

TEAM TEACHING, SUPPORTIVE TEACHING, SUPPLEMENTAL TEACHING AND PARALLEL TEACHING IN A LEARNERS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS (LSENs) CLASSROOM: TOWARDS STEPS IN SETTING HIGH EXPECTATIONS

Dainalyn T. Baliscao

Email: dainalynbaliscao91@gmail.com
Alcott Elementary School, Michigan, USA

ABSTRACT

This study examined team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching practices in classrooms for Learners with Special Education Needs (LSENs) as a basis for developing steps toward setting high expectations. Specifically, it described the profile of school administrator-respondents and assessed LSEN teachers' co-teaching practices, determined whether significant differences existed in administrators' assessments when grouped according to profile variables, and examined the relationships among the four co-teaching approaches. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design and utilized a validated survey questionnaire. The respondents were 55 school administrators, school heads, Master Teachers, and Head Teachers from schools implementing inclusive education in the Division of General Trias City. Frequency count, weighted mean, t-test, and Pearson correlation coefficient were used to analyze the data.

Results revealed that the four co-teaching approaches were generally somewhat practiced: team teaching obtained a composite mean of 3.49, supportive teaching 3.46, supplemental teaching 3.36, and parallel teaching 3.47. Significant differences were found in the administrators' assessments of the four practices when respondents were grouped according to age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service. Significant positive relationships were also found between team teaching and supportive teaching ($r = 0.465$, $p < .001$) and between supportive teaching and supplemental teaching ($r = 0.298$, $p = .027$). The findings indicate the need to strengthen collaborative planning, shared responsibility, communication, clearly defined instructional roles, and coordinated teaching practices to establish higher expectations and more effective inclusive learning environments for LSENs.

Keywords: *Co-teaching, Team teaching, Supportive teaching, Supplemental teaching, Parallel teaching, Learners with Special education needs, Inclusive education*

How to Cite: Baliscao, D. T. (2026). Team Teaching, Supportive Teaching, Supplemental Teaching And Parallel Teaching In A Learners With Special Education Needs (LSENs) Classroom: Towards Steps In Setting High Expectations. IAM FAME Journal of International Education Research, 1(1), 44-48.

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education requires schools to provide appropriate learning opportunities for Learners with Special Education Needs (LSENs) while ensuring that they participate meaningfully in classroom instruction. One

approach to strengthening inclusive classroom practices is co-teaching, in which educators collaborate in planning, delivering, monitoring, and evaluating instruction. Team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching provide different structures through which teachers can combine their expertise and respond to diverse learner needs.

Collaboration between special education and general education teachers is particularly important because effective inclusion extends beyond placing LSENs in general education settings. It requires shared responsibility, coordinated expectations, appropriate instructional strategies, collaborative decision-making, and an environment in which educators collectively work toward improved learner outcomes. The study therefore examined the extent to which these four teaching approaches are practiced and how school administrators perceive their implementation. The findings were intended to provide a basis for developing steps toward setting high expectations for LSENs and strengthening collaborative inclusive education. The manuscript identifies learners, teachers, principals, education officials, and future researchers as potential beneficiaries of stronger collaborative teaching practices.

RESEARCH PROBLEMS

The study sought to answer several key questions, beginning with determining the demographic profile of the school administrator-respondents in terms of their age, sex, highest educational attainment, and length of service. It then explored how these administrators assess the practices of LSEN teachers specifically regarding team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching.

Additionally, the research investigated whether there are significant differences in the administrators' assessments of these four co-teaching approaches when the respondents are grouped according to their profile variables. The study also examined if there is a significant relationship among the co-teaching variables themselves.

Finally, based on the findings, the research aimed to identify what steps may be developed toward setting high expectations for Learners with Special Education Needs (LSENs).

OBJECTIVES

The study aimed to determine the team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching practices in Learners with Special Education Needs (LSEN) classrooms as a basis for developing steps toward setting high expectations.

Specifically, it aimed to describe the profile of the school administrator-respondents in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, and length of service; determine the administrators' assessment of LSEN teachers' practices in team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching; determine whether significant differences exist in the assessment of the four co-teaching practices when respondents are grouped according to their profile; determine the significant relationships among team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching; and use the findings as a basis for developing steps toward setting high expectations in LSEN classrooms.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component was used to describe the respondents' profiles and their assessments of LSEN teachers' practices in team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching. The correlational component was employed to determine the relationships among the co-teaching variables.

The respondents consisted of 55 school administrators, school heads, Master Teachers, and Head Teachers from the Division of General Trias City. Purposive sampling was used to select respondents whose schools implemented inclusive education and accommodated Learners with Special Education Needs.

To analyze the data, frequency and percentage were employed to describe the respondents' profiles, while weighted mean was used to assess the co-teaching practices. An independent sample t-test was utilized to determine significant differences in assessments when respondents were grouped by sex and educational attainment. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed for variables with three or more categories, specifically age and length of service. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationships among the co-teaching practices.

Data were collected using a researcher-developed survey questionnaire based on related literature and studies. The instrument underwent expert validation and revisions based on recommendations from graduate-school professors and the research panel. A four-point scale was utilized. Frequency count was employed for respondent profiles, weighted mean for the assessment of teaching practices, t-test for determining significant differences, and Pearson correlation coefficient for examining significant relationships among the variables.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

The findings of the study, presented according to the research problems, revealed insights from 55 administrator-respondents. Demographically, most respondents were aged 40 to 44 years with females slightly outnumbering males, and all were highly experienced professionals possessing at least 20 years of service and postgraduate qualifications, with 58% holding completed master's degrees and 42% having earned doctoral units.

In assessing co-teaching practices, team teaching obtained a composite mean of 3.49 (Somewhat Practiced), driven largely by the high use of technological tools for collaboration, cooperative classroom routines, and blended expertise, though collaborative lesson preparation and open dialogue were assessed comparatively lower. Supportive teaching followed closely with a composite mean of 3.46 (Somewhat Practiced), highlighted by a strong multidisciplinary approach to student success involving general education teachers, specialists, and parents, despite a noted need for better coordination of expectations and resources. Supplemental teaching received the lowest overall composite mean at 3.36 (Somewhat Practiced), where shared responsibility for the learning process was rated highest, but collaborative course goal-setting, syllabus preparation, and evaluation were rated lowest.

Meanwhile, parallel teaching garnered a composite mean of 3.47 (Somewhat Practiced), excelling in the establishment of shared academic and social goals but requiring strengthened communication, common planning time, and joint ownership. Statistical analyses indicated significant differences in the administrators' assessments of all four teaching approaches when respondents were grouped by age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service.

Finally, regarding the relationships among the teaching approaches, a significant positive relationship was found between team teaching and supportive teaching ($r = 0.465$, $p < .001$), as well as between supportive teaching and supplemental teaching ($r = 0.298$, $p = .027$), while the relationships between team and supplemental, team and parallel, supportive and parallel, and supplemental and parallel teaching were not statistically significant.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings demonstrate that team teaching, supportive teaching, supplemental teaching, and parallel teaching are present in LSEN classrooms but are generally only somewhat practiced, indicating opportunities for more systematic and consistent implementation. Team teaching demonstrates strengths in technology integration and cooperative classroom routines; supportive teaching emphasizes shared responsibility and multidisciplinary collaboration; supplemental teaching reflects shared accountability but requires stronger joint planning and instructional design; and parallel teaching demonstrates strength in establishing common academic and social goals.

The significant differences according to administrator profiles suggest that age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service influence administrators' assessments of these co-teaching practices.

Moreover, the significant relationships between team and supportive teaching and between supportive and supplemental teaching indicate that certain collaborative approaches reinforce one another.

Overall, strengthening the integration of co-teaching practices can contribute to more coordinated inclusive instruction and the establishment of higher expectations for Learners with Special Education Needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, several key recommendations emerge to enhance co-teaching practices. First, schools should institutionalize dedicated and consistent co-planning periods for special education and general education teachers to establish common instructional goals, jointly prepare materials, and align teaching strategies. To support this foundation, it is crucial to strengthen communication and collaboration through regular discussions, shared decision-making, and constructive feedback responsive to the diverse needs of Learners with Special Education Needs (LSENs). Educators should be encouraged to promote an "our class" philosophy, assuming equal and shared responsibility for the academic, behavioral, and social development of all learners.

Furthermore, co-teachers must clearly define and alternate their instructional roles to ensure balanced participation in instruction, classroom management, and student assessment. This collaboration should be reinforced by developing shared classroom routines and resources that promote the consistent implementation of team, supportive, supplemental, and parallel teaching. To sustain these efforts, administrators must provide continuous professional development and support, alongside regular monitoring and collaborative reflection to address implementation gaps and improve practices over time.

Finally, it is highly recommended to adopt the proposed "Steps in Setting High Expectations for LSEN Classrooms" as a practical guide for both teachers and administrators to strengthen shared responsibility, collaborative planning, and consistently high expectations for all learners.

REFERENCES

- Blanton, L. P., & Perez, Y. (2011). Exploring the relationship between special education and general education teachers in inclusive classrooms. In J. M. Kauffman & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), *Handbook of special education* (pp. 139–152). Routledge.
- Cole, B. A. (2005). Mission impossible? Special educational needs, inclusion and the re-conceptualization of the role of the SENCO in England and Wales. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 20(3), 287–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250500156020>
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (2010). The state of the art of collaboration on behalf of students with disabilities. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 1–8.
- Cramer, E. D. (2010). *Collaborative leadership and inclusive schools*. Pearson.
- Department of Education. (2020). *Philippine professional standards for school heads (PPSSH)*.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 9–27.