follow the students' work and ensure the peace in the classroom is helpful. Four teachers felt that it was helpful that when they taught more difficult content, for example, grammar, the special education teacher was there to help the students with the language teacher.

They considered the special education teacher's skills to simplify the taught matters and use their own teaching methods with some students as valuable. This is what Niko said about co-teaching in languages in example 24:

Example 24. Niko

Hankalaa välillä, kun heillä ei oo käsitystä, että mikä on preesens, perfekti, ei oo suomeksikaan. Niin miten sitä opettaa vieraalla kielellä? Jos opettaja tietää, kenellä on ne suuremmat, niin heidän kanssaan erityisopettaja voi sitte oikein keskittyä siihen asiaan. Se vois toimia, että jos kielioppiasiaa käydään läpi, niin erityisopettaja pystyy siinä auttamaan, jos itte selittää vähän hankalasti. Ja että erityisopettaja pystyy niiden kanssa katsomaan, jotka tarvitsee eniten apua ja ite pystyy menemään vähän eri tahtia.

It is hard sometimes as they don't have a clue about what is present or perfect tense even in Finnish. So how can you teach it in another language? If the teacher knows who are the ones that have the biggest problems, the special education teacher can focus on the issue with them. It could work when grammar is taught that the special education teacher could help if I explain something inconveniently. And the special education teacher can work with the ones who need help the most and I can proceed in my own pace.

As Niko stated, a special education teacher is useful in language classes as many students struggle with languages and even their own mother tongue. Heidi and Mikko said that co-teaching is useful when the students work orally with their partner as there are two teachers to observe how they are doing. In example 25, Heidi tells about another co-teaching method that they have used in which they group the students into smaller groups when going through chapters in the textbook.

Example 25. Heidi

Käsitellään kappale välillä sillä tavalla, että jaetaan kolmeen pienempään ja suullisesti ja viimeksi oli niin, että siinä pitää aina miettiä, että ketä sit niinku millonki mihinki, että viimeks esimerkiks laitoin erityisopettajalle pelkästään niinku tehostetun tuen oppilaat, joita sattuu olemaan kaks siinä ryhmässä ja kolmannelle ohjaajalle annoin semmosia oppilaita, jotka pärjää vähän

paremmin, jotka ei tarvii niin paljon sitä apua ja sitte ite otin semmosen sekalaisen ryhmän. Että luohan se mahollisuuksia, kun on useampi.

Sometimes we go through a chapter so that we divide the students to three smaller groups and last time we did so that, you always have to think about who you put where and when, that last time I gave the special education teacher, only, the ones who are in intensified support who happened to be two in that group and the third paraprofessional I gave such students who don't need that much help and I took a mixed group. So it really does create possibilities when you have several adults in the classroom.

In Heidi's example, the students were divided into groups according to their skills and each adult taught such group that corresponded their strengths as instructors. Antti presented many co-teaching methods that could be used in language teaching. His ideas for co-teaching can be seen in example 26:

Example 26. Antti

Jos puhutaan vaikka lausuntaharjoituksesta, et jos mä sanon jonku asian kerran, niin porukka, joilla on vaikeuksia kuullun ymmärtämisen kanssa niin erkka voi sitten toistaa. Tai sitte mitä tulee lukemiseen, jos tehdään jotain normaalia lukemisharjoitusta neljä viis ryhmää ja lukevat porukalla ja sit jos on yks ryhmä, jossa saattaa olla lukihäiriöisiä tai muuta niin erkka voi siihen keskittyä heidän kanssaan. [...] Itse oon dramatisoinnin suuri ystävä, että yleensä lukutehtävissä, jos se on kirjassa, niin on useita henkilöitä, että ihan dialogina tulis lukutehtävät, että ei pistäis nauhaa päälle, että kielenopettaja ja erkka lukis keskenää. [...] Kielenopetuksessa on iso asia, että millaisella äänellä sä sitä kuulet. Mä uskon siihenki kyllä, että kun opettajat englantia puhuvat, vaikka täydellinen ei pidä ollakaa, koska on hyvä olla luomatta liikaa painetta. Toisaalta ääni vois olla ihan hyvä esimerkki, että tältä se kuulostaa, kun se on iha hyvää. Että jos kuulee useammankin äänen, niin toivoisin sen olevan oppilaille motivoivaa sillee, et vau noi molemmat osaa.

When talking about, for example, practicing speaking, if I say something once, the special education teacher can repeat it for those who have problems with listening comprehension. Or what comes to reading if we do some normal reading task, four five groups read together and if there is a group in which there

might be dyslexics or something else then the special education teacher can focus on it with them. [...] I am a great friend of dramatizing so usually if there are multiple characters in the book texts, the language teacher and the special education teacher could read it out loud together as a dialog and we wouldn't use the tape at all. [...] In language teaching, how the language that you hear is spoken is meaningful. I, at least, believe in that when the teachers speak English, even though you don't have to be perfect, because it is not good to create too much pressure. On the other hand, a voice could be a good example that this is what it sounds like when it is relatively good. So if the students hear multiple voices, I'd hope that it would be motivating for them like wow, they both can speak.

Like Heidi, Antti divided students into groups according to their skills, too, in the co-taught lessons. He, also, mentioned interesting points concerning speech that the students hear in the classroom. Heidi and Jenni felt that, maybe, special education teachers do not have as much expertise at languages and language teaching as them. They, however, did not even expect it from them and they were ready to answer their questions when needed.

The most used co-teaching method in language teaching was grouping the students according to their skills, especially, when challenging and crucial topics were taught. Many students have difficulties in languages and that is why the teachers perceived that co-teaching is useful in English and Swedish classes even though they could not compare languages to other subjects.

4.2.4 Perceptions on effective co-teaching and suggestions for improvements

In this theme, the language teachers' perceptions on how co-teaching that does not work in a best possible manner is presented. Their opinions on what, vice versa, is effective co-teaching and how the current situation in schools could be improved are, also, presented. The only negative side to co-teaching that was mentioned by more than two participants was that the special education teachers did not have enough time and that was, why the plans were not, always, followed. Heidi's experience on the issue can be seen in example 27:

Example 27. Heidi

Ku heidän aikataulut joustaa, että sitte eivät ylipäätään pääse paikalle, nii välillä on semmosta niinku ennakoimattomuutta siinä, että ei pysty tietää, että onks mulla nyt just se erkka sinne tulossa vai joudunksmä olee yksin. Että sit välillä pitää niinku hihasta tai lennosta vaihtaa suunnitelmaa. Ei nyt pystykää sitte tekemään tätä, johon mä olisin ehdottomasti tarvinnu.

As their timetables are flexible that they then can't come to the class at all so sometimes there is unpredictability that I can't know if the special education teacher is going to come or if I have to be alone. So sometimes I have to change the plan on the go. That I can't now do this thing where I would have absolutely needed the special education teacher.

As seen in the example, the special education teacher did not, for instance, sometimes attend the classes that they were supposed to co-teach with a language teacher. In addition to Heidi, other teachers had had similar situations, too. Niko did not like that the special education teacher tended to come to the class late and by doing so disturbed his teaching. Mikko said that, sometimes, when they advised the students at the same time, their orders got mixed up with each other. Laura told that they, sometimes, had trouble deciding what kind of roles they would take in the classroom. Raili's experience was very interesting and probably quite unique as her best experiences were from her previous school from the beginning of her career like she told in example 28:

Example 28. Raili

Olis vaikka sillee hienoo ja näin mä tein siinä entisessä elämässäni, että me jaettiin se luokka kahtia, erityisope tuolla ja minä täällä. Hänellä oli vähemmän väkeä ja sit niinku pidettiin kahta tuntia yhtä aikaa. Mut tää on tapahtunu siis 90-luvulla eli siellä, mistä mä tulin niin me oltiin siellä kyllä hirveen edistyksellisiä. Niin kun mä tulin tänne niin kelloa vedettiin niinku taaksepäin. Tää on hirveen vanhanaikainen paikka siihen, mitä me siellä tehtiin. Ei sillon alkuvuosina ollu täällä ollenkaan, että erityisopettaja tuli luokkaan, mut oli sellasia vuosia, että ei täällä ollu muita erityisopettajia muutaku joku x. Mä en

tiedä, onko tää vaan mun kohdalle sattunut, että nää parhaat ajat on siellä menneessä.

It would be great and this is what I did in my previous life that we divided the group in two, the special education teacher there and I was here. They had less students and then we kind of held two lessons at the same time. But this happened in 90's so there where I came from we were very advanced. When I came here it was like the clock was rotated backwards. This is a very old-fashioned place compared to what we did there. In the beginning we didn't have co-teaching at all here but we had such years that we didn't have other special education teachers than x. I don't know if this has happened, only, to me that the best times are in the past.

She felt that the methods that they used with her co-teaching partner in the 90's were more advanced than the methods she had ended up using in her current school.

Planning was considered problematic by two teachers not only because they did not know if the special education teacher would attend the classes but also because they would have wanted the special education teacher to help them more with it and, thus, be more prepared. Almost all participants stated that they had planned the classes alone and the special education teacher had just emerged to the classroom. Some teachers mentioned that they had quickly talked through their plans with the special education teacher before the class during the break, but that the special education teacher had just accepted their plans without changing them. One mentioned reason for this habit was that they did not have a predetermined time for co-planning in their schedules. Another possible reason could be that they felt that planning alone took less time than co-planning. In example 29, Mikko tells about how he has planned the classes with his co-teaching partner.

Example 29. Mikko

Yleensä ollaan otettu puheeksi välitunnilla ennen sitä tuntia käyty vähän lävitte, että mitäs tänään. Tuolla ollaan ihan suht hyvin pärjätty tähän mennessä. Se on lähinnä mulla se, että millai mä sen tunnin pidän ja se on aika lailla mun käsissä se rakenne siinä, että ei semmosta hirveesti ollu, että toinen ois ehdottanu, että tehään tällönen tehtävä.

Usually, we have talked during the break before the class about what we are going to do that day. That has pretty much been enough so far. I am mostly the one who decides how the lesson is taught and what we do. There has not been much such that the special education teacher would have suggested that let's do this kind of task.

The manner in which Mikko had planned his co-taught lessons alone and, then, quickly gone through his plans with the special education teacher during the break before the lesson was very typical. In example 30, Laura speaks about how planning of co-taught classes differs from her planning her own lessons.

Example 30. Laura

On siihen kulunut enemmän, et ehkä noit tuntei, kun siihen liittyy toinenkin opettaja niin suunnittelee tarkemmin, et sit ennen tuntii pitää kuitenkin kertoa hänelle, et mitä on suunnitelmis. Et tällee kun on ollu jo monta vuotta opettajana niin ehkä joskus saattaa omal oppitunnil mennä sillee, et kattoo et ai nii me ollaan nyt täs kohtaa menos ja lähtee etenemään. Pitää sil toisel kertoa niit niin on se vähän työläämpää.

It has taken more time as when there is another teacher you plan more carefully as you have to tell them before class that what you are planning to do. As I have been teacher many years, already, I might sometimes go to my own lesson so that I check where we are at the material and continue from there. When you have to tell about your plans to the other, it is a bit more work.

Planning co-taught classes took more time than planning other classes and it was done more carefully according to Laura. Planning of the classes was the most mentioned aspect influencing the effectivity of co-teaching. Three teachers thought that careful planning makes co-teaching effective. Two of the participants stated that it would make co-teaching more effective if the special education teacher participated more in the planning.

Nevertheless, the participants had opinions on what effective co-teaching is like, too. Three teachers mentioned that effective co-teaching is such that the special education teacher has an active role, too, and that the teachers have clear roles. Heidi commented

on the issue saying that what is effective changes depending on the situation and among other matters, she told about making sitting arrangements in the classroom in example 31:

Example 31. Heidi

Esimerkiksi joskus hän ihan miettii, että mikä olis hyvä istumajärjestys, et ihan semmostaki. Se on sitä tehokkuutta joskus, ku hän pystyy siinä hetkessä tarkkailee niitä, mitä tuolla tapahtuu, et ketkä on hyvä olla erillää ja muuta. Tekee varmasti paremman istumajärjestyksen ku toi Wilma tuolla.

For example, sometimes they think about what could be a good sitting arrangement, so even things like that. It is effective sometimes when they can in the moment observe what is happening in the classroom and which students are good to be kept apart and stuff. They for sure make a better sitting arrangement than that Wilma there.

Antti pondered about what would be the most effective co-teaching like this in example 32:

Example 32. Antti

Tää, että kieltenopettaja vetää ja erkka tukee, itse koen sen tehokkaaks. Sitte jos mietitään tilannetta, että erityisopettajaki olis siinä selittämäs taikka oltais etukäteen jaettukin tietty materiaali, että minä selittäisin vartin ja sitte erkka jatkaa asiasta vaikka yksityiskohtasemmin sillee vielä tai toisinpäin, että erkka esittää asian yleispiirteisesti ja sitte minä kielen asiantuntijana sitte menisin yksityiskohtiin. Oisko se tehokkaampaa? Kenties. [...] Se ei olis ollu siinä mielessä, mitä tuli sanottuaki siitä resurssien käytöstä. Siinähan menis suunnitteluaikaa niin paljon enemmän verrattuna siihen, että mullon nyt tässä nämä, onks hyvä? Olihan se nopeempaa. Missä nyt saadaan se tehokkaaks niin ehkä se kannattaa tehdä.

This that the language teacher leads and the special education teacher supports, I see it as effective. Then if we think about a situation where the special education teacher would be there to explain, too or we would have divided a certain material and I would explain for 15 minutes and then the special education teacher would continue more specifically or the other way round that the special

education teacher would explain the matter generally and then I as a specialist of the language would go to specifics. Would it be more effective? Possibly. [...] It would not have been when thinking about what I said about using resources. That would take so much more planning time than if I would just present what I had planned alone. It was faster. I think that, maybe, we should do the thing that is the most effective.

When looking at these examples, it is obvious that effectiveness can be measured in many means and when thinking about co-teaching, it can be seen from a student's or a teacher's standpoint.

The teachers had some suggestions on how their co-teaching could be improved in the future. Their suggestions are listed in table 18.

Table 18. The participants' suggestions for improving of the co-teaching

What could be improved	Times mentioned
The special education teacher should have a more active role	8
The special education teacher should be available more	3
More time for co-planning	2
The special education teacher should give more feedback	1
More tips for teaching from the special education teacher	3

All participants agreed on that the special education teacher should have a more active role in their co-teaching. They wished that he or she would participate more on the planning and have more responsibility in the classroom, too. Mikko's suggestions can be seen in example 33:

Example 33. Mikko

On miettinyt sitäki, että olis joku semmonen tunti, että mä oon siellä tunnilla, mutta mä en oo kuitenkaan se ns pääopettaja, että vois olla kivaakin, että jompikumpi hoitais vuoron perään niit juttuja. Et se on aina sillai et mä oon se, joka alotan tunnit ja annan tehtävät ja muut ja pistän läksyt näkyvii ja sit toinen vaan niinku on vähän siellä kiertämäs sitte, kattoo et kaikki sujuu. Että ehkä itteki

vois olla joskus siellä oppilaiden seassa ja toinen vois hoitaa sen tunnin pääpiirteessään, mutta sitä ei oo tullu kokeiltua tähän mennessä koskaa.

I have thought about that, too, that we would have such lesson that I am there but that I would not be the main teacher. It might be nice that we would take turns taking care of the things. It is always so that I am the one to start the lessons and I give the tasks and stuff and show the answers to the homework and then the other one is there to just circulate and check that everything runs smoothly. That maybe I could, too, be sometimes among the students and the other teacher could mainly take care of the lesson but we have never tried it so far.

In addition to the wish mentioned in the example, Mikko wished, also, that the special education teacher would give him more feedback on his teaching. Antti and Jenni would have wanted to have more time for co-planning. Three teachers said that special education teachers should have more time for co-teaching or that if they do not have enough time, there should be more of them in schools.

Three teachers perceived that they needed more advice from the special education teacher for how to help the special education students. Niko referred to the lack of education on the special needs as a beginning teacher in example 34:

Example 34. Niko

Enemmän erityisopettajalta toivois vinkkejä siihen, että miten näiden tukioppilaiden kanssa vois asioita niinkun esimerkiksi käydä läpi, koska et sä, jos sä tuut opettajankoulutuksesta, niin eihän niitä oo mihnään käyty läpi mitään niitä. Ehkä enemmän toivois, että jos on vaikka lukihäiriö, miten tehdä siellä.

I would want more tips from the special education teacher for how I could go through the things with the special education students because you can't if you come from the teacher education, these things have not been gone through there. Maybe I would wish advice for if there is, for instance, dyslexia that what I am supposed to do there.

Niko had not had education on how to teach, for instance, dyslexic students and that is why he felt that he needed help from the special education teacher. According to the language teachers, education on the co-teaching with a special education teacher was

practically nonexistent in teacher studies. Six teachers said that co-teaching with a special education teacher was not practiced or talked about at all in teacher studies and the remaining two told that it was, at least, not tried in practice if it was sometimes mentioned. Four participants stated that they had practiced teaching with another language teacher student. Niko commented on co-teaching in the teacher education like this in example 35:

Example 35. Niko

Jos ottaa erityisopettajan kanssa, niin en yhtään, koska mun mielestä sitä ei käyty mitenkään, koska meillä oli se erityisopettajan kurssi niin se oli vaan sellasta, että opettaja sano, mene hänen kanssaan, mutta hän ei antanu mitään vinkkejä, miten tehdä siinä nii ei se oikein mitenkää siinä toiminu. Jos ottaa samanaikaisopetus ilman erityisopettajaa niin siitä on kyllä positiivisia kokemuksia. Just opiskeluaikana meilläki oli saksas, kun se oli mun pääaine, meitä oli vaan kolme siellä, niin me alussa tehtiin kaikki oppitunnit yhdessä, suunniteltiin, pidettiin myös ne yhdessä, että ensin kolmestaan, sitte kahdestaa. Meillä oli just sellanen hyvä porukka, niin se oli niin loistava ku voi olla, ku itellä on aina omat strategiat, miten mennä, sitten ku muiden kanssa työskentelee, niin oppii heiltäki siinä samalla. Sellasta ainaki ite toivois normaalikouluihinki enemmän ja kyllä se erityisopettajanki kanssa varmasti toimis tosi hyvin, että suunnitteluvaiheessa sais vähän käydä sitä läpi.

If you think about co-teaching with a special education teacher, we didn't practice it at all because when we had a course held by a special education teacher, it was just such that the special education teacher said that go with that student but they didn't give any advice on what to do so it didn't work pretty much at all. If you think about practicing co-teaching without a special education teacher, I have positive experiences of that. When I studied, we had only three students in my major German and in the beginning, we conducted all the lessons together. We held and planned them together, first all three of us and then in pairs. We had a good group so it was as brilliant as can be as I, always, have my own strategies on how to teach and then when you work with others you learn things from them, too. Such I would like to see more in teacher training schools,

and it would work well with a special education teacher, too, that you could go through the lessons with them when planning.

Even though the participants had not received training on co-teaching with a special education teacher in their teacher studies, they had not received much education on it from their schools, either. Four teachers said that they had not had any training on co-teaching after their teacher studies or, at least, they had not participated in it. Antti told that co-teaching had been discussed in their school, occasionally, but there had not been any training available, possibly, because there was not enough time. Heidi and Anne remembered that they had had a special education teacher visiting their school and lecturing about co-teaching. Laura had been in a co-teaching training and she felt that it had been very important as she told in example 36:

Example 36. Laura

Mä olin semmoses päivän kestäväs koulutukses, joka nimenomaan valmensi tähän samanaikaisopetukseen. Et siel oli esimerkkejä kouluttajis, jotka oli alakoulus pitäny tämmöstä samanaikaisopetusta, mut sit oli myös aineenopettajia. Me, jotka siellä oltiin niin me ollaan sitä kokeiltu. Mä luulen, et se koulutus oli vähän tällänen sysäys. Ehdottomasti mä oon sitä mieltä, että koulutus on tarpeen, koska en mä olis varmaan ilman sitä lähteny kokeileen.

I was in a training for a one day that namely trained us for this co-teaching. There were examples among the trainers who had done this co-teaching in primary school but then there were subject teachers, as well. Us who were in that training have tried co-teaching. I think that that training was kind of a push. I think that training is definitely needed as I probably would not have tried co-teaching without it.

From the participants' answers, it could be concluded that there should be more education on co-teaching, especially, with a special education teacher. That would give the teachers a better understanding about what effective co-teaching is like and encourage them to try it in their own classrooms. It could, also, be concluded that if language teachers are not taught how to teach special education students even in the future, co-teaching with special education teachers will remain crucial when teaching inclusive groups.

In conclusion, the most important factor that made co-teaching effective according to the participating language teachers was that the special education teacher had an active role in planning and in the classroom just like the language teacher did. Lack of co-planning time and busy special education teachers deteriorated the quality of co-teaching. The participants perceived that more education on co-teaching would definitely be needed.

4.2.5 Changes in the language teachers' perceptions and co-teaching conducted

In this theme, the manner how the language teachers' perceptions on the co-teaching have changed and how their own co-teaching has developed are presented. What they have learned from the special education teachers while co-teaching and what they, overall, think that language teachers could learn from special education teachers will be presented, too. The teachers were asked how their perceptions on the co-teaching changed when they started to conduct it themselves. Their answers are collected into table 19.

Table 19. Change in teachers' perceptions on co-teaching

Change in own perceptions	Heidi	Niko	Anne	Raili	Mikko	Antti	Jenni	Laura
Remained the same, positive					X	X		
Remained the same, vague		X						
Changed to more positive	X							X
Could not answer			X	X			X	

Mikko and Antti's perception on co-teaching was positive, already, before they started teaching and they wished that they could have a special education teacher in the classroom to help them. Their perceptions had not changed after gaining experience on it. Niko's perception on what co-teaching is about was not very clear before trying it and it had not changed much because he had had so few classes with a special education teacher. Heidi and Laura had some doubts before starting to co-teach but their opinions had changed to more positive as they had gotten used to it. Anne, Raili

and Jenni could not answer the question as they had not really thought about co-teaching before starting to conduct it.

The participants did not have much to say about how their co-teaching had developed. Five of the teachers could not pinpoint anything that would have improved in their co-operation with their co-teaching partners. Reasons mentioned for the lack of improvement were too short time of co-teaching together and that they had talked about co-teaching with their partners but had not done anything to make their teaching better. Like seen above in example 7, Anne told that she had learned to plan the lessons so that the special education teacher being in the classroom would be utilized as well as possible. In example 37, Laura tells about their development.

Example 37. Laura

Alus todettiin joskus tunnin jälkeen, et tää ei ollutkaan hyvä juttu ja sit ollaan tehty se toisel tavalla. Ehkä nyt sit myöhemmin on ollu semmosii tuntei, et tunnin jälkeen ollaan oltu sitä mieltä, et kaikki meni ihan ok sit, ku ollaan saatu vähän keksittyä niitä juttuja mitkä toimii siin tietyssä luokassa ja mitkä ei toimi.

In the beginning, we noticed sometimes after a lesson that this was not a good thing and then we have done it differently. Maybe later we have now had such classes that we have thought afterwards that everything went ok as we have come up with what works with that certain group and what doesn't.

Laura and her co-teaching partner had learned what works and what does not through trial and error. Heidi told that their co-teaching had, simply, developed so that they had radically reduced the times when the special education teacher had taken students to his or her own room and increased co-operation in the classroom. She told, also, that in the beginning she had had to tell the special education teacher more about which students need extra help.

The language teachers told about multiple issues that they had learnt from the special education teachers and what language teachers could, overall, learn from special education teachers. In table 20, the issues that the participants told they had learnt from the special education teachers are listed.

Table 20. What the participants have learnt from special education teachers

Teacher	What the teacher has learnt from the special education teacher
Heidi	- cannot really tell
Niko	- how to teach, for example, grammar for special education students - how to differentiate exams for special education students
Anne	- has learnt to see behind the students' behavior and understand them better
Raili	- practical matters such as making larger line spacing for the special education students
Mikko	- has learnt to see behind the students' behavior and understand them better
Antti	- has learnt not to differentiate downwards for the special education students but upwards for the others and other matters related to differentiation
Jenni	- nothing really
Laura	- how to teach, for example, grammar for special education students

The participants had learnt, for example, to teach grammar and differentiate teaching and materials for the special education students from the special education teachers. Some language teachers had, also, learned to understand the students' behavior better. Mikko told about what he had learnt for the special education teacher like this in example 38:

Example 38. Mikko

No siis semmosta suhtautumista vähän, että kun nehän koko ajan näkee kaikenlaisia tilanteita ja tietää, mitä kotona tapahtuu ja muuta, että ehkä vähän semmosta, että vois itekin ottaa rennommin siinä tilanteessa, että niillä oppilailla on kuitenkin niitä taustahommia, jotka näkyy siinä tunnilla. Et ehkä hiukan ymmärrystä tullu sitä kautta enemmän tohon oppilaitten tilanteeseen, mitä aiemmin ei ehkä miettiny samalla tavalla.

Well, I have learnt to look at the situations differently as the special education teachers see all kinds of situations all the time and know what is happening in

the student's homes and stuff so maybe such that I could take it more easy in a situation, too, because the students have these things in the background, after all, and they affect their behavior during lessons. So maybe I have gained some understanding towards the students' different situations through co-teaching which I didn't think about earlier as much.

Mikko had realized that, sometimes, students' bad behavior is a result of, for example, problems at home and he had become more compassionate.

Moreover, the participants had many suggestions on what language teachers could learn from special education teachers. Their ideas are listed in table 21.

Table 21. What language teachers could learn from special education teachers

Teacher	What could language teachers learn from special education teachers
Heidi	- how to teach special education students and which methods to use with them
Niko	- how to teach special education students and which methods to use with them - how to discipline students who have, for example, ADHD
Anne	- how to see matters from the students' point of view
Raili	- practical matters
Mikko	- learn to spare more time for the students, for example, after classes
Antti	- learn to simplify the language that is spoken when teaching
Jenni	- cannot think of anything
Laura	- rhymes and word plays to help memorizing and learning

The participants' suggestions on what language teachers could learn from special education teachers were very similar to what they told that they had learnt themselves. In example 39, Antti stated that while co-teaching with special education teachers, he had realized language teachers could pay more attention on what kind of language they use while they teach heterogenous groups on students.

Example 39. Antti

Itte kun on ollu omasta mielestään lapsesta asti hyvä puhuja, niin toivois sopivaa nöyryyttä sillee lakata uskomasta likaa omaan erinomaisuuteensa, mitä tulee niinku kielen käyttäjänä. Se voi hyvinki pelottaa opiskelijoita, joilla on haasteita. Ihan vaan tämmönen sanavaraston yksinkertaistamine, lauseiden tiivistäminen, ku sitte samoissa tilanteissa nää erkat he oli hyvin tiivistä sananpartta, ei mitää fancy words. Semmone oikean rekisterin omaksuminen siitä, mikä on omassa päässä sitä hyvää ja oikeaa kieltä.

As I have been in my opinion good at speaking since childhood, I would wish for being more humble like stop believing too much on my own excellence what comes to using languages. That can easily scare the students who have challenges. Just using simpler vocabulary and shortening the sentences as in similar situations the special education teachers used very condensed language and no fancy words. Learning to use a suitable language compared to what is in my head good and correct language.

Concluded, there was not much change in the language teachers' perception on co-teaching after they had started to conduct it. This could be because they had not had much education on it so maybe they did not have much of an opinion on it beforehand, at all. The co-teaching they had conducted had not developed much over time, either. The participants perceived that special education teachers had more knowledge on how to teach and understand special education students and that was what they had learnt from them.

In the last chapter, I will summarize the results of this study and draw conclusions from the findings. Moreover, I will compare my results to the findings of previous research and evaluate the significance and quality of this study. Lastly, I will give suggestions for future research.

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I will, first, summarize my results and draw conclusions from them. After that, I will compare and contrast the results of this study to the results of previous

research. In the second part, I will evaluate this study and discuss what the results could be used for as well as give suggestions for future research.

5.1 Summary and conclusions of the results

The aim of this study was to examine English and Swedish teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching with special education teachers. Based on the results, all the participating English and Swedish teachers' experiences and perceptions on co-teaching with a special education teacher were largely similar. The first research question was that what kind of experiences the participants had on co-teaching. All participants felt that the attitude towards co-teaching was positive in their schools. What was considered as problematic was that there were not enough special education teachers in the schools and that was why the special education teachers were very busy. Co-teaching seemed to be a quite new concept in these schools so maybe the administrators did not yet know how to enable it as well as possible.

The most common co-teaching method that the teachers used was one teach, one drift in which the special education teacher circulated in the classroom while the language teacher taught in front (Friend and Cook 2004: 17). However, most of the participants mentioned that they circulated in the classroom, too. The language teacher, often, had the leading role in the classroom because he or she was the one who had planned the lessons. Half of the participants had, also, experience of separating some of the students to another room with the special education teacher even though co-teaching cannot be conducted in that manner. Three teachers mentioned having grouped the students into smaller groups and, thus, conducted alternative teaching (Friend and Cook 2004: 20). The special education teacher, usually, had the main responsibility of the special education students. Most of the language teachers stated that they were equal in terms of authority with the special education teacher.

The language teachers' experiences in their co-teaching relationships with special education teachers were mostly positive. Their feedback giving to each other worked well, too, in most cases. Most of them, however, mentioned also that they had sometimes wished for more feedback or they would have wanted to talk about something with their co-teaching partners, but they had not had enough courage to do

it. Many of them stated that they had co-taught more with a paraprofessional than a special education teacher. They considered co-teaching with a special education teacher to be more beneficial than with a paraprofessional as they could not trust the paraprofessionals' skills as much as the special education teachers' skills.

The second research question was that what kind of perceptions the participants had on co-teaching. The participants' perceptions on co-teaching were mainly positive just like in most of the previous studies. The language teachers felt that co-teaching offered both the teachers and the students additional support, which was one of the most common findings in previous research, too. For example, Ahtiainen et al. (2011) had similar results in their study. Almost all participants thought that co-teaching is needed when trying to overcome the challenges caused by inclusion. Co-teaching was well suited for language teaching according to the participants. The special education teacher was considered as helpful, especially, when more difficult topics such as grammar were being taught.

Most of the teachers mentioned better peace in the classroom as one of the most noticeable benefits of co-teaching. The most common opinion among the teachers was that co-teaching did not help the students in receiving better grades, but its benefit lied more on their better behavior and through that better learning results. The student's grades not improving could, partially, be related to the teachers not using the most effective co-teaching methods. Lack of education on co-teaching did not help the teachers and it is possible that not all of them even knew which co-teaching methods are the most effective according to research. Even though it was not a topic of this study, it seems that language teachers would wish for more knowledge about teaching the special education students, too. The better peace that the participants mentioned receiving by using co-teaching could have been reached to a certain extent by using paraprofessionals with enough authority. The participants, however, did not trust the paraprofessionals' pedagogical abilities as much as they did the special education teachers' skills, which makes me think that the special education teachers should not, always, be replaced by using paraprofessionals.

The most mentioned problem with co-teaching was that the special education teachers did not have enough time to invest in it. The language teachers were almost always the ones who planned the lessons most probably because there was no time to co-plan. The participants stated that co-planning time given by administrators would make co-teaching more effective. All teachers agreed on that the special education teachers should have a more active role in the classroom. Some teachers mentioned, also, that they would like to receive more advice from the special education teachers for how to help the weaker students learning, too. Education that the language teachers had received on co-teaching was basically non-existent so increasing co-teaching training in teacher studies and through schools would be needed.

There were not many changes in the teachers' perceptions on co-teaching after they had started to conduct it themselves. Lack of time to co-plan the lessons and short co-teaching experience resulted in that the teachers could not pinpoint many changes in their co-teaching over time. Lack of knowledge could be one reason to the lack of development in the participants' co-teaching over time. They might have been satisfied enough with the co-teaching that they were, already, conducting as they did not know about anything else. As many of them had started to co-teach because they were told to do so, it is possible that some of them did not even have the passion for it and wanted to get it done as effortlessly as possible. Of course, many teachers thought co-teaching was necessary when they gained experience of it, but even enthusiasm, maybe, was not enough for improvement to happen if the co-teaching was conducted, only, a couple of times a week.

The language teachers said that they had learnt to take special education students more into account and to see more behind the students' behavior when co-teaching with special education teachers. What language teachers could learn from special education teachers according to the participants is, for example, how to adjust the teaching to suit the special education students and how to encounter all students better.

The results of this study were quite similar to what researchers' have discovered previously. Participants in Strogilos et al.'s (2016) study did not conduct team teaching

but they ended up using one teach, one drift model because they did not have time for co-planning (Friend and Cook 2004: 17, 21). Another reason for them using one teach, one drift was that they felt that the special education teacher had better skills at working with the special education students. However, they wished to have more time for co-planning, regardless, like some teachers in Austin's (2001) study, too. Based on Ahtiainen et al. (2011), Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara (2012) and Pulkkinen and Rytivaara's (2015) studies, the situation was similar in Finnish schools, as well. Lack of co-planning time was, probably, the most common result in the co-teaching studies and my study was no exception. The teachers in my study did not have enough co-planning time, either, and similarly to Strogilos et al's (2016) results they, also, felt that the special education teachers had more knowledge on working with the special education students. Inter alia, these factors together resulted in them using almost only one teach, one drift model which was in previous research noticed as not the most effective co-teaching model, at least, if the teachers do not exchange their roles frequently enough. One teach, one drift is effortless to use when there is no common planning time and there is no certainty of if the special education teacher is even going to attend the lesson. (Friend and Cook 1996: 48.)

Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara (2012), Pesonen et al. (2020) and Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015) discovered that the teachers liked to be able to distribute responsibilities between two teachers. On the contrary, Austin (2001) found out that the participants of his study felt that the general education teacher had more work. Unfortunately, the results of my study were more coterminous with Austin's study due to lack of co-planning time and knowledge. Lack of co-planning time and the responsibility laying more on the language teacher resulted in the teachers using largely similar methods that they would have used without the co-teaching partner in the classroom. The results differed from Ahtiainen et al. (2011) and Rytivaara's (2012) results which indicated that the teachers experienced co-teaching being more versatile than teaching individually.

In most of the previous studies the overall perception that the participants had on co-teaching was positive, which was the same among the participants of my study, too.

Ahtiainen et al. (2011), Pesonen et al. (2020) and Rytivaara (2012) discovered in their studies that the teachers valued the support that they received from their co-teaching partners. The received support was one of the benefits of co-teaching mentioned by my participants, as well. On the contrary, in Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara's (2012) study, some teachers did not like that there was someone assisting them in the classroom. The participants of my study felt that the students received more attention and support in co-taught classrooms. Austin (2001) and Ahtiainen et al. (2011) had similar results. In my study, the teachers felt that the additional attention that the students received lead to them behaving better in the classroom. Ahtiainen et al. (2011) and Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara (2012) had similar results in their studies. In King's (2010) study the teachers felt that the special education students benefited from not being taken to a separate room. On the contrary, my participants did not always fully conduct co-teaching as the special education teachers were separated from the group, sometimes.

The participants of this study were mainly satisfied with their co-teaching relationships. One reason for that was, possibly, that they assumed that they had quite similar teaching philosophies with their co-teaching partners. Pulkkinen and Rytivaara (2015), Pesonen et al. (2020) and Rytivaara (2012) discovered that similar teaching philosophies were considered as important in a co-teaching relationship according to their participants. In Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara's (2012) study, some teachers said that they did not communicate enough with their co-teaching partners and that is why their co-operation was not as effective as possible. Teachers in Rytivaara et al.'s (2017) study noted that it is important to be able to be oneself, communicate openly with one's co-teaching partner and to be able to trust him or her. Abbye-Taylor (2014) and Pesonen et al.'s (2020) participants stated that a functional co-teaching relationship is important for successful co-teaching. The results of my study were similar. According to Pesonen et al.'s (2020) participants, what made a co-teaching relationship unpleasant was if the teachers did not agree on issues or if the co-teaching partner did not do what he or she had promised to. A similar problem could be seen in my study, too, as the participants were not happy with not knowing for sure if the special education teacher was going to attend a lesson or not.

In Chitiyo and Brinda's (2018) study, almost half of the participants had learned something about co-teaching in university education. In Pancsofar and Petroff's (2013) study, older teachers had less education on co-teaching than younger teachers. In my study, most of the teachers had had almost no education on co-teaching in teacher education and the older teachers had had it even less than the younger ones so the results were in line with Chitiyo and Brinda (2018) and Pancsofar and Petroff (2013). Half of Chitiyo and Brinda's (2018) participants did not feel ready to co-teach and their feeling of readiness did not correlate with if they had tried co-teaching or not. In Pancsofar and Petroff's (2013) study, the ones who conducted co-teaching had more education on it than the ones who did not and the ones with education were more positive and confident when co-teaching. In King's (2010) study, the participants would have wanted to have more education on co-teaching. My study gave similar results which indicated that additional education on co-teaching would probably increase teacher's readiness and willingness to co-teach. In Takala and Uusitalo-Malmivaara's (2012) study, the participants' perceptions on co-teaching changed to slightly more negative towards the end of the school year. The results in my study were not similar as, if anything, the language teachers' perceptions had become more positive over time.

5.2 Evaluation of the study and suggestions for the future

Overall, I am satisfied with how I conducted my study and how I wrote this report. What increased the quality of my study, was that I had carefully thought through my interview questions beforehand (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2017: 184). However, while I was conducting my interviews, I came up with even more interesting interview questions that I could have asked. Unfortunately, I had already conducted the first interviews and could not add new questions to the remaining interviews. I received answers to my research questions through my interview questions (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 162). As the interviews included, for example, questions about the participants' co-teaching relationships, it is possible that they did not tell me everything, especially, their more negative experiences. The results could have been more reliable if I had used an anonymous questionnaire as my data collection method, but as I stated in chapter 3, it would have been challenging to find enough participants

for it. (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2017: 186.) After all, I think that interviewing was the best possible method for this study. Through interviews, I received more detailed information than I would have through a questionnaire (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 161).

I transcribed all the interviews by using a similar method, which made my data more reliable (Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2017: 185). When analyzing the results of this study, I was as objective as possible (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 136). The results would be more generalizable if the participants would have come from schools all around the Finland from different sized cities instead of almost all of them coming from the same area (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 140). When thinking about anonymity, it would have, also, been better if I had not chosen many teachers from the same school. I would have chosen my interviewees differently if I had had more time to collect them. While conducting this study, I, also, learnt that it is easier to receive interviewees to a study by asking them face-to-face, and that is a method I would have used more if I had known how effective it is.

I have written my report very carefully and ensured that there is no plagiarism in this report (Kuula 2015: 35). The results are, solely, based on the data collected in the interviews so I have not invented them (Kuula 34, 37). I have told about the phases of my study very thoroughly in chapter 3 so that the readers of this report can see how this study was conducted (Tuomi and Sarajärvi 2011: 141). Other aspects related to the ethics of this study are discussed more in chapter 3.

Looking at co-teaching from the point of view of language teaching was challenging because the participants stated that they did not see a substantial difference in co-teaching between different subjects. They had, only, experienced co-teaching in languages and could not, hence, compare it to co-teaching in other subjects. Furthermore, it was difficult to find background information and previous research that would have been conducted from the point of view of language teaching. That is why this topic was, maybe, not the best possible for a master's thesis in English and Swedish but, on the other hand, more research on the topic was needed. Master's

theses are not intended to be scientifically significant, so the number of participants in this study was not in such level that the results could be generalized.

The topic of this study is important because there was not much research conducted on co-teaching from language teachers' point of view previously. The results suggest that co-teaching suits language teaching well in language teachers' opinion. The positivity that the participating English and Swedish teachers felt towards co-teaching could inspire more teachers to try co-teaching. The results of this study show that teachers should be provided with more co-planning time. Increased knowledge on co-teaching among administrators could help them to develop better conditions for co-teaching. There is, also, need for more education on co-teaching for language teachers. Providing more information about co-teaching for teacher students and working language teachers could lead to more effective co-teaching. Some aspects that enable effective co-teaching and co-teaching relationship are discussed in the chapter 2.6.

In the future, co-teaching in languages could be studied, for example, through a questionnaire, as it might give different results than an interview. Another possibility would be to continue collecting data through interviews with a larger sample than in this study so that more generalizable data could be gathered. In this study, the participants were English and Swedish teachers, but the topic could be researched from the point of view of teachers of other languages, too.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbye-Taylor, S. (2014). *Characteristics of Successful Co-Teaching Experiences in Classrooms with General and Special Education Students*. School of Education. Northcentral University of Arizona.
<https://search.proquest.com/openview/eece7fcd95d85e016189ac630c90f59c/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

Ahtiainen, R., Beirad, M., Hautamäki, J., Hiltavuori, T. and Thuneberg, H. (2011). Samanaikaisopetus on mahdollisuus: Tutkimus Helsingin pilottikoulujen uudistuvasta opetuksesta. *Helsingin kaupungin opetusviraston julkaisusarja*.
http://yhdesa.edu.hel.fi/pdf/Samanaikaisopetustutkimus_Helsinki_2011.pdf

Austin, V. L. (2001). Teachers' beliefs about co-teaching. *Remedial & Special Education* 22 (4), 245–255.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/074193250102200408>

Beninghof, A. M. (2012). *Co-Teaching That Works: Structures and Strategies for Maximizing Student Learning*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=817491>

Cambridge Dictionary.
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/perception>. (31 January, 2020).

Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. (1999). *Inclusive education at work: students with disabilities in mainstream schools*. Paris: OECD

Chitiyo, J. and Brinda, W. (2018). Teacher preparedness in the use of co-teaching in inclusive classrooms. *Support for Learning* 33 (1), 38–51.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1467-9604.12190>

Conderman, G., Pedersen, T. and Bresnahan, V. (2009). *Purposeful Co-Teaching: Real Cases and Effective Strategies*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=a7346c9c-4d47-4626-914f-2289bc33deca%40sdc-v-sessmgr01&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=nlebk&AN=473688>

Dufva, H. (2011). Ei kysyvä tieltä eksy: kuinka tutkia kielten oppimista ja opettamista haastattelun avulla. In P. Kalaja, R. Alanen and H. Dufva (eds.), *Kieltä tutkimassa: tutkielman laatijan opas*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 131-145.

Erityisopetuksen strategia. Opetusministeriön työryhmämuistioita ja selvityksiä 2007:47.
<http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/79498/tr47.pdf>

Friend, M. and Cook, L. (1996). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. White Plains, New York: Longman.

Friend, M. and Cook, L. (2004). Co-Teaching: Principles, practises and pragmatics. New Mexico Public Education Department. Paper presented in Quarterly Special Education Meeting, Albuquerque in 24th of April 2004.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED486454.pdf>

Hattukangas, J. and Kotimäki, T. (2010). *Samanaikaisopetus yläkoulussa – tapaustutkimus aineen- ja erityisopettajan yhteistyöstä*. Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education.
https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/23037/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-201003161326.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y

Hirsjärvi, S. and Hurme, H. (2008). *Tutkimushaastattelu: teemahaastattelun teoria ja käytäntö*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Ikonen, H. (2017). Puhelinhaastattelu. In M. Hyvärinen, P. Nikander, J. Ruusuvuori and L. Aho (eds.), *Tutkimushaastattelun käsikirja*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 270-286.

Jyväskylän yliopisto. Kasvatustieteen ja psykologian tiedekunnan erilliset opintokokonaisuudet 01.08.2017-31.07.2020.

<https://www.jyu.fi/ops/fi/edupsy/kasvatustieteiden-ja-psykologian-tiedekunnan-erilliset-opintokokonaisuudet#opettajan-pedagogiset-aineopinnot-24354>. (27 April, 2020).

Kettula, E. and Repola, T. (2008). *Samanaikaisopetuksen rakentuminen ja toteutuminen opettajien kertomana*. Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education.

https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/19208/URN_NBN_fi_jyu-200805235361.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Kalaja, P., Alanen, R. and Dufva, H. (2011). Minustako tutkija? Johdattelua tutkimuksen tekoon. In P. Kalaja, R. Alanen and H. Dufva (eds.), *Kieltä tutkimassa: tutkielman laatijan opas*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 8-32.

King, K. E. (2010). *Teachers' Perceptions of Co-Teaching in a Southern Rural County*. College of Education. University of Walden.

<https://search.proquest.com/eric/docview/964171860/355B3E7F0B1E4C7FPQ/13?accountid=11774>

Kuula, A. (2015). *Tutkimusetiikka: aineistojen hankinta, käyttö ja säilytys*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Malinen, O. and Palmu, I. (2017). Johdanto. In R. Ahtiainen, J. Kontinen, O. Malinen, I. Palmu, J. Pulkkinen, A. Rytivaara and T. Saarenketo (eds.), *Tavoitteena yhteisopettajuus: näkökulmia ja toimintamalleja onnistuneeseen yhdessä opettamiseen*. Jyväskylä: Niilo Mäki Instituutti, 10-13.

Matikainen, S. (2016). *English teacher trainees' perceptions of co-teaching*. Bachelor's thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.

<https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/48534/URN-NBN-fi-jyu-201601291348.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y>

Murawski, W. W. (2010). *Collaborative Teaching in Elementary Schools: Making the Co-Teaching Marriage Work!* Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.

Murto, P., Naukkarinen, A. and Saloviita, T. (2001). *Inklusion haaste koululle: oikeus yhdessä oppimiseen*. Jyväskylä, PS-kustannus.

Palmu, I., Kontinen, J. and Malinen, O. (2017). Pedagogiset menetelmät yhteisopetuksessa. In R. Ahtiainen, J. Kontinen, O. Malinen, I. Palmu, J. Pulkkinen, A. Rytivaara and T. Saarenketo (eds.), *Tavoitteena yhteisopettajuus: näkökulmia ja toimintamalleja onnistuneeseen yhdessä opettamiseen*. Jyväskylä: Niilo Mäki Instituutti, 66-77.

Pancsofar, N. and Petroff, J. G. (2013). Professional Development Experiences in Co-Teaching: Associations With Teacher Confidence, Interests, and Attitudes. *Teacher Education and Special Education* 36 (2), 83-96.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0888406412474996>

Peltonen, A. (2017). *Aikuisopiskelijoiden merkittävät kokemukset samanaikaisopettajuudesta*. Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education.

<https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/54637/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-201706213014.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Perttala, K. and Salonen, S. (2013). "Tää elämä ylipäättään on sellaista yhteistyötä": Opettajien ajatuksia samanaikaisopetuksesta. Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education.

<https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/42473/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-201311182606.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2014.

https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.pdf

Perusopetuslaki (628/1998).

<https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1998/19980628>

Pesonen, H. V., Rytivaara, A., Palmu, I. and Wallin, A. (2020). Teachers' Stories on Sense of Belonging in Co-Teaching Relationship. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00313831.2019.1705902?needAccess=true>

Pulkkinen, J., Ahtiainen, R. and Malinen, O. (2017). Yhteisopetusta tukevat rakenteet. In R. Ahtiainen, J. Kontinen, O. Malinen, I. Palmu, J. Pulkkinen, A. Rytivaara and T. Saarenketo (eds.), *Tavoitteena yhteisopettajuus: näkökulmia ja toimintamalleja onnistuneeseen yhdessä opettamiseen*. Jyväskylä: Niilo Mäki Instituutti, 26-35.

Pulkkinen, J. and Rytivaara, A. (2015). *Yhteisopetuksen käsikirja*. Helsinki. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/48450/Yhteisopetuksen%20k%C3%83%C2%A4sikirja.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Rodrigues, A. B. (2013). Perceptions of Co-Teaching by Content Area and Special Education Teachers with and without Experience. School of Education. Northeastern University of Boston.

<https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:336517/fulltext.pdf>

Ruusuvuori, J. and Nikander, P. (2017). Haastatteluaineiston litterointi. In M. Hyvärinen, P. Nikander, J. Ruusuvuori and L. Aho (eds.), *Tutkimushaastattelun käsikirja*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 427-444.

Ruusuvuori, J. and Tiittula, L. (2017). Tutkimushaastattelu ja vuorovaikutus. In M. Hyvärinen, P. Nikander, J. Ruusuvuori and L. Aho (eds.), *Tutkimushaastattelun käsikirja*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 46-86.

Rytivaara, A. (2012). *Towards Inclusion: Teacher Learning in Co-Teaching*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research 453. University of Jyväskylä. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/40446/978-951-39-4927-3.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Rytivaara, A., Pulkkinen, J., Palmu, I. and Kontinen, J. (2017).

Yhteisopetuksen työtavat sekä opettajien kokemukset ja ammatillinen kehittyminen. In R. Ahtiainen, J. Kontinen, O. Malinen, I. Palmu, J. Pulkkinen, A. Rytivaara and T. Saarenketo (eds.), *Tavoitteena yhteisopettajuus: näkökulmia ja toimintamalleja onnistuneeseen yhdessä opettamiseen*. Jyväskylä: Niilo Mäki Instituutti, 16-23.

Saloviita, T. (2008). Kaikille avoimeen kouluun: erilaiset oppilaat tavallisella luokalla. Jyväskylä, PS-kustannus.

Saloviita, T. (2016). Usein esitettyjä kysymyksiä. In T. Saloviita and S. Aarnio (eds.), *Samanaikaisopetus: tuntisuunnitelmia ja työpajoja*. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 165-174.

Saloviita, T. and Aarnio, S. (2016). *Samanaikaisopetus: tuntisuunnitelmia ja työpajoja*. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus.

Soukkala, R. (2016). *Jaettu opettajuus - Samanaikaisopettajuus opettajien kokemana. Pro Gradu thesis*. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education.
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/51595/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-201610124344.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Stainback, S. B. and Stainback W. C. (1996). *Inclusion: a guide for educators*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Strogilos, V., Stefanidis, A. and Tragoulia, E. (2016). Co-teachers' attitudes towards planning and instructional activities for students with disabilities. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 31 (3), 344-359.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/08856257.2016.1141512>

Takala, M. and Uusitalo-Malmivaara, L. (2012). A one-year study of the development of co-teaching in four Finnish schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 27 (3), 373-390.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08856257.2012.691233>

Takala, T. and Vartiainen, L. (2014). *Yhdessä opettaen ja oppien - Mitä opettajat kokivat oppineensa yhteisopetuksen aikana?* Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Education.

<https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/43644/URN%3aNBN%3afi%3ajyu-201406061953.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Tuomi, J. and Sarajärvi, A. (2011). *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi*. Helsinki: Tammi.

Ukkola, P. (2016). Samanaikaisopetus – erityisopetuksen uusi valoisa tulevaisuus. In T. Saloviita and S. Aarnio (eds.), *Samanaikaisopetus: tuntisuunnitelmia ja työpajoja*. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 109-120.

Villa, R., Thousand, J. S. and Nevin, A. (2008). *A guide to co-teaching: practical tips for facilitating student learning*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.

Wilson, G. L. and Blednick J. (2011). *Teaching in tandem: effective co-teaching in the inclusive classroom*. Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=832267>

APPENDIX 1: Privacy notice and consent form

Tietoa tutkimukseen osallistujalle

Hei!

Tämän tutkimuksen toteutan minä, Iida Kalmari osana maisterintutkielmaani. Olen kuudennen vuoden englannin ja ruotsin opettajaopiskelija Jyväskylän yliopistosta. Maisterintutkielmani aiheena on: Englannin ja ruotsin opettajien kokemukset samanaikaisopetuksesta erityisopettajan kanssa.

Tutkimukseni tarkoituksena on kerätä tietoa englannin ja ruotsin opettajien kokemuksista samanaikaisopetuksesta erityisopettajan kanssa ja siten edistää tulevaisuudessa erimerkiksi samanaikaisopetukseen liittyvää koulutusta.

Samanaikaisopetuksen toteuttamistapoja voidaan kehittää toimivammiksi opettajien mielipiteiden avulla. Samanaikaistutkimuksesta on tehty tähän asti vain vähän tutkimusta kieltenopettajien näkökulmasta. Tutkimus toteutetaan haastattelemalla englannin ja ruotsin opettajia.

Jotta voin käsitellä henkilötietojasi tutkimuksen toteuttamiseksi, minulla on oltava siihen riittävä peruste. Tietojen käsittely perustuu osallistujan suostumukseen ja pyydän sinulta lupaa käyttää tätä haastattelua tutkimukseeni. Tutkimuksen tulokset ovat kaikkien hyödynnettävissä.

Pyydän Sinua mukaan tutkimukseeni, koska tarvitsen riittävästi haastateltavia saadakseni tarpeeksi suuren otannan. Maisterintutkielman kirjoittaminen on viimeinen vaihe matkallani kieltenopettajaksi valmistumiseen ja olisin kiitollinen avustasi.

Vapaaehtoisuus ja tutkittavan oikeudet

Tutkimukseen osallistuminen on täysin vapaaehtoista. Voit kieltäytyä haastattelusta tai keskeyttää tutkimukseen osallistumisen. Sinun ei tarvitse kertoa minulle, miksi et halua osallistua. Jos sinulla on kysyttävää oikeuksistasi voit olla yhteydessä myös yliopiston tietosuojavastaavaan tietosuoja(at)yu.fi, p. 040 805 3297.

Tietoa tutkimuksesta

Tulen haastattelemaan sinua _____. Haluan tietää Sinusta, miten kauan olet toiminut aineesi opettajana, miten kauan olet samanaikaisopettanut ja millä luokka-asteella sekä kuulla kokemuksiasi samanaikaisopetuksesta ja samanaikaisopetussuhteestasi erityisopettajan kanssa. Lisäksi olen kiinnostunut kuulemaan, millaista koulutusta olet saanut samanaikaisopetukseen ja oletko kehittynyt samanaikaisopettajana työurasi aikana. Haastattelu kestää noin tunnin. Tutkimukseen osallistumalla annat luvan keskustelumme äänittämiseen.

Suojaan keräämäni henkilötiedot

- Kerään vain tutkimuksen kannalta oleelliset henkilötietosi eli mitä ainetta opetat, millä luokka-asteella, miten kauan olet opettanut ja millaisessa koulussa opetat.
- Käsittelen haastattelussa saadut tiedot luottamuksellisesti ja nimettömästi. Kukaan muu ei kuuntele äänitettä kuin minä. En kerro kenellekään niitä asioita, joita kerrot minulle. Noudatan myös yliopiston ohjeita tietojen säilytyksessä. Sinua ei voida tunnistaa tutkimusraportista.
- Tietojasi käsitellään vain Suomessa, eikä niitä siirretä ulkomaille.

Tietojen arkistointi

Kun äänitteitä ei enää tarvita, hävitän ne asianmukaisesti eikä niitä arkistoida mihinkään.

Tutkimuksen tulokset

Kirjoitan tutkimuksesta maisterintutkielmani, joka julkaistaan Jyväskylän yliopiston JYX-julkaisuarkistossa.

Tutkittavan oikeudet

Voit kysyä minulta mitä tahansa tutkimuksesta ennen haastattelua, haastattelun aikana tai sen jälkeen. Sinulla on oikeus tarkastaa tai oikaista antamasi tiedot sekä voit myös kertoa minulle, että et halua tietojasi käsiteltävän ja tehdä valituksen henkilötietojesi käsittelystä.

Pyydän sinua allekirjoittamaan suostumuslomakkeen, kun teemme haastattelun.

Lomakkeella voit antaa minulle luvan käsitellä niitä tietoja, joita minulle kerrot.

Lomake on tämän tiedoston viimeisellä sivulla.

Suostumus osallistua tutkimukseen

Minua on pyydetty osallistumaan tutkimukseen: Englannin ja ruotsin opettajien kokemuksia samanaikaisopetuksesta erityisopettajan kanssa.

Olen lukenut yllä olevat tiedot ja ymmärtänyt ne. Olen saanut tarpeeksi tietoa tutkimuksesta. Iida Kalmari on kertonut minulle tutkimuksesta myös suullisesti ja vastannut kaikkiin kysymyksiini tutkimuksesta.

Ymmärrän, että tähän tutkimukseen osallistuminen on vapaaehtoista. Minulla on oikeus milloin tahansa tutkimuksen aikana keskeyttää tutkimukseen osallistuminen. Minun ei tarvitse ilmoittaa syytä keskeyttämiseen eikä siitä aiheudu minulle mitään ikäviä seuraamuksia.

Kyllä, haluan osallistua tutkimukseen.

Päiväys _____

Tutkittavan allekirjoitus _____

Tutkittavan nimen selvennys _____

Tutkijan allekirjoitus _____

Tutkijan nimen selvennys _____

APPENDIX 2: Interview questions

Teemahaastattelu kokemuksista samanaikaisopetuksessa

Taustatiedot opettajasta

- Minkä aineen opettaja olet?

- Kauanko olet toiminut opettajana ja missä kouluissa/millä luokka-asteella?

Käydään läpi, mitä samanaikaisopetus tarkoittaa tässä tutkimuksessa (opetus tapahtuu yhtä aikaa samassa luokassa erityisopettajan kanssa)

- Kauanko olet samanaikaisopettanut?

- Kauanko olet samanaikaisopettanut erityisopettajan kanssa ja montako tuntia viikossa?

- Mikä on koulunne suhtautuminen samanaikaisopetukseen?

Kokemukset samanaikaisopetuksesta

- Millaisia kokemuksia sinulla on samanaikaisopetuksesta?

- Hyvät/huonot

- Miten samanaikaisopetus sopii mielestäsi kieltenopetukseen?

- Minkälaista samanaikaisopetusta olette toteuttaneet?

- Anna esimerkkejä esim. opettajien roolista luokassa ja opetusmetodeista

- Millaista on mielestäsi tehokas samanaikaisopetus?

- Minkälaisia aspekteja liittyy erityisesti kieltenopetuksessa tehtävään samanaikaisopetukseen?

- Oletko huomannut samanaikaisopetuksella olevan vaikutusta oppimistuloksiin?

- Onko samanaikaisopetus mielestäsi tarpeellista?

- Onko se hyödyllistä esimerkiksi inklusion haasteisiin vastaamisessa?

- (Mitä mieltä inklusiosta?)

- Onko käsityksesi samanaikaisopetuksesta muuttunut alkaessasi itse toteuttaa sitä?

Kokemukset samanaikaisopetussuhteesta

- Oletteko päässeet asioista hyvin yhteisymmärrykseen?
 - Ovatko opetusfilosofianne samankaltaiset?
- Mikä on saanut teidät samanaikaisopettamaan yhdessä?
 - Esim. oma halu tai käsky ylemmältä taholta
- Kuinka tuntien suunnittelu on sujunut?
 - Onko aikaa kulunut mielestäsi enemmän vai vähemmän kuin suunnitellessasi omia tuntejasi?
- Onko työnjako sujunut mielestäsi hyvin?
 - Oletteko tasa-arvoisia esimerkiksi rooleissanne luokassa?
 - Ovatko erityisopiskelijat vain erityisopettajan vastuulla?
- Koetko joskus, että erityisopettaja tulee reviirillesi?
- Oletteko antaneet toisillenne palautetta?
 - Oletteko puhuneet vaikeistakin asioista rehellisesti erityisopettajan kanssa?
- Jos olet samanaikaisopettanut jonkun muunkin kuin erityisopettajan kanssa niin miten tämä samanaikaisopetussuhde eroaa siitä?
- Miten yhteistyönne ja opetusmetodinne ovat kehittyneet siitä, kun aloititte samanaikaisopetuksen työparisi kanssa?
 - Miten voisitte kehittää yhteistyötänne vielä lisää?

Koulutuksen merkitys ja työelämästä saatu oppi

- Koetko saaneesi opettajankoulutuksesta eväitä samanaikaisopetukseen?
 - Oliko harjoittelussa koskaan samanaikaisopetusta vai jäikö koulutus vain teorian tasolle?
- Entä täydennyskoulutus?
- Oletko oppinut asioita erityisopettajalta?
 - Mitä kieltenopettajat voisivat ottaa opiksi erityisopettajilta?
- Oletteko saaneet tukea samanaikaisopetukseen työpaikaltanne?
 - Esim. yhteistä suunnittelu-aikaa tai vinkkejä ja kannustusta yhteistyöhön